

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/134368/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Boivin, J. , Harrison, C., Mathur, R., Burns, G., Pericleous-Smith, A. and Gameiro, S. 2020. Patient experiences of fertility clinic closure during the COVID-19 pandemic: appraisals, coping and emotions. *Human Reproduction* 35 (11) , pp. 2556-2566. [10.1093/humrep/deaa218](https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deaa218)

Publishers page: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deaa218>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



1 **Patient experiences of fertility clinic closure during the COVID-19 pandemic: Appraisals, coping**
2 **and emotions**

3

4 Running title: Coping with fertility COVID-19 clinic closure

5 Authors: J. Boivin^{1*}, C. Harrison¹, R. Mathur², G. Burns³, A. Pericleous-Smith, S. Gameiro¹

6

7 ¹Cardiff University, School of Psychology, Tower Building, 70 Park Place, Cardiff, United Kingdom,
8 CF10 3AT

9 ²Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust and Manchester Academic Health Sciences Centre,
10 Manchester, UK.

11 ³Fertility Network UK, London, UK

12 ⁴British Infertility Counselling Association, York, UK

13 *Corresponding author

14 Cardiff University, School of Psychology, Tower Building, 70 Park Place, Cardiff, United Kingdom,
15 CF10 3AT

16

17 **Abstract**

18 **Study Question**

19 What are appraisals, coping strategies and emotional reactions to COVID-19 fertility clinic closures?

20 **Summary Answer**

21 Clinic closure was appraised as stressful due to uncertainty and threat to the attainability of the
22 parenthood goal but patients were able to cope using strategies that fit the uncertainty of the
23 situation.

24 **What is known already**

25 Psychological research on COVID-19 suggests people are more anxious than historical norms and
26 moderately to extremely upset about COVID-19 fertility treatment cancellation.

27 **Study design, size, duration.**

28 Cross-sectional design. Mixed-methods, English, anonymous, online survey posted from April 09 to
29 April 21 to social media. Eligibility criteria was being affected by COVID-19 fertility clinic closure, 18
30 years of age or older and able to complete survey in English. In total 946 people clicked on the
31 survey link, 76 did not consent, 420 started but did not complete survey, and 450 completed (48%
32 completion, 446 women, 4 men).

33 **Participants / materials, setting, methods**

34 Overall 74.7% (n=336) were residents in the UK with average age was 33.6 years (SD=4.4) and
35 average years trying 3.5 years (SD=2.22). The survey comprised quantitative questions about
36 intensity of appraisal and emotions, and ability to cope with clinic closure. Open-text questions
37 covered understanding of COVID-19 and its effect on reproductive health and fertility plans,
38 concerns and perceived benefits of clinic closure, and knowledge about closure. Sociodemographic
39 information was collected. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used on quantitative data.
40 Thematic qualitative analysis (inductive coding) was performed on the textual data from each
41 question. Deductive coding grouped themes from each question into meta-themes related to
42 cognitive stress and coping theory.

43 **Main results and the role of chance**

44 Most patients (82.2%, n=367) had tests or treatments postponed, with these being self (41.6%,
45 n=186) or publicly (46.8%, 209) funded. Patients appraised fertility clinic closure as having potential
46 for a more negative than positive impact on their lives, and to be very or extremely uncontrollable
47 and stressful ($p \leq .001$). Most reported a slight to moderate ability to cope with closure (11.9% not at
48 all able). Data saturation was achieved with all open-text questions with 33 broad themes identified
49 and four meta-themes linked to components of the cognitive stress and coping theory. First,
50 participants understood clinic closure was precautionary due to unknown effects of COVID-19 but

51 some felt clinic closure was unfair relative to advice about getting pregnant given to the public.
52 Second, closure was appraised as a threat to attainability of the parenthood goal largely due to
53 uncertainty of the situation (e.g., re-opening, effect of delay) and intensification of pre-existing
54 hardships of fertility problems (e.g., long time waiting for treatment, history of failed treatment).
55 Third, closure taxed personal coping resources but most were able to cope using thought-
56 management (e.g., distraction, focusing on positives), getting mentally and physically fit for next
57 treatments, strengthening their social network, and keeping up-to-date. Finally, participants
58 reported more negative than positive emotions ($p \leq .001$) and almost all participants reported stress,
59 worry and frustration at the situation, some expressed anger and resentment at the unfairness of
60 the situation, and a minority reported intense feelings of hopelessness and deteriorating wellbeing
61 and mental health.

62 **Limitations, reasons for caution**

63 The survey captures reactions at a specific point in time, during lockdown before clinics announced
64 re-opening. Participants were self-selected (e.g., UK residents, women, 48% starting but not
65 completing the survey) which may affect generalisability.

66 **Wider implications of the findings**

67 Fertility stakeholders (e.g., clinics, patient support groups, regulators, professional societies) need to
68 work together to address great uncertainty from COVID-19. This goal can be met proactively by
69 setting up transparent processes for COVID-19 eventualities and signposting to information and
70 coping resources. Future psychological research priorities should be on identifying patients at risk of
71 distress with standardised measures and developing digital technologies appropriate for realities of
72 fertility care under COVID-19.

73 **Study funding / competing interests**

74 University funded research. Outside of submitted work Professor Boivin reports personal fees from
75 Merck KGaA , Merck AB, Theramex, Ferring Pharmaceuticals A/S, grants from Merck Serono Ltd,
76 outside the submitted work and that she is co-developer of Fertility Quality of Life (FertiQoL) and
77 MediEmo app. Outside of submitted work Dr. Mathur reports personal or consultancy fees from
78 Manchester Fertility, Gedeon Richter, Ferring and Merck. Outside of submitted work Dr. Gameiro
79 reports consultancy fees from Ferring Pharmaceuticals A/S and grants from Merck Serono Ltd.

80 **Keywords:** COVID-19, infertility, stress and coping, mental health, counselling

81 **Total word count (including abstract and references): 8063 [now 7172]**

82 Introduction

83

84 The COVID-19 pandemic caused fertility clinic closures worldwide. More than a million cycles of
85 fertility treatment are typically performed every year with many patients affected by unexpected
86 clinic closure (Adamson et al. 2018). Guidance about COVID-19 emerged mid-March from
87 professional societies (e.g., European Society for Human Embryology, America Society for
88 Reproductive Medicine, British Fertility Society, ESHRE, ASRM, BFS, respectively) with often abrupt
89 closures following. In the UK, the government regulator (HFEA) issued direction to end all
90 treatments by mid-April (with some exceptions for cancer patients) which meant that patients could
91 not access treatment and, depending on timing, cycles in progress were abandoned or converted to
92 freeze all. Although clinics are re-opening worldwide, much uncertainty remains for patients about
93 how fertility services will resume, the prioritisation of waitlists, or potential re-closure for “second
94 wave” COVID-19. A vaccine is not expected for some time though some are promising. Professional
95 societies have jointly affirmed the importance of fertility care and principles to guide how it could be
96 delivered safely (Veiga et al. 2020). Given this uncertainty, the distress it can cause, and numbers
97 potentially affected, the aim of the present study was to gather data about patient experiences of
98 COVID-19 fertility clinic closures to inform on present and future needs of patients.

99

100 According to stress and coping theory, imbalance between appraisal of a threat and ability to cope
101 with it is what leads to stress reactions (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). People facing disasters generally
102 experience more stress than usual, but remarkably most cope and recover, with some eventually
103 seeing benefits from the situation (e.g., personal strength) (Pfefferbaum & North, 2020). Research to
104 date on experiences of COVID-19 in the general population indicates more anxiety and depression
105 among respondents than historical norms (online survey, Nelson, 2020), worry about becoming
106 mentally unwell due to uncertainty and loss of control but nevertheless able to use coping efforts to
107 manage the situation (online survey, Cowan et al. 2020). Factors associated with better mental
108 health include receiving up-to-date information about the outbreak and lack of pre-existing health
109 problems (online surveys, Cowan, 2020, Wang et al, 2020). To our knowledge peer-reviewed
110 research on COVID-19 appraisals and emotions in infertile populations has not yet been published
111 but a survey at an American centre posted that 85% of patients (n=253) were moderately to
112 extremely upset about treatment cancellation and only a third supported a cancellation policy
113 (Turocy et al. 2020, unpublished).

114

115 To have a more in-depth understanding of patient experiences the present study used an online
116 mixed method survey (quantitative-qualitative) to collect data on experiences of COVID-19 fertility
117 clinic closures.

118

119 **Methods**

120

121 *Participants*

122 Eligibility criteria were being a patient affected by fertility clinic closure, 18 years of age or older and
123 ability to respond in English. In total 946 people clicked on the survey link, 76 did not consent, 420
124 started but did not complete the survey, and 450 completed (all female except 4 men). Power
125 calculations were not performed due to uncertainty of any quantitative effects. Table 1 shows the
126 demographic characteristics of the final sample.

127

128 [insert Table 1 about here]

129

130 *Materials*

131 The quantitative-qualitative English, anonymous, online survey was created using Qualtrics
132 (Qualtrics, Provo UT). Quantitative questions were from the daily record-keeping form (Boivin &
133 Lancaster, 2010) which was designed from cognitive stress and coping theory (Lazarus and Folkman,
134 1984; Peacock & Wong, 1990). Five single appraisal items asked whether clinic closure could have a
135 positive or negative impact for the person (primary appraisal), was controllable or stressful, and
136 whether the person had the resources to cope with the situation (secondary appraisal). A further
137 eight single items asked about intensity of emotional reactions associated with threat (nervous,
138 worried), harm (sad, discouraged), challenge (positive, hopeful) and benefit (relieved, happy). The
139 appraisals and emotions were rated on a five-point response scale (1 not at all to 5 extremely)
140 where higher scores indicated more of the attribute. The response scale differed from the original
141 four-point response scale in Boivin and Lancaster (2010) and we used only 8 of the 16 DRK items.
142 Due to using single items reliability could not be computed. Open text questions (without character
143 limits) asked participants to indicate, in their own words, their understanding of COVID-19 and its
144 reproductive impact, perceptions of closure (i.e., who decided, when clinics would re-open, desired
145 information), its impact on fertility plans, fears and concerns related to closure, ways of coping with
146 closure, and any perceived benefits from the closure. Background information was collected (e.g.,
147 gender, age, relationship status, financial risk due to COVID-19 and fertility status, treatment
148 funding). The School of Psychology, Cardiff University provided study ethical review and approval.

149

150 *Procedure*

151 A draft survey was generated and submitted to our professional and patient group collaborators
152 (British Fertility Society, Fertility Network UK, British Infertility Counselling Association). Comments
153 were integrated and the revised draft uploaded to Qualtrics and distributed. Webmasters at five
154 charities and social influencers in the fertility domain were contacted to help distribute the survey
155 via social media from April 09 to 21, 2020. Two webmasters could not distribute due to full social
156 media schedules and prioritising their own surveys. Upon clicking the survey link an information and
157 consent form was presented. There was no time limit on survey completion, but interrupted surveys
158 had to be completed within one week of last input. At the end of the survey participants were
159 thanked, debriefed and provided with links to support resources.

160

161 *Data analysis*

162 Descriptive and inferential statistics were used on quantitative data. A within-subject analysis of
163 variance (ANOVA) was used to compare appraisals and emotions rated by the same person.
164 Significant main effects were followed-up with Bonferroni adjusted paired t-tests. Qualitative
165 analysis was used on textual data according to the method of Braun and Clarke (2006) with first
166 steps being familiarisation with data, inductive coding (attaching meaningful labels to textual data
167 segments) and reviewing coding with colleagues. Coding was carried out until no new codes
168 (variation in data) were identified (i.e., data saturation reached). Codes were then organized into
169 themes that captured a recurrent more abstracted idea present in the data. Meta-themes according
170 to stress and coping theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) were then deduced from themes occurring
171 across questions. Given the rapid response nature of the survey JB, CH and SG were all first coders
172 and code reviewers on at least one question. Authors came together multiple times across the
173 coding process for peer debriefing, to reflect, discuss, review, and name the themes emerging from
174 the data. Themes were cross-checked against the extracts of data. Textual data analysis was
175 presented as a summary accompanied by a thematic map and illustrative verbatim quotations.
176 Within illustrative quotations the use of [...] indicated part of the quotation was not presented
177 because it was not relevant whereas (text) indicated additional text was added for clarity (i.e.,
178 readability, comprehensibility). Grammatical errors were corrected. Participant number was
179 indicated with P.

180

Results

181 Sample fertility characteristics

182 Table 2 shows fertility and treatment characteristics for the sample. For the majority (> 80%) the
183 clinic was closed at the time of the survey and treatments or testing postponed.

184

185 [insert Table 2 about here]

186

187 Experiences of fertility clinic closures

188 Inductive coding revealed 33 themes for the open-text questions. Figure 1 shows the meta-thematic
189 map relating themes generated across questions to the four main components of the cognitive
190 stress and coping theory. According to theory, people first appraise an event (i.e., closure) as having
191 the potential of threatening wellbeing, and then appraise whether they have the resources to cope
192 with stressor. Imbalance between these appraisals can trigger diverse stress reactions
193 (psychological, physical, behavioural). Supplementary Table 1 shows main and meta-themes with
194 illustrative quotes, and Supplementary Tables 2 to 7 shows coding for each question.

195

196 [insert Figure 1]

197

198 I. Experience and appreciation of uncertainty in COVID-19 and context for fertility clinic closure

199

200 The context of clinic closure was understood to be precautionary and due to uncertain effects of
201 COVID-19 on fertility, pregnancy and baby health, government guidance to stop non-essential
202 treatments, and health service staffing issues (e.g., redeployment). Among those responding
203 (n=399), patients understood the decision to close clinics involved the government or its regulator
204 (hereafter “government”, 64.7%, n=258), professional societies (20.1%, n=80), clinics (15.8%, n=63),
205 the health service (6.5%, n = 26), with a proportion being unsure (11.5%, n = 46). At the time of the
206 survey, recollection was that no details (“nothing”) was provided about re-opening.

207

208 The nature of evidence used to express views on COVID-19 effects varied in quantity-and source (see
209 Supplementary Table 1). Participants were in agreement regarding the belief that: pregnancy
210 reduced immunity to fight off COVID-19, fever or illness in early pregnancy was damaging to the
211 foetus, COVID-19 in late pregnancy could cause pre-term delivery and it would be difficult to treat
212 pregnant women (e.g., use of ventilator). In contrast, mixed agreement was expressed about risk of
213 contracting COVID-19, vertical transmission between mother and foetus, increased risk of
214 miscarriage, or affected mothers giving birth to unhealthy babies. In the few occasions fertility
215 effects were mentioned these were for an effect on sperm quality (usually due to fever).

216

217 Participants understood that clinic closure had been necessary. [*“It’s a necessary evil to help stop the*
218 *death toll from COVID-19 rising even higher. P74”*]. When asked about possible benefits of closure
219 about half the sample reported at least one, with most referring to safety of healthcare staff and the
220 general population, and reduced strain on healthcare services. [*“Personally none, but in holistic*
221 *terms there are more staff to help with the pandemic [...] P71”*].

222

223 Unfairness at clinic closure was expressed for diverse reasons. First, it was perceived as
224 discriminatory that people dependent on clinics to achieve pregnancy were treated differently than
225 those able to do so without treatment: [*“Get the clinics open. If not, start telling everyone not to*
226 *conceive otherwise this is a massive breach against our human rights. P163”*]. Linked to this was the
227 view that COVID-19 could have been handled differently [*“It was cruel to stop treatment halfway*
228 *through and before the (regulator’s) deadline. P66”*] and that clinics could provide “[...] *at least some*
229 *treatments safely even if on a reduced scale. P243”*. Second, unfairness was expressed at the closure
230 decision not being well founded [*“...it felt like the decision to stop IVF treatments was based on very*
231 *little evidence. P243”*] or based on remote evidence [*“...some arbitrary decision made by the distant*
232 *international organization.... P254”*]. Participants also perceived fertility services not being
233 considered essential as unfair [*“(fertility treatment) is not deemed as essential service but yet garden*
234 *centres and off license can remain open. It feels like the government don’t care. P168”*].

235

236 II. Negative appraisals of clinic closure

237

238 Figure 2 shows descriptive data for appraisals. The main effect of appraisal in within-subject ANOVA
239 was significant ($F(4, 1764)=1074.37, p < .001$). Bonferroni adjusted paired t-tests showed all
240 appraisals were significantly different from each other ($p < .001$) except for perceived negative
241 impact and stressfulness ($p = .412$) which were both highest, and between positive impact and
242 controllability ($p = .082$) which were both lowest.

243

244 [insert Figure 2 about here]

245

246 Textual analysis showed that clinic closure was appraised as a threat to the attainability of the
247 parenthood goal because it meant the possible end to hopes and dreams to get pregnant (with own
248 eggs), to become a parent, or give a child a sibling. Participants perceived missing out on their one or
249 very last opportunity to become pregnant (“running out of time”). Delay was also appraised as a loss

250 that participants were processing: *“It’s painful to think [...] we will have gone through another year*
251 *without a child. P210”*.

252

253 Two characteristics of the situation made threat and loss appraisals stronger. First, uncertainty
254 overall, and especially regarding the impact of treatment delay on fertility (e.g., egg quality, lower
255 ovarian reserve) and success rates [*“By the time clinics reopen I may no longer have any eggs left at*
256 *all. P14”*; *“my eggs will be in decline therefore reducing the success rate of IVF being successful even*
257 *further”*. P117]. Uncertainty about personal circumstances were also expressed (e.g., reaching age
258 limit, see Supplementary Table 1). A second situational characteristic linked to threat appraisals was
259 closure being an additional burden on top of what patients had already experienced due to fertility
260 problems. The sense of waiting on top of waiting was described as being an unacknowledged
261 challenging process in fertility treatment [*“[...] just feels like another setback and waiting game and*
262 *you get plenty of this in the awful world of infertility. P332”*; *“... Infertility is cruel as it is let alone*
263 *combined with COVID-19. P142”*]. People also referred to accumulated past disappointments
264 (miscarriages, treatment failures) to which COVID-19 was now added, making *“ ... this (clinic closure)*
265 *is not easy to take. P32”*. When asked, some participants did see that closure could have benefits
266 such as providing an opportunity to process difficult emotional experiences before re-starting [*“[...] I*
267 *can grieve my previous losses. P229”*, *“[...] give me more time to process the grief associated with*
268 *using a donor [...] P426”*].

269

270 *III. Coping with clinic closure is taxing*

271

272 Figure 2 shows that participants reported slight to moderate ability to cope with the situation
273 (coping significantly lower than scale mid-point, $t(445)=16.03, p<.001$). Coping efforts were most
274 often directed at managing the uncertainty of waiting, the perceived threat to attainability of the
275 parenthood goal, and perceived losses.

276

277 Textual analysis showed people mostly used thought-management strategies especially in relation to
278 coping with uncertainty and waiting (see Supplementary Table 1). These included keeping busy
279 (distraction coping), and focusing on the present (e.g., yoga, meditation, mindfulness), the positives
280 (e.g., positive reappraisal coping, valuing the small things in life, reading positive stories), or what
281 could be controlled. People also compared themselves to others (perspective taking) in worse
282 situations [*“I can’t feel sorry for my situation and treatment stopping mid-cycle. I’ve friends who are*
283 *NHS staff treating covid-19 patients, that’s scarier ... Perspective is needed here. P64”*] but this was

284 not always possible [*“[...] not being able to try again feels much worse than COVID-19. P444”*].
285 Thought avoidance and denial were also used [*“I am trying not to think at all about a future I cannot*
286 *control. P80”*; *“Denial. I try to convince myself this will be over very soon and that a 2-month delay is*
287 *meaningless. P150”*]. A few were accessing therapy or counselling [*“I contacted the counselling*
288 *service of the clinic. It is helpful to a degree to have some special time to talk about it and reflect.*
289 *P134”*].

290

291 A common strategy focused on getting mentally and physically ready for clinic re-opening by
292 exercising, having a healthy diet, managing weight and taking vitamins and supplements, in order to
293 maximise chances of success of next treatments. Giving the body a rest from the past burden of
294 treatment was seen by some as a benefit of closure. The reverse was also true with reverting to “...
295 *using bad habits to cope. P217”* being mentioned [*“I fell into a slump of drinking wine, eating rubbish*
296 *and not exercising, not being able to sleep [...] P281”*].

297

298 Participants reported strengthening their social support network by staying close and
299 communicating with their partner, reaching out and maintaining contact with friends and family.
300 Many participants used social media for support [*“[...] we met through the hospital support group*
301 *and have continued this during covid-19 via WhatsApp groups. P411”*]. These participants were
302 reassured they were not alone and felt understood because [*“[...] most others don’t understand the*
303 *difficulties we are experiencing. P248”*]. For a minority these were spaces to express frustrations and
304 share indignation [*“I am on a number of fertility forums. We all feel the same. Victimised and robbed*
305 *of our human rights [...] P28”*]. Not all social contact was seen as positive: [*“I cannot speak to or see*
306 *via the internet any friends with young children, and I have had to block them all... P313*].

307

308 Information gathering was also an important coping strategy. The ability to communicate and get
309 updates from clinics was perceived as integral to forming accurate threat appraisals and essential to
310 coping. Participants kept up-to-date about clinics re-opening by directly asking for updates and
311 advice from clinics or organisations (e.g., government), by following social media, checking clinic
312 websites, reaching out to consultants or voicing concerns to clinics. Diverse proactive clinic
313 initiatives (e.g., personal call, Q&A sessions, webinars, clinic Facebook page for patients, dedicated
314 line for questions) were perceived as helpful. Perceived benefits of receiving updated clinic
315 information were mental wellbeing, preparation for treatment, and to counter social media
316 (mis)information. Communication was sometimes perceived to be problematic. Participants were
317 told that clinics would update regularly but updates were not posted and patients felt “left in the

318 dark", "left hanging", "forgotten" "dropped off with no follow-up", which was difficult [*"I know it's*
319 *hard for them to predict but it's just not good for any of us to have no hope! P102"*]. The main
320 information participants wanted was when clinics would re-open (even a rough estimate) and
321 prioritisation of the waitlist. Comments suggested tailored information might be needed for sub-
322 group of patients who were not officially on waitlist because awaiting results, using medication (e.g.,
323 ovulation induction), cross-border reproductive care, or egg donors (shortage of donors expected).
324 Finally, some participants coped by being the providers of information, active in groups that raised
325 awareness of their own and others' situation with professional societies and government, with
326 variable success.

327
328 Whilst most reported coping with the situation, 11.9% (n=53) did not feel they had the resources to
329 cope with clinic closure (reported on quantitative scale) which was reflected in textual replies that
330 nothing was helpful and that coping in this situation was very difficult despite trying [*"[...] I find my*
331 *mind wanders and I start thinking about never being a mum etc. I try to focus on something else but*
332 *it's very difficult. P30"*]. Coping was also described as being ineffective. Paradoxically, a few
333 participants found comfort in the idea that there was nothing they could do. [*"I am aware there is*
334 *nothing I can do, so there is a small amount of comfort in that [...]. P184"*].

335 336 IV. Stress reactions despite coping efforts

337
338 Quantitative emotion analysis (see Figure 3) using within-subjects ANOVA showed the main effect of
339 type of emotion was significant ($F(3.00, 1332.17)=1054.57, p<.001$, Greenhouse-Geiser adjusted
340 degrees of freedom). Harm (sad, discouraged) and threat emotions (nervous, worried) were most
341 intense compared to challenge (positive, hopeful) and benefit (relieved, happy) emotions. Post hoc
342 tests using the Bonferroni correction revealed that all emotions were significantly different from
343 each other ($p < .000$) except for nervous and discouraged, and relieved and happy. Strong emotional
344 terms were used about clinic closure (e.g., devastated, heartbroken) and of high intensity (*"through*
345 *the roof P114"*, *"shattered our world P243"*, *"horrendous P19"*).

346
347 Textual analysis showed that clinic closure was taxing but manageable for most. A range of stress
348 reactions was reported (see Supplementary Table 1). Participants referred to stress, worry and
349 frustration about clinic closure, usually linked to strain of uncertainty [*"...hate the uncertainty...*
350 *P232"*, *"not knowing ... is agonising P104"*]. Uncertainty also entrained rumination with
351 unanswerable 'what if' questions [*"I have a lot of 'what if' questions, such as what if we were at a*

352 *private clinic that was still operating, what if my cycle started earlier and we could have seen*
353 *treatment through etc. P26”]. Perceptions that clinic closure was unfair (see section I) were echoed*
354 *in feelings of resentment (implicit, explicit) towards experiences of pregnancy and parenting in*
355 *others [“[...] but then I see other people getting naturally pregnant and can’t help feeling how it’s so*
356 *unfair and unjust. Feel angry and a deep, deep sadness. P86”]. Fewer participants expressed deeper*
357 *hopelessness, sadness, depressive feelings and lack of control. A minority were starting to*
358 *acknowledge they might have to come to terms with being childless [“...I won’t be able to have my*
359 *own children and face the feelings and emotions that go with that. P141”]. The situation occasionally*
360 *caused people regret [“It’s particularly hard knowing that with a different partner I probably could’ve*
361 *had the children that I wanted when I wanted them and been happy P217”]. Those most affected*
362 *referred to deterioration in mental health [“my mental health is spiralling out of control [...]. P66”] or*
363 *impacts on relationship [“Fear of the strain it may put on my marriage. P290”]. Approximately half*
364 *of participants could not report any personal benefits when asked, and a few felt clinic closure*
365 *would require serious long-term support [“... It’s [closure] just going to cause a number of people*
366 *needing antidepressants, counselling and therapies perhaps lifelong. P28”]. Four participants*
367 *reported suicidal ideation [“Not only this but (closure has) had huge impact on my mental health and*
368 *put me into a deep depression, causing suicidal thoughts that I never experienced before in my life*
369 *and never thought it can happen to me. P331”].*

370

371 Finally, some people reported more physical or behavioural stress reactions: [“The extra stress put
372 upon an already intense situation [...] I have lost weight, unable to eat correctly, feeling nauseous the
373 majority of the time due to anxiety...P155”]. Many people reported “crying every day. P292” or not
374 being able to “sleep very well P217”, for example.

375

376 **Discussion**

377 The COVID-19 fertility clinic closure was experienced as an exceptional event but is one likely to
378 recur, or at minimum one that will substantially change delivery of fertility care worldwide. Results
379 show that the precautionary need for clinic closure was understood but viewed as a significant
380 threat to the attainability of parenthood goals. Most experienced significant stress reactions as
381 judged by the wording of textual replies, suggesting coping was not optimised, and 11% reported
382 feeling unable to cope on a quantitative measure. Managing fertility care under COVID-19 will
383 require processes for COVID-19 eventualities and boosting patient coping resources. These
384 processes are likely to involve communication strategies optimised for uncertain and unpredictable
385 situations, expectation management and a stepped approach to psychosocial support. We make

386 suggestions to achieve these, which we believe apply in times of closure and future operations
387 under COVID-19 circumstances. This study was a rapid assessment at an early time during clinic
388 closure. Future research will need to assess longer-term psychosocial adjustment to COVID-19 using
389 standardised measures of anxiety and depression and, support development and evaluation of
390 interventions to address emerging support needs.

391

392 Clinic closure was a devastating event that taxed coping resources of participants reporting from the
393 UK, Europe and North America). According to stress and coping theory, accommodative strategies
394 (e.g., distraction, acceptance, positive reappraisal) are best suited to manage unpredictable and
395 uncontrollable situations like clinic closure (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984) as these help people modify
396 their view of the situation rather than try to change a situation they cannot change. Accommodative
397 strategies have been shown to be effective for non-fertility and fertility-related stressors (e.g.,
398 waiting for pregnancy tests results, Ockhuijsen et al. 2014). Participants in the present study and
399 other COVID-19 studies (Cowan, 2020) seem to intuitively use these strategies, alongside other
400 forms of coping such as social support for validation and information-seeking to reduce uncertainty
401 (e.g., checking in with forums, monitoring clinic information). However, the benefits of
402 accommodative coping were not maximised as indicated by significant stress reactions. These results
403 suggest that boosting and optimising the accommodative coping patients already do and
404 encouraging wider stakeholders (patient groups, professional organisations, regulators) to intervene
405 in a way that aligns with such efforts could extend coping benefits (e.g., ability to tolerate uncertain
406 situation, wellbeing).

407

408 One way for clinics to boost coping resources is to achieve better signposting of information and
409 present it in a way that matches patient preferences (e.g., format, gaps in knowledge). Coping and
410 communication strategies for uncertainty are needed because uncertainty was a modifiable
411 situational characteristic strongly associated with appraisals of closure being a threat. In other
412 COVID-19 studies, regular up-to-date information was perceived to be especially useful (Wang et al.,
413 2020, Cowan, 2020). Table 3 provides recommendations for information provision according to
414 needs and preferences expressed by participants, and ways in which uncertain information could be
415 presented more certainly. While we suggest signposting, we are aware of the complexities of
416 information provision in the COVID-19 context. First, is identifying who can best deliver what
417 information. Patients were monitoring multiple sources of information (e.g., governments,
418 regulators, health organisations, professional societies, clinics) in addition to informal sources (social
419 media, news). In principle, the body responsible for deciding whether clinics open or not (i.e.,

420 government, professional society or clinic) should be responsible for announcing closures and
421 naming the trigger event(s) by which clinics will re-open (e.g., minimum effective [R]eproduction
422 number, maximum number of new COVID-19 cases). The government/regulator could work with
423 patient groups and professional organisations to collate and make resources readily available.
424 Second, is the format of information. Results suggest personal contact (e.g., personal call or email)
425 and personalised information (e.g., clinics will open on date X and you will be seen on date Y) were
426 especially valued. Generic information on social media and websites was also appreciated. Third,
427 clinic re-opening is not the end of the COVID-19 impacts for patients or clinics. As part of the new
428 normal, clinics will have to make their processes resilient for the challenges of providing fertility care
429 under COVID-19 and be transparent to patients who will need to adapt to these new processes.
430 Already there is discussion and guidance about clinic operations (e.g., COVID-19 screening, triage,
431 telemedicine, micro-teams, recurring closures) and the possibility that clinic closures will recur as
432 part of managing COVID-19 flare-ups. To minimize disappointment patients will need to be
433 forewarned on how their treatment experience will change, and of criteria that may lead to more
434 change, delay or even termination in treatment cycle procedures (e.g., presence of COVID-19
435 symptoms, regulator announcement of clinics re-closure). We illustrate here with information
436 sources from the UK and Europe due to our familiarity with these sources (see Table 3) but
437 information specific to each country should be provided.

438

439 [insert Table 3 about here]

440

441 The results also suggest a need to support patients develop realistic expectations of fertility care
442 constrained by COVID19 operational requirements. One warning for patients is that creation of new
443 knowledge takes time and patients will often need to tolerate long periods of a no-change status in
444 clinic updates. Information providers (clinics, regulators) can ease this waiting if dates for regular
445 updates are clearly indicated and the change/no-change status is explicitly acknowledged. Even
446 when information is provided, it is important to forewarn patients that it is subject to review due to
447 the constant emergence of new evidence and rapidly evolving situation. Second, is addressing
448 perceived unfairness of clinic closure as soon as voiced. This explanation could reflect that, as
449 collaborators to the patient's parental project, fertility staff are partly responsible for the welfare of
450 the child, which entrains specific legal constraints and duty of care not imposed on couples achieving
451 pregnancy without treatment (Boivin and Pennings, 1994). However, such legal constraints (e.g.,
452 closure) are applied for the shortest period of time possible to achieve safety for all. Finally, patients
453 often want personalised information and not just information, which is an expectation that often

454 cannot be met. For example, most patients worried about the effects of delay on their own chance
455 of pregnancy. Patients should be reassured that in the majority of cases a delay of six months in
456 fertility treatment is unlikely to harm the likelihood of live birth (Romanski et al. 2020). However,
457 caveats need to be provided in that clinics cannot be sure that for this specific patient a delay of
458 three or four months will not make a difference.

459

460 In considering psychosocial support, a stepped approach to care is advocated according to
461 psychosocial guidelines for staff in fertility clinics (Gameiro et al. 2015) and suggested best practice
462 for the COVID-19 pandemic (Pfefferbaum & North, 2020). This stepped approach starts with
463 prevention (e.g., screening), psychoeducation and low intensity psychological support (e.g.,
464 normalising information, modelling resilience, coping boosts, links to support groups) provided to all,
465 with personalised support for specific vulnerabilities (e.g., counselling) and formal assessment for
466 urgent support needs such as suicidal ideation (e.g., psychiatric support) provided to those with
467 specific needs. The results of the present study suggested the need for all levels of service and,
468 accordingly, Table 3 shows suggestions for psychosocial support at different levels of intensity and
469 tailored to specific needs. An important issue is how to ensure vulnerable patients in need of urgent
470 support are identified during this period when access to care is limited. In the present survey it was
471 only possible to direct patients to resources in the debrief due to anonymous replies. However,
472 clinics can proactively offer psychosocial support to any patients they identify (or have identified) as
473 being at risk for high distress (e.g., via screening using generic standardised or disease specific
474 measures) or to patients with history of traumatic events (e.g., miscarriage) that could be re-
475 triggered by the current crisis. Having information about patients' infertility related psychosocial
476 vulnerability is always useful but particularly during unexpected crises that are expected to tax
477 already stretched coping resources. Clinics that do not yet have screening or mood monitoring
478 procedures in place should consider its implementation given established feasibility and usefulness
479 of existing methods (e.g., SCREENIVF Ockhuijsen et al. 2017 van Dongen et al. 2012, FertiQoL Koert
480 et al. 2019).

481

482 Due to the present cross-sectional design, the psychological experiences reported could have been
483 multiply determined and not just due to clinic closure. Reactions could be due to patients' history of
484 infertility which is often associated with significant distress (Gameiro et al. 2016) and not *de novo*
485 experiences. Similarly, it is possible that some reactions were due to other correlates of COVID-19
486 (e.g., confinement, social isolation) and not clinic closure per se, as these too have effects on
487 wellbeing (e.g., stress, feelings of being inadequately informed) (Brook et al. 2020, Cowan, 2020).

488 Finally, this survey captured experiences in the middle of the pandemic and clinic closure and
489 therefore reflect raw experiences which may change over time. Future studies should consider
490 including fertile controls and longitudinal designs to differentiate effects due solely to clinic closure,
491 and to understand how people adapt psychologically, and in their fertility planning, to COVID-19 and
492 new ways of providing fertility care. We focused on the patient but staff too are facing
493 unprecedented challenges (e.g., major changes to work schedule, setting, responsibilities; working
494 with highly distressed patients; deployment to frontline, etc.) in a work environment already shown
495 to be highly demanding (Boivin et al. 2017). Internal audits to assess and provide adequate support
496 to staff should be considered of equal priority.

497

498 Psychological research priorities in times of COVID-19 are numerous and ours follow those
499 expressed by international groups (Holmes et al. 2020). Particularly relevant to fertility care is
500 developing strategies for monitoring mental health so we can understand prevalence in times of
501 COVID-19 and causal mechanisms associated with poorer mental health trajectories additional to
502 what is already known (see reviews in Gameiro et al. 2015). Monitoring should use generic measures
503 with clinical cut-offs to capture possible clinical need in this population. Identifying resilience factors
504 and support technologies that can be fitted to COVID-19 demands of social distancing, avoidance of
505 in-clinic contacts or periods of isolation is certainly critical. New digital psychological interventions
506 being tested, especially those that can both monitor and support, are especially valued.

507

508 **Strengths and Limitations**

509 A strength was that all participants were patients affected by clinic closure. The sample was self-
510 selected from social media websites mainly associated with patient support groups and this profile
511 may affect generalisability. Informative comparisons across gender and country was impossible
512 because only 4 participants were men and the 25% of non-UK respondents were from 13 countries
513 (see Table 1). However, background characteristics were in line with UK ART data, and psychological
514 experiences were in line with recent COVID-19 studies (Cowan, 2020) and empirical work from
515 cognitive theory of stress and coping, all of which increases confidence in findings. Attrition was 48%
516 (started but uncompleted surveys) which is common in online studies and could be reduced in
517 future studies putting background questions first, providing financial incentives and asking fewer
518 questions (Howell, 2020). The mixed methods approach allowed us to collect theory driven
519 quantitative data while giving patients the opportunity to voice experiences in their own words
520 (qualitative data). The sample was large and we achieved saturation in thematic analysis of all
521 questions. The mixed approach allowed us to contextualise quantitative scores with fertility specific

522 factors. While we took measures to strengthen thematic analysis (code checking, consistency
523 between coders and saturation) it was a rapid qualitative assessment and deeper analysis could
524 reveal more marginal but important issues. We made some adaptations (number of items, response
525 scale) to the DRK emotion scale which makes average scores not comparable with other studies
526 using it. Finally, patients provided their own account of information provided to them, but we do
527 not know what information was actually provided for which a separate survey would be needed.

528

529 **Conclusion**

530 COVID-19 will undoubtedly change how fertility care is delivered worldwide for the foreseeable
531 future, and we all need to be prepared for the impact such events produce for patients, namely
532 great uncertainty and worry about attainability of parenthood goals. Patients intuitively used coping
533 strategies suited to unpredictable and uncontrollable situations but fertility stakeholders (clinics,
534 patient groups, government and regulators, health services, professional societies) could bolster
535 patient coping by working together to set up transparent processes for COVID-19 eventualities and
536 sign-posting information and coping resources. Psychological research priorities are to develop and
537 evaluate digital technologies appropriate for realities of fertility care in COVID-19 situation.

538

539 **Author contribution**

540 J Boivin, C Harrison and S Gameiro conceptualised, designed and together executed all aspects of the
541 study, drafted the manuscript and revised the manuscript.

542 R Mathur, G Burns, A. Pericleous-Smith contributed to the design of study materials, recruitment of
543 participants, review of draft manuscript, and revised the manuscript, and advised (respectively) on
544 medical aspects, patient support, and counselling.

545

546 **Funding:** Cardiff University

547 **Acknowledgements:** Fertility Network UK, Fertility Europe, Fertility Matters Canada and social
548 influencers willing to post survey links on their social media.

549

550 **References**

- 551 Adamson, G.D., de Mouzon, J., Chambers, G.M., Zegers-Hochschild, F., Mansour, R., Ishihara, O., Banker, M.
552 and Dyer, S., 2018. International Committee for Monitoring Assisted Reproductive Technology: world
553 report on assisted reproductive technology, 2011. *Fertility and sterility*, 110(6), pp.1067-1080.
- 554 Boivin, J. and Lancaster, D., 2010. Medical waiting periods: imminence, emotions and coping. *Women's*
555 *Health*, 6(1), pp.59-69.

556 Virginia Braun & Victoria Clarke (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology, *Qualitative Research in*
557 *Psychology*, 3:2, 77-101.

558 Boivin, J., Bunting, L., Koert, E., ieng U, C. and Verhaak, C., 2017. Perceived challenges of working in a fertility
559 clinic: a qualitative analysis of work stressors and difficulties working with patients. *Human Reproduction*,
560 32(2), pp.403-408.

561 Brooks SK, Webster RK, Smith LE, et al. The psychological impact of quarantine and how to reduce it: rapid
562 review of the evidence. *Lancet* 2020; 395: 912-20.

563 Cowan, K. Survey results: Understanding people’s concerns about the mental health impacts of the COVID-19
564 pandemic. MQ: Transforming Mental Health and the Academy of Mental Sciences, April 2020. The
565 Academy of Medical Sciences. <http://www.acmedsci.ac.uk/COVIDmentalhealthsurveys> (2020), Accessed 14
566 May 2020.

567 de Klerk, C., Hunfeld, J. A. M., Heijnen, E. M. E. W., Eijkemans, M. J. C., Fauser, B. C. J. M., Passchier, J., &
568 Macklon, N. S. (2008). Low negative affect prior to treatment is associated with a decreased chance of live
569 birth from a first IVF cycle. *Human Reproduction*, 23(1), 112-116.

570 Folkman, S. and Lazarus, R.S., 1984. Stress, appraisal, and coping (pp. 150-153). New York: Springer Publishing
571 Company.

572 Folkman, S. and Moskowitz, J.T., 2000. Positive affect and the other side of coping. *American psychologist*,
573 55(6), p.647.

574 Gameiro S, Boivin J, Dancet EAF, de Klerk C, Emery M, Lewis-Jones C, et al (2015). ESHRE Guideline: Routine
575 psychosocial care in infertility and medically assisted reproduction - A guide for fertility staff. *Hum Rep*,
576 30(11): 2476-85.

577 Gameiro, S., van den Belt-Dusebout, A.W., Smeenk, J.M., Braat, D.D., van Leeuwen, F.E. and Verhaak, C.M.,
578 2016. Women's adjustment trajectories during IVF and impact on mental health 11–17 years later. *Human*
579 *Reproduction*, 31(8), pp.1788-1798.

580 Gnoth, C., Godehardt, D., Godehardt, E., Frank-Herrmann, P. and Freundl, G., 2003. Time to pregnancy: results
581 of the German prospective study and impact on the management of infertility. *Human reproduction*, 18(9),
582 pp.1959-1966.

583 Holmes EA, O’Connor RC, Perry VH, et al. Multidisciplinary research priorities for the COVID-19 pandemic: a
584 call for action for mental health science. *Lancet Psychiatry* 2020; published online April 15, 2020.
585 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(20\)30168-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30168-1)

586 Howell B (2020). (<https://www.psychstudio.com/articles/dropout/>)

587 Human Fertilisation & Embryology Authority (HFEA, May 2019). Fertility treatment 2017: Trends and figures.
588 HFEA, London, May 2019.

589 Koert, E., Takefman, J. and Boivin, J., 2019. Fertility quality of life tool: update on research and practice
590 considerations. *Human Fertility*, pp.1-13.

591 Nelson, B., Pettitt, A.K., Flannery, J. and Allen, N., 2020. Psychological and Epidemiological Predictors of COVID-
592 19 Concern and Health-Related Behaviors. (uploaded <https://psyarxiv.com/>)

593 Peacock, E. J., & Wong, P. T. (1990). The stress appraisal measure (SAM): A multidimensional approach to
594 cognitive appraisal. *Stress medicine*, 6(3), 227-236.

595 Pfefferbaum, B. and North, C.S., 2020. Mental health and the Covid-19 pandemic. *New England Journal of*
596 *Medicine*.

597 Ockhuijsen, H., van den Hoogen, A., Eijkemans, M., Macklon, N. and Boivin, J., 2014. Clarifying the benefits of
598 the positive reappraisal coping intervention for women waiting for the outcome of IVF. *Human*
599 *Reproduction*, 29(12), pp.2712-2718.

600 Ockhuijsen, H.D., van Smeden, M., van den Hoogen, A. and Boivin, J., 2017. Validation study of the SCREENIVF:
601 an instrument to screen women or men on risk for emotional maladjustment before the start of a fertility
602 treatment. *Fertility and sterility*, 107(6), pp.1370-1379.

603 Romanski, P.A., Bortoletto, P., Rosenwaks, Z., Schattman, G.L., 2020. Delay in IVF treatment up to 180 days
604 does not affect pregnancy outcomes in women with diminished ovarian reserve, *Human Reproduction*,
605 deaa137, <https://doi.org/10.1093/humrep/deaa137>

606 Turocy, J.M., Robles, A., Hercz, D., D'Alton, M., Forman, E.J. and Williams, Z., 2020. The emotional impact of
607 the SRM Guidelines on fertility patients during the COVID-19 pandemic. medRxiv.

608 Van Dongen, A.J.C.M., Kremer, J.A.M., Van Sluisveld, N., Verhaak, C.M., Nelen, W.L., 2012. Feasibility of
609 screening patients for emotional risk factors before in vitro fertilization in daily clinical practice: a process
610 evaluation. *Hum Rep*, 27(12): 3493-501.

611 Veiga, A., Gianaroli, L., Ory, S., Horton, M., Feinberg, E., Penzias, A. (2020). Assisted reproduction and COVID-
612 19: a joint statement of ASRM, ESHRE and IFFS, *Human Reproduction Open*, Volume 2020, Issue 3, 2020,
613 hoaa033, <https://doi.org/10.1093/hropen/hoaa033>

614 Wang, C., Pan, R., Wan, X., Tan, Y., Xu, L., Ho, C.S. and Ho, R.C., 2020. Immediate psychological responses and
615 associated factors during the initial stage of the 2019 coronavirus disease (COVID-19) epidemic among the
616 general population in China. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 17(5),
617 p.1729.

618

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of the sample

Demographic characteristics	Total sample (N=450)
Age <i>M (SD)</i>	33.65 (4.37)
Gender female % (<i>n</i>)	99.1 (446)
Married or cohabiting % (<i>n</i>)	91.8 (412)
Relationship length, years <i>M (SD)</i>	8.76 (4.27)
Financially at risk due to COVID-19, % (<i>n</i>)	
Yes	10.7 (48)
No	58.6 (262)
Maybe	30.6 (137)
Country of residence % (<i>n</i>)	
United Kingdom	74.7 (336)
Non-UK [∞]	24.9 (112)

Note. *M*=mean, *SD*=standard deviation. [∞]Other Countries are Australia (*n*=1), Canada (*n*=11, 2.4%), Croatia (*n*=23, 5.1%) Germany (*n*=1), Ireland (*n*=27, 6.0%), Israel (*n*=2), Norway (*n*=1), New Zealand (*n*=1) Poland (*n*=3), Romania(*n*=5), Switzerland (*n*=1), The Netherlands (*n*=1), United States (*n*=34, 7.6%), Not specified (*n*=1).

Table 2.

Fertility and treatment characteristics of the sample.

Variable	Total sample (N=450)
Have children % yes (<i>n</i>)	16.9 (76)
Time trying to achieve pregnancy in years <i>M(SD)</i>	3.54 (2.22)
Is your clinic closed? <i>n (%)</i>	
Yes	81.6 (367)
No	2.2 (10)
Limited service	16.2 (73)
Treatment status <i>n (%)</i>	
Tests/treatments postponed	82.2 (370)
Not currently undergoing tests/treatment	3.8 (17)
Tests/treatments ongoing	3.6 (16)
Other	10.4 (47)
Treatment funding <i>n (%)</i>	
Costs covered (i.e., national health service)	46.8 (209)
Costs partially covered	4.3 (19)
Private	41.6 (186)
Other	7.4 (33)

Note. *M*=mean, *SD*=standard deviation

Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Table 3 Suggestions for provision of information and psychosocial support based on needs and preferences expressed by participants affected by clinics closure

Information resources*	Psychosocial resources
<p><u>General clinic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Centralise resources in a single webpage and keep consistency between contents here and those delivered via social media. • Actively monitor misinformation circulating about COVID-19 effects to rapidly and unequivocally counteract it with patients. • Signpost patients to information subjected to regular updates, indicate dates for next update and explicitly acknowledge if update results in change or no-change for each topic. This may allow patients to leave aside uncertainty until the next update. • Provide patients with a clear mechanism to voice their concerns (which may change as the situation evolves). These can be addressed in information updates or support initiatives making it easy for clinics to identify and address common patient worries. <p><u>Access to treatment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide clear information about the status of the clinic and the services still accessible. Information should outline organisation of fertility treatment such as waiting lists, prioritization, change in practice, work hours, staffing. Patients can prepare in advance and manage their expectations of care. • Provide general information on the requirements clinics must meet for re-opening/operating to increase patient understanding of health and safety concerns. Examples from the BFS (UK) and ESHRE (Europe) are: https://www.britishfertilitysociety.org.uk/2020/05/06/arcs-and-bfs-u-k-best-practice-guidelines-for-reintroduction-of-routine-fertility-treatments-during-the-covid-19-pandemic/ https://www.eshre.eu/Home/COVID19QApatients <p><u>Health and safety</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide trustworthy information sources about the effects of COVID-19 on fertility, pregnancy and baby health to help patients keep up-to-date. Examples: https://cgf.cochrane.org/news/covid-19-coronavirus-disease-fertility-and-pregnancy https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelines-research-services/guidelines/coronavirus-pregnancy/ • Reassure patients about medical issues (e.g., safety of stored gametes and embryos, effect of delay on pregnancy and success rates) keeping in mind that needs of sub-groups may be additional (e.g., cross-border, LGBTQ, third part reproduction). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure staff are familiar with psychosocial care guidelines for fertility staff: https://www.eshre.eu/Guidelines-and-Legal/Guidelines/Psychosocial-care-guideline.aspx • Proactively provide psychoeducation to manage uncertainty. Many websites exist with tips on coping with anxious thoughts, including those related to COVID-19 (written and audio). https://www.nhs.uk/oneyou/every-mind-matters/anxiety/ https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/stress-anxiety-depression/moodzone-mental-wellbeing-audio-guides/ • Some patients reported processing a feeling of loss over parenthood goals, for which online guidance is also available. https://fertilitynetworkuk.org/life-without-children/finding-more-to-life-self-help-guide • Identify patients that are at risk for severe psychosocial distress and provide private and free-of cost access to fertility counselling, which can be found through national organisations. These patients too can benefit from psychoeducation about depressive symptoms and advice about suicidal thoughts. https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/stress-anxiety-depression/low-mood-and-depression/ https://www.nhs.uk/conditions/suicide/ https://www.bica.net • Connect people to national patient groups and those that work with specific sub-populations, as well as counselling organisations. UK and European examples are: https://fertilitynetworkuk.org http://www.fertilityeurope.eu <p>Note. *Mainly UK illustrative examples provided but these could be substituted for national resources.</p>

Supplementary Table 1 Meta-themes about fertility clinic closure emerging across questions and deduced from stress and coping theory

Meta-theme	Associated themes	Illustrative quotation
I. Experience and appreciation of uncertainty in COVID-19 and fertility clinic closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clinic communications uncertain (reason and duration of closure), trigger events to re-open ● Information comes from variable sources and trustworthiness ● Unknown effects of COVID-19 on reproduction ● Clinic closure unfair 	<p>Common uncertain wording used: “do not know”, “unknown”, “no idea”, “indefinite”, “not for foreseeable future”, “unsure until further notice”</p> <p><i>“They tell me they don’t understand the risks so can’t risk getting me pregnant, yet this is contradicted with advice from chief medical officers that there is not thought to be further risks to baby P324”</i></p> <p><i>“I have no idea when treatment will start up again and if a backlog will cause further delays. I have no idea if this will mean that I don’t ever have a child. P10”</i></p> <p><i>“Very unfair how the fertile population have not been advised to not get pregnant. P22”</i></p>
II. Negative appraisal of clinic closure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Threat to attainability of parenthood goal ● Delay as loss of family dream ● Uncertainty causes threat (e.g., effect of delay on fertility, patient prioritisation, unknown financial aspects such as fewer funded cycles, repeating costly diagnostic tests, refunds for interrupted cycles, affordability of treatment, after COVID-19 employment loss), and worry about stored gametes, access to donors, or reaching age limited for treatments ● History of fertility problems increase threat (i.e., long years of waiting, accumulated disappointments, putting lives on hold) Information reduces threat 	<p><i>“I have felt for the first time that a natural family might not be possible for us. P80.”</i></p> <p><i>“I cry most days that my dreams of being a family have been put on hold. P100”</i></p> <p><i>“I have just turned 40 ... my chances of IVF working could be gravely affected. It might mean I miss the window of opportunity ... P149”</i></p> <p><i>“There is going to be a high demand once clinics open again particularly NHS patients and waiting lists are very long as it is...P 291”</i></p> <p><i>“I hope that my eggs are safe at the centre and it reassures me a bit to know I have eggs frozen but I don’t know if the eggs will be safe if the centre is closed. P111”</i></p> <p><i>“It feels as though I’ve done nothing but wait throughout this whole (infertility) process. P40”.</i></p> <p><i>life as “stuck”, “at a standstill” or fertility plans “pushed back” and “further from dream” of parenthood</i></p> <p><i>“I had really hoped to be pregnant again before the summer. P172”</i></p>
III. Coping with clinic closure taxing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Thought-management strategies for uncertainty ● Getting physically and mentally ready for treatment ● Strengthening social support network ● Keeping up-to-date ● Inability to cope (nothing helps) 	<p><i>“I have been trying to practice mindfulness (acupuncture, yoga) ... helps me to live with stress and the emotions of fertility struggles. P424”; “I read up on a lot of positive stories helps a lot. P15”; “focusing on my work P123”; “[...] having a failed cycle and trying to distract yourself and stay healthy during this pandemic is hard. P173”; “Considering what I am in control of. P5”</i></p> <p><i>“For me I am seeing this lockdown as an opportunity to look after myself, relax, eat well and prepare my body for my next cycle. P326”,</i></p>

		<p><i>“Spending time with my partner. P397”; “My partner is amazing, and we deal with it together we communicate well with each other. P123”, “Speaking to others online within the infertility community who understand exactly how I feel and many of whom are in the exact same position is about all that is helping me. P34”,</i></p> <p><i>“Able to take a break for my body rather than move right into another cycle. P413” could be a benefit</i></p> <p><i>[...] having a failed cycle and trying to distract yourself and stay healthy during this pandemic is hard. P173”</i></p> <p><i>“I have emailed politicians on a regular basis....no replies. I have emailed (professional society) on a regular basis...one very inadequate reply. I contacted a journalist who wrote an article which appeared on the front page of (national newspaper). These things helped me a bit but there's no action so hope is fading. P166”</i></p> <p><i>“Q&A with the clinic has been helpful. P45”, “Speaking to the fertility nurse who has arranged a telephone appointment (was helpful). P90”, “Webinars that are being provided by some fertility clinics and organisations have been very helpful in the past two weeks. P422”, “Our clinic has been fantastic at keeping in contact including live Q and A’s and zoom chats. P268”</i></p>
<p>IV. Stress reactions despite coping efforts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stress, worry and frustration about uncertainty for almost all • Feeling aggrieved, angry and resentment • Deep hopelessness, sadness, depressive feelings and lack of control for some 	<p><i>Extremely stressful, stressed, full of stress, building up frustration, extremely frustrated</i></p> <p><i>“Mostly I feel angry. Because we were so close. And the (regulator) have said we should have been allowed to finish. P214”].</i></p> <p><i>“Our world has collapsed and our hopes dashed. The planning and preparation for an anti-climax. P123”</i></p> <p><i>[“dream snatched away P9”; “The light at the end of the tunnel is not there. P246”]</i></p>

Note. Themes per survey questions shown in Supplementary files 2 to 7.

Supplementary Table 2 Themes identified about what patients understood were the effects of COVID-19 on fertility, pregnancy or the health of the baby

(JB primary coder)

Uncertainty about effects of COVID-19	Undisputed possible effects	Disputed possible effects	Views on reason for closure	Clinic closure unfair
Unsure, do not know, unknown, evidence lacking or limited, so unknown	Pregnancy reduces immunity for fighting virus	Pregnant women at higher risk (or not)	Precautionary	Pregnancy in infertile postponed but fertile people can attempt pregnancy, not told to stop trying, not advised to go on contraceptives
No known or proven effects, low risk, no effects	Fever or illness dangerous in early pregnancy	Vertical transmission possible (or not)	Protect NHS (pressure on NHS, strain on NHS)	Delay could make it harder to conceive due to increased age
Many sources of evidence (clinic, government, media, social media, unspecified "they", heard about)	Pre-term labour if affected late pregnancy	Affected women give birth to unhealthy children (or not)	Clinic staff redeployed	Fertility treatment not considered essential care
Vague reference to harms	Difficult to treat in pregnancy (e.g., use of ventilator)	Increased chance of miscarriage (or not)	Doctors not able to help pregnant women	Additional stress of waiting for treatment
	Pregnant women should self-isolate	Type of advice (e.g., C-sections, same as SARS)	Lack of communication from clinic about why	Closure not based on good evidence/science
	Sperm quality reduced (due to fever)	Maternal death		
	Stress of having treatment or being pregnant during pandemic			

Supplementary Table 3: Themes identified about what patients perceived were COVID-19 effects on their fertility plans”

(JB primary coder)

Reactions	Loss of dream	Closure unfair	Perceived impacts	Uncertainty about future	Communication about closure
Threat emotions: Anxiety, worry, stress, uncertainty, fear	Life on hold, limbo, standstill, pushed back, can't plan, further from dream, stuck	Double standard (fertile people not told to abstain, ART not considered essential, told my fertility is not important)	Chance of pregnancy will get worse (increased age, loss of funded cycles, proliferated disease,)	Unsure impact of delay on fertility and treatment success	Understand why closure (told why closure, explained closure, informed government action)
Harm emotions: Devastating, agonising, heart-breaking, suicidal ideation, hopeless, sad, desolation, feelings of grief (dreams)	Loss of hope, no light at the end of tunnel, hope dashed, snatched away	Closure on top of accumulated hurts of infertility (miscarriage, neonatal deaths, failed treatments)	Stress, anxiety and poorer mental health	Unsure when clinic re-opens	Clinic supportive because answered calls and questions, reassured top of list, kept us updated
Anger & frustration (unfair)	Missed opportunity, denied peace of having tried all we planned	Long-time waiting already (trying naturally, waiting for referral, test results, waitlist)	Re-visiting decisions (e.g., whether to continue, stay with infertile partner) & regret (e.g., delay for exams, to prepare mentally)	Unsure conditions of treatment (e.g., longer waiting lists, prioritisation, NHS funding, shortage of egg donors, repeating costly tests, cost of cycles)	Clinic unsupportive because of lack of communication on future appointments, ongoing treatment (e.g., clomid), guidance and support, interpretation of worrying test results
Intensity of feeling strong	May never conceive, become parent, conceive with own eggs, have second child	No chance naturally (LGBT, biologically, PGD, need donor sperm)	Changed social media habits		Clinic does not care, insensitive postings on social media, only cares about money, conveyor belt
		Choice taken away (blanket closure, arbitrary)	Trying to be positive, increasing fitness		

Supplementary Table 4 Themes identified about information provided and needed (JB primary coder)

Uncertainty and diversity of information	Communication styles and channels	Desired information	Spontaneous evaluations of communication
Reasons for clinic closure diverse (effects of COVID-19, guidance to stop non-essential treatments, and staffing issues such as staff being redeployed or needed elsewhere, or too few staff for clinic operations).	Diverse communication channels (call, email, website, social media)	Estimated time/date for reopening (even provisional)	Feeling neglected
Duration of wait before reopening uncertain (“they do not know”, unknown, no idea, indefinite, not for foreseeable future, until further notice)	Frequency of monitoring, updating, “checking-in” (weekly, monthly, regularly)	Prioritisation (already known, being considered, own personal rank)	Feelings about lack of communication (frustrating, disappointing, neglected)
Trigger event for clinics to re-opening diverse (when regulator, government, guidelines permit reopening, safe to do so, staff returned to normal duties, non-essential services resumed, “as soon as possible”, or when pandemic is over)	Proactivity (patient to seek information, clinic to provide)	Financial issues (continuation of public funding, need to repeat costly tests, higher cost of treatment)	Resentment at perceived unfairness (cycles stopped or not started, lack of transparency from regulator, interfering with autonomy)
	Preferences (personalised information, delivered when and how told would be delivered)	Needs of specific subgroups (cross border, on medication, people not yet on waitlist, LGBT)	Communication is positive (staff doing best to inform, give reassuring information)

Supplementary Table 5 Themes identified about fears, concerns or difficulties experienced dur to fertility clinic closure (SG primary coder)

Delay impacts chances of pregnancy	Uncertainty of delay	Time and waiting in infertility	Delay could impact mental-health and partnership	Health of stored material	Differences between fertile and infertile people
Lower chances of success due to age (quantity and quality of eggs, AMH, uterine receptivity)	The duration of delay is uncertain	Time is crucial	Concerns about current or eventual impact on mental health and partnership (stopping midway is stressful)	State of stored material during closure	Differential treatment of infertile vs fertile people regarding pregnancy
Lower access to treatment due to backlog of patients, NHS lower capacity to reopen)	Uncertainty is stressful	Waiting is inherent to infertility	Stress on top of stress	Consequences of frozen versus fresh cycles	Clinic closure unfair, not well founded
Lower access to funding (older patients reaching age limit)	Many “what if” questions	Waiting on top of waiting	Need to be in good place mentally and physically when treatment restarts	What happens to stored material if clinic closes permanently	Difficult to see ‘fertile world’ during pandemic and discourse around “corona baby boom”
Loss of opportunity(ies)		Waiting is stressful	Stress could impact future treatment success		
		Being in limbo			

Table 6: Themes identified about how participants tried to overcome any of the fears, concerns or difficulties experienced (SG primary coder)

Managing thoughts	Keeping healthy for future treatment	Strengthening support network	Keeping up to date	Nothing is helpful for some
Wide variety of strategies for managing unhelpful thoughts, stress and worry (distraction, focusing on present through yoga, meditation, mindfulness, focusing on positives and benefits)	Exercise for coping (especially running)	Support from close people (partner, family, friends)	Being in contact with clinics and organizations	Inability to cope
Hard not to worry	Exercise, diet, and supplements to improve chances of pregnancy with trying naturally or future treatment	From others in same situation for validation	Mixed results from communications	Denial and hopelessness
Keeping perspective	Less restrictions during lockdown	Protesting together and being angry together, especially at unfairness	Information and communication perceived as very helpful	Comfort in downward comparisons (others worse off)
	Going back or starting unhealthy habits		Being proactive	Comfort in know clinic staff helping others
			Infertile neglected, and badly portrayed as burdening system (compared to fertile)	

Supplementary Table 7 Themes identified about possible benefits to come from COVID-19 fertility clinic closure (CH primary coder)

No benefits or unfair	Benefit to public and national health service	Chance to improve personal health	Forced break from treatment	Process and grief
No personal benefits, cannot see any benefits	Staff will remain safe Prevent spread of virus	Postponing pregnancy now would avoid stress of pregnancy during a pandemic	Able to take a break for my body rather than move right into another cycle (e.g., break from hormones).	Gives more time to get over my past treatment
No benefit and unfair because fertile can try to get pregnant	Medical staff and equipment deployed to other departments	Would avoid COVID-19 effects on pregnancy or baby (if these exist)	Forced time off to reset mentally	Can grieve previous losses.
		Improving physical and mental fitness level generally and for future treatment	Save more money for treatment	More time to process grief associated with using a donor.
			Maybe might get pregnant without any treatment	