

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

Understanding Families' Experiences Following a Diagnosis of Non-Syndromic Craniosynostosis: A Qualitative Study

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-033403
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Aug-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Kuta, Victoria; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Curry, Lauren; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Medicine McNeely, Daniel; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Walling, Simon; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Chorney, Jill; IWK Health Centre Bezuhly, Michael; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery
Keywords:	Craniosynostoses, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, parents, delayed diagnosis, outcome assessment (health care)





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



2		
3 4	1	Understanding Families' Experiences Following a Diagnosis of Non-Syndromic
5	2	Craniosynostosis: A Qualitative Study
6 7	-	
8 9	3	
9 10 11	4	Victoria Kuta M.D. ¹
12 13	5	Lauren Curry M.D. ²
14 15 16	6	P. Daniel McNeely M.D. ³
17 18	7	Simon Walling M.B.Ch.B. ³
19 20	8	Jill M. Chorney Ph.D. ⁴
21 22 23	9	Michael Bezuhly M.D., M.Sc., S.M. ⁵
24 25	10	
26 27 28	11	¹ Division of Otolaryngology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
29 30	12	² Division of General Internal Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
31 32	13	³ Division of Neurosurgery, IWK Health Centre, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
33 34 35	14	⁴ Department of Anesthesia, Pain Management and Perioperative Medicine, IWK Health Centre,
36 37	15	Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
38 39	16	⁵ Division of Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery, IWK Health Centre, Dalhousie University,
40 41	17	Halifax, Canada
42 43 44	18	
45	19	Corresponding author
46 47 48	20	Michael Bezuhly, MD, MSc, SM, FRCSC, FAAP, Division of Plastic and Reconstructive
49 50	21	Surgery, Dalhousie University, IWK Health Centre, 5850/5980 University Avenue, PO Box
51 52 53	22	9700, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, B3K 6R8; Tel: +1-902-470-8168, Fax: +1-902-470-7939;
53 54 55 56 57 58	23	E-mail: mbezuhly@dal.ca
59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1		
2 3 4	24	Data Sharing
5 6	25	Transcript dataset available from the Dryad repository, DOI: 10.5061/dryad.fr9305r
7 8 9	26	
9 10 11	27	Conflicts of Interests
12 13	28	The authors have no conflicts to disclose.
14 15 16	29	
17 18	30	Funding
19 20	31	This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
21 22 23	32	not-for-profit sectors.
24 25	33	
26 27	34	
28 29 30	35	Keywords: Craniosynostoses; qualitative research; parents; delayed diagnosis; outcome
30 31 32	36	assessment (health care)
33 34	37	
35 36 27	38	Word count: 5,089
37 38 39	39	
40 41	40	
42 43	41	
44 45 46	42	
47 48	43	
49 50	44	
51 52 53	45	
53 54 55	46	
56 57		
58 59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
00		

47 ABSTRACT

48 <u>Objectives</u>: Craniosynostosis is typically diagnosed and surgically corrected within the first year 49 of life. The diagnosis and surgical correction of the condition can be a very stressful experience 50 for families. Despite this, there is little research exploring the impact that craniosynostosis has on 51 families, especially in the period immediately following diagnosis and correction. In this study, 52 the authors aimed to qualitatively examine the psychosocial experience of families with a child 53 diagnosed with craniosynostosis.

54 <u>Design</u>: Qualitative study.

55 <u>Setting</u>: Tertiary care paediatric health centre.

56 <u>Participants</u>: Parents of children newly diagnosed with single-suture, non-syndromic
 57 craniosynostosis

58 Intervention: Semistructured interviews regarding parental experience with the initial diagnosis,

59 their decision on corrective surgery for their child, the operative experience, the impact of 60 craniosynostosis on the family and the challenges they encountered throughout their journey.

Primary and Secondary Outcome Measures: Interpretive phenomenological analysis, a type of
 qualitative analysis that provides an in-depth account of participant's experiences and their
 meanings, was used to analyze the interview data.

64 <u>Results</u>: Over a four-year period, twelve families meeting eligibility criteria completed the study. 65 Three main themes (6 subthemes) emerged from the pre-operative interviews: frustration with 66 diagnostic delays (parental intuition and advocacy, hope for improved awareness), understanding 67 what to expect (healthcare supports, interest in connecting with other families), and justifying the 68 need for corrective surgery (influence of the surgeon, struggle with cosmetic indications). Two 69 main themes (4 subthemes) were drawn from the post-operative interviews: overcoming fear (the

BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.	BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l

3 4	70	role of healthcare professionals, transition home) and relief (reduction in parental anxiety,
5 6	71	cosmetic improvements).
7 8 9	72	Conclusions: Overall, the diagnosis of craniosynostosis has a profound impact on families, leading
10 11	73	them to face many struggles throughout their journey. A better understanding of these experiences
12 13	74	will help to inform future practice, with a hope to improve this experience for other families
14 15 16	75	moving forward.
17 18	76	
19 20 21	77	
21 22 23	78	ARTICLE SUMMARY
24 25	79	Strengths and limitations of this study
26 27 28	80	• The prospective, qualitative study involving semi-structured interviews allowed parents
28 29 30	81	of children with craniosynostosis to richly describe their journey from the point of
31 32	82	diagnosis through to the post-operative period.
33 34 25	83	• Major pre-operative themes included frustration with diagnostic delays, understanding
35 36 37	84	what to expect, and justifying the need for corrective surgery. Major post-operative themes
38 39	85	included overcoming fear and relief.
40 41	86	• The themes of concern identified provide a helpful guide to both primary care physicians
42 43 44	87	and members of craniofacial teams involved in the care of families with craniosynostosis.
45 46	88	• Given the small, homogeneous group of participants included, it is unclear whether the
47 48	89	results accurately represent the experience of other populations.
49 50 51	90	
52 53	91	
54 55 56 57 58	92	

INTRODUCTION

Craniosynostosis, a congenital anomaly involving abnormal fusion of calvarial sutures, affects 1 in every 2,000 to 3,000 live births¹⁻⁴. It is traditionally classified as either syndromic or non-syndromic. Non-syndromic synostosis is not associated with other dysmorphisms outside the abnormal craniofacial morphology, and typically involves only a single suture. The most common subtypes include sagittal, metopic, unicoronal, bicoronal and lambdoidal. Non-syndromic craniosynostosis is classically treated with corrective surgery within the first year of life, with inconclusive evidence that earlier intervention may be beneficial for certain subtypes⁵.

While still controversial, there is increasing evidence that non-syndromic craniosynostosis may be associated with long term neurodevelopmental deficits, including difficulties with visuospatial skills, memory, speech and language, and learning disorders⁵. Further studies have suggested that these impairments will persist and cannot be prevented with corrective surgery⁶⁻⁹. Despite this inconclusive evidence, most parents opt for corrective surgery to remodel the skull and allow for normal head growth in their child.

Although the impact of non-syndromic craniosynostosis on neurocognitive development remains in question, children with this congenital anomaly may be faced with social and psychological barriers that negatively impact their self-esteem and social function owing to their abnormal appearance¹⁰⁻¹¹. While many reports document the psychosocial aspects of craniosynostosis from the perspective of the patient, they do not detail the experience of the family. Because corrective surgery is typically performed when patients are infants, parents are responsible for making proxy decisions and are actively involved in patient care. Thus, to obtain a true understanding of early experiences with craniosynostosis, it is important to expand our scope, and study not the just the patient, but the family.

Previous studies that attempted to quantify parental stress levels found no difference in the level of stress experienced by parents of children with and without single-suture craniosynostosis before corrective surgery¹²⁻¹⁶. Other studies have examined parental satisfaction with their child's postoperative results, with high satisfaction with surgical outcomes generally reported¹⁶⁻¹⁸.

120 The aim of the current study is to provide an in-depth qualitative description of families' 121 experiences with craniosynostosis. By adopting a qualitative approach involving semi-structured 122 interviews, we allowed families to richly describe their journey and freely communicate personally 123 meaningful topics. This study prospectively explored the experience of families beginning at the 124 time of diagnosis and continuing to the postoperative period. We aim to use our findings to inform 125 future research and practice, with the hope of improving the overall experience for families facing 126 this diagnosis in the future.

128 METHODS

Interpretive phenomenological analysis (IPA) was selected as the qualitative methodology. IPA is designed to examine, in detail, participants' experiences of an event and its meaning through an interpretive process of examining the information they provide^{19,20}. The role of the researcher in the interpretation is also recognised²¹. Rather than testing a specific hypothesis, this method allows for flexible exploration of a topic in a small, homogeneous sample of respondents for whom the topic is particularly relevant. IPA informed both the data collection and the analysis for the current study. Neither patients nor the public were involved in the study design. The interviewer received IPA technique training under one of the senior authors (J.M.C). The interviewer was not directly involved in the management of patients.

139 Patient and public involvement

The research question was developed based on comments expressed to the corresponding author by several families with a diagnosis of craniosynostosis regarding the need for timelier referral to the craniofacial program and a need for additional teaching resources to primary care providers on the diagnosis. While these families were the impetus for the research question, they did not directly participate in the design or conduct of the study. As stated below, participants were given the opportunity to review a summary of the themes and provide feedback following data analysis.

Study sample

Institutional research ethics approval was obtained for this study from the IWK Health Centre Research Ethics Board. All families presenting to the IWK Health Centre with a child who received a new diagnosis of non-syndromic craniosynostosis were eligible for this study. These families were identified prospectively by participating surgeons between February 15, 2016 and February 15, 2018. Eligible families were informed of the study by one of the participating surgeons during their initial consult, after receiving a diagnosis. Families were then consented to have their contact information provided to the principle investigator of the study.

Data collection

Participants completed two phone interviews. The first interview was completed within a month of receiving the initial diagnosis. The second interview was completed three months postoperatively, or three months after the initial interview if the family decided not to proceed with surgery. All interviews were completed by the first author. Verbal consent was obtained over the phone before initiating the interviews. Interviews were semistructured using an interview guide

BMJ Open

based on the team's clinical experience and a scoping literature review. The initial interview guide
contained questions on the diagnostic experience as well as the decision on corrective surgery. The
second interview guide investigated the surgical experience and the recovery period.

166 Analysis method

Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim by a professional transcriptionist with subsequent deidentification. Transcripts were divided into pre-operative and post-operative categories. Initial coding was completed by the first author using accepted IPA methods. Transcripts were reviewed multiple times to assign codes to the main topics discussed by the participant. The codes identified in earlier transcripts informed the coding of later transcripts. New codes identified in later transcripts prompted earlier transcripts to be reviewed again to determine if these codes were also present in these. The organization of themes followed an iterative process aiming to identify the meaning behind participants' statements rather than solely the prevalence of topics discussed. Themes were then clustered, allowing for superordinate themes to be generated based on subsumption and abstraction techniques.

To ensure rigour, theme development was reviewed and discussed between the first and senior authors to confirm that the interpretations accurately represented the transcript data. A second author reviewed the transcripts independently to assess for representativeness. Member checking was also performed, where participants were given the opportunity to review a summary of the themes and provide feedback.

49 182

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

185 RESULTS

186 Twelve eligible families were identified and enrolled into the study over the enrollment 187 period. This sample size is typical for IPA studies to reach thematic saturation²⁰. Participant 188 demographics are presented in Table 1.

Themes were organised into preoperative and postoperative categories. Three main themes emerged from the preoperative interviews: frustration with diagnostic delays, understanding what to expect, and justifying the need for corrective surgery. Two main themes emerged from the postoperative interviews: overcoming fear, and relief. Representative quotes are included throughout the text.

24 194

Frustration with diagnostic delays

Most participants expressed some frustration around diagnostic delays, excepting two participants whose child was born at the tertiary care hospital and received a diagnosis immediately post-partum. Two subthemes emerged: parental intuition/advocacy and hope for improved awareness.

200 Parental intuition and advocacy

Ten families noticed the abnormal shape of their child's head at birth and expressed concerns (Participant 12 - "I knew something was wrong, but I couldn't prove it"). They were frequently offered the explanation that it was a result of the birthing process and were told it would resolve spontaneously (Participant 2 - "The day he was born at the hospital we started noticing that one of his eyes would not open, and his nose was crooked a bit and the opening in one of his nostrils was very narrow. We were told it was because of what they call a traumatic birth, and it would fix as he grows.") Page 11 of 31

BMJ Open

Over time, when no aesthetic improvement was observed, families began seeking medical advice. One family requested an x-ray; however, the diagnosis of craniosynostosis was missed. Other families resorted to taking their child to the emergency room or requesting a referral to a paediatrician after feeling their concerns were not adequately addressed by their family physician. One family expressed feelings of guilt around not pushing for the referral to a specialist earlier (Participant 2 - "I started doing my own research online and that's when I realised something should have been done when he was younger. I was a bit frustrated with my doctor. I felt like I should have pushed for it sooner when he was younger").

Hope for improved awareness

Overall, families describe a lack of awareness among community family physicians around craniosynostosis. One mother explains her surprise that the craniosynostosis wasn't picked up by her family physician despite regular exams (Participant 5 - "At every doctor's appointment they are always doing measurements of his head and looking for his soft spot"). Another mother describes her own physical findings that she felt were discounted (Participant 6 - "I also noticed a ridge along the top of his skull that I brought up to my GP and he kind of passed if off as not a big deal"). When asked how their overall experience could be improved, many parents suggested efforts to increase craniosynostosis awareness to allow for earlier detection (Participant 10 – "Being able to have more education for family doctors, nurse practitioners, that sort of thing, around what is normal and what's not normal"; Participant 2 - "I think it's something they should be more educated on.")

Understanding what to expect

Participants described the importance of being informed on what to expect and how this helped them to feel more comfortable during the whole experience. Two subthemes emerged: health care supports, and interest in connecting with other families.

Health care supports

Participants described feeling overwhelmed during their initial consultation, and most were unaware that surgery would be recommended for their child. Many had come mentally prepared with questions, but were then unable to recall these during the consult (Participant 1 - "So when he said 'do you have any questions' I was like 'no' because I was just trying to take it all in'). Other families chose to write down their questions ahead of time, which proved to be a more successful strategy. One participant commented on too many learners being present in the room- a comment that nursing staff later agreed with. This added to the overwhelming nature of the consult and hindered this participant's ability to express themselves. All participants described receiving verbal information; however, many suggested that additional written resources could have been provided for review once they have had time to process things (Participant 10 - "So I would say having a cheat sheet of something, where it's already written down that you leave with. Because in the moment, you're listening and not thinking of writing it down yourself"). Skull models used during the consult were helpful for participant education. As many participants were doing their own research, they requested references to reputable resources for further information. Additionally, participants appreciated having access to a specialised nurse after the consultation with the surgeons who they could email or call with additional questions. All participants spoke very highly of this support system and felt that it significantly reduced their anxiety (Participant

BMJ Open

10 - "It was so helpful to know that if we did [have questions], we had a way to get a hold of [theclinic nurse]").

255 Interest in connecting with other families

While all of the participants felt their consultation visits were informative, they expressed a strong interest in connecting with other families who have been through a similar experience (Participant 8 – "The doctor told me what I could expect, what I'm going to see after the surgery and all this, but hearing it from a parent's perspective is a whole different story"). Participants felt it was important to hear other local success stories and mentioned that they would like access to pre- and post-operative photos from other families (Participant 7 - "As a mom and dad you really need to see that other children have risen through it"). Many participants reached out to other families through craniosynostosis support groups on social media platforms. They described the support and hope provided through these online chats (Participant 10 - "Those connections are important, I think, just to see that there are other people who are going through it and have made it through to the other side"). While most participants thought these types of communication would be helpful, one participant describes her emotional struggle after meeting with a family who experienced complications (Participant 12 - "I was scared. I'm even more scared now than I was then, because now that we're in support groups and see what's going to happen, we are scared about the surgery. It's always hard when you have a small sample size too. It can make things look like they are in different proportions than they are").

273 Justifying the need for corrective surgery

274 Participants describe the difficult process of reaching a decision on corrective surgery for 275 their child. Two subthemes emerged: influence of the surgeon, and struggle with cosmetic 276 indications.

277 <u>Influence of the surgeon</u>

All participants decided to proceed with corrective surgery for their child. This decision was reached during the initial consultation. The families described the importance of the information they received during this surgical visit and stated there were no outside influences factored into their decision. This speaks to the magnitude of the influence held by the surgeons. Many participants describe their positive relationship with the surgeons, and how it gave them confidence to consent to surgery during the first visit (Participant 7 - "I feel really confident with the doctors, I feel good with them, which I definitely think is a part of it"). Both bedside manner and the communication style of the surgeons were noted to help participants feel more comfortable with their decision on surgery (Participant 11 - "They talk to you like you're a human being. They talk to you in a fashion that, you know, we know what you're actually telling us. But it's easing my mind that we have such a great team"). Participants also appreciated surgeons speaking in lay terms during the consultation and consenting processes. Other families focused primarily on the evidence and risks communicated by the surgeon (Participant 4 - "When he told us there are 10-15% that have pressure build-up in their brain and it can affect development and also his vision, [...] I don't think we had to think very long to decide that we do not want to take that risk if we can definitely prevent it by doing a surgery"). While many families deliberated on this difficult decision, some families describe the feeling of not having a choice, that surgery was the only option (Participant 1 -"He was talking about how the shape of his head would just continue to grow

BMJ Open

this way, and his brain would be squeezed and there would be pressure. But yeah, I felt like thiswas our only option").

298 <u>Struggle with cosmetic indications</u>

The participants discussed their struggle weighing the importance of cosmetic indications, with most families stating that the decision would be much more difficult if the surgery was for aesthetic purposes alone (Participant 4 -"If it was just cosmetic it definitely would have taken us more time to think about it."). While most families identified potential neurological risks as their primary motivator, it seems that aesthetic concerns were still present, even if not directly vocalised (Participant 11 – "So we know that it's not a decision that we're being selfish and trying to fix her look. It needs to be completed"). Other families were more direct in voicing their cosmetic concerns and were worried about potential psychosocial difficulties later in life, especially after learning about the potentially progressive nature of the condition. This included concerns around future bullying, depression, and the even the risk of suicide if surgery was not performed (Participant 8 – "No child should grow up and develop that head shape"; Participant 12 – "When she was first diagnosed, I would have said no, but now, the asymmetry is so much that it wouldn't be fair to her not to repair it. She would always look very different from other children"; Participant 10 - "If we don't do the surgery, he's going to hate us later in life because we didn't fix this. He would probably be teased and picked on"). One family related their cosmetic concerns to the sex of their child, describing the gender-biased aesthetic standard they have experienced in society (Participant 12 - "[My husband] keeps saying specifically because she's a girl, and we live in a society where what a girl looks like is important").

Overcoming fear

The participants describe fear at various stages of their journey and shared what helped them cope with this emotion. Two subthemes emerged: the role of healthcare professionals, and the transition home.

The role of healthcare professionals

Participants discussed at length how health care providers helped reduce their fear and anxiety while in hospital. Firstly, although parents found it very difficult to hand over their child for surgery, the were comforted by regular updates throughout the procedure (Participant 4 -"You're just waiting for that nurse to come and give us the news that everything is going well, and like it's supposed to. And she did, every time. That was great"). There was only one family who did not receive regular updates throughout the operation. This participant describes feeling extremely nervous in the waiting room after not being informed about a delay in the surgical start time (Participant 5 - "I would have liked to know that they started later than think something bad happened"). Overall, regardless of the stage in their journey, parents described feeling much calmer when they were kept informed. In addition, families commented on the importance of empathy in healthcare. For example, one participant (Participant 10) spoke of the impact that small gestures can have on a family during a difficult time: "They brought us out the bag of his hair. One of them had written on it 'baby's first haircut'. It let you know that they care about your child, that they see that it's not just another patient."

Transitioning Home

Most participants were very surprised with the short recovery time after discharge home (Participant 5 – "You don't think they are going to recover that quick [...], but within 2 or 3 days

they're their normal self"). This introduced a new fear for parents. Many families described difficulty allowing their child to return to regular activities out of fear they would hurt themselves (Participant 8 - "We're still really scared, like if he falls and bangs his head or something, we're like 'Ooohh!'"). These concerns were heightened if the child had young siblings (Participant 1-"And even now, it's hard, because [my other children] are so young, and he still has the soft spot on his head, but they don't understand"). When asked what helped ease their transition home, families stated that were very grateful to be given contact information to reach their healthcare team with questions after discharge. They felt comfortable emailing or calling members of the team with post-operative questions. Ultimately, the ongoing support for parents helped to reduce feelings of fear and anxiety after discharge. Relief

All twelve participants expressed a sense of relief post-operatively, feeling confident they had made the right decision regarding corrective surgery. Two subthemes emerged: reduction in parental anxiety and cosmetic improvements.

357 <u>Reduction in parental anxiety</u>

Participants described significant anxiety leading up to the operation, despite feeling very well informed. Many families feared that they would regret their decision regarding corrective surgery and felt a substantial amount of pressure to make the right choice (Participant 7 -"My fear was that he would be changed for the worse and that we would forever regret the decision to do it"). All participants felt their anxiety subside post-operatively after a successful operation.

¹ 363

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Parents also described significant anxiety around the potential for neurological deficits associated with craniosynostosis, worrying that irreversible effects would occur before surgery (Participant 1 - "I was always making sure he could focus on me, and if he couldn't focus on me I'd think 'oh no, is he going blind"). Post-operatively, participants no longer worried about neurological deficits, and felt they were no longer anxious about their child meeting developmental milestones. Many families also described positive behavioural changes in their child that they attributed to the surgery (Participant 7 – "He is happier and a little more relaxed. He is able to play more"; Participant 12 – "She was almost, I would say, mute leading up to surgery. Within a week of surgery she started making sounds and now, three months later, has a full vocabulary").

Cosmetic improvements

Although most families claimed neurological deficits were their primary motivation for surgery, the cosmetic improvements were heavily commented upon in the post-operative interviews (Participant 3 - "The best part would be how he looked after surgery. Like three weeks after, how good he looked. He looked like a total different baby"). Participants expressed relief with the aesthetic success of the operation (Participant 4 -"It did really change the way that his face and features look. It wasn't the main reason for us to do the surgery, but it was definitely, like, 'oh wow!'"). One mother commented on the practical aspect of her child's new head shape (Participant 6 - "I appreciate being able to put a hat on him now"). Another reflected on the progressive nature of craniosynostosis, describing what she felt her child would have looked like now without the operation (Participant 8 - "If we never would have done that surgery [...], his head would be so much like a football right now"). Overall, parents seemed very satisfied that their child would no longer stand out due to a cranial deformity (Participant 6 - "He looks like a completely normal 8-month old now, besides the really faint scarring").

1 2		
3 4	387	
5 6	388	DISCUSSION
7 8 9	389	The diagnosis and treatment of craniosynostosis has a significant impact on families. This
9 10 11	390	qualitative analysis provides a rich description of families' experiences with craniosynostosis,
12 13	391	from the point of diagnosis through to the period of surgical recovery.
14 15	392	In the pre-operative interviews, most families described frustration around diagnostic
16 17 18	393	delay, acknowledging the importance of advocating for their child and their hope for improved
19 20	394	craniosynostosis awareness in community practice. They stressed the importance of knowing what
21 22	395	to expect, and the value in both healthcare supports and making connections with other families.
23 24 25	396	They also discussed the struggle to decide on corrective surgery, acknowledging the influence of
25 26 27	397	the surgeon and their difficulties weighing functional and cosmetic indications.
28 29	398	In the post-operative interviews, families discussed their journey of overcoming their fear.
30 31 22	399	They highlighted the contribution of healthcare professionals and emphasised the challenges of
32 33 34	400	transitioning home. There was also a very different tone to the second round of interviews, one of
35 36	401	relief. All families were happy with their decision to proceed with corrective surgery, and felt their
37 38	402	anxiety was reduced in the post-operative period. They also commented on their satisfaction with
39 40 41	403	the cosmetic improvement.
42 43	404	For most forms of non-syndromic craniosynostosis the prevention of elevated intracranial
44 45	405	pressure and associated neurocognitive deficits is the principal indication for surgery ²² . Sagittal
46 47 48	406	craniosynostosis may be an exception, as compensatory growth along patent sutures largely
49 50	407	prevents elevated intracranial pressure but produces a stigmatising head shape. To this end,
51 52	408	aesthetic concerns may be a greater motivation for surgical correction of sagittal
53 54	409	craniosynostosis ²³ . A recent health utility outcome study found relatively high utility scores for

sagittal craniosynostosis, suggesting that the cosmetic burden of this condition as perceived by the general population is low²⁴. This aligns with our findings, where most participants stated that the cosmetic indications for corrective surgery were secondary to the neurological ones. Despite this, all families decided to proceed with corrective surgery, including those who received a diagnosis of sagittal craniosynostosis. While families may find it difficult to choose a potentially morbid corrective surgery for aesthetic indications alone, it is important to remind parents of the potential psychosocial consequences of living with an uncorrected craniofacial abnormality²⁵. Interestingly, despite the difficulty justifying aesthetic indications pre-operatively, the satisfaction with cosmetic improvements was heavily commented on in the postoperative interviews.

Many of the themes developed in our study align with those reported by previous studies examining the experiences of families with children diagnosed with other craniofacial deformities. For example, parents with children diagnosed with cleft lip/palate described their anxiety around surgery and their need for emotional support throughout treatment, for both themselves and their child²⁶⁻²⁸. Furthermore, families of children diagnosed with craniofacial abnormalities have expressed fears that their child will be bullied and ostracised later in life^{26,28}. Previous studies have emphasised the importance of parental support in healthcare, suggesting that the emotional state of caregivers significantly influences the emotional development of children with craniofacial abnormalities²⁸⁻³⁰. Elevated caregiver stress was found to have long-lasting, negative psychosocial effects on children who received corrective surgery for craniofacial abnormalities and was also associated with increased levels of anxiety and depression among patients during childhood³¹. By better understanding the experience of craniosynostosis by families, supports can be appropriately tailored to address current areas of concern and improve the overall experience.

Page 21 of 31

BMJ Open

While many of our themes supported previous research, frustration with diagnostic delays was a key theme in our study and has not previously been reported for craniosynostosis. While there are currently no guidelines outlining the optimal age for surgical correction of craniosynostosis, much research has focussed on this issue. A systematic review by Mandela et al. found no conclusive evidence that earlier surgery may be beneficial to patients with sagittal synostosis, for example. There is no evidence that later surgery is beneficial for any of the craniosynostosis subtypes⁵. This speaks to the importance of early detection, as the age of diagnosis will affect when and what type of surgery is offered. One family in our study received the diagnosis of craniosynostosis early in the post-partum period. Due to the young age at detection, the child was eligible for less invasive endoscopic correction and helmet therapy. This option would not have been offered had the family experienced a diagnostic delay like that experienced by most families in our series.

In addition to improving craniosynostosis awareness, families also suggested that it would have been helpful to have received printed material during the initial consult to complement the information that was provided verbally. They expressed interest in receiving written pamphlets as well as a list of reliable and recommended internet sources where they could review the information further. The provision of these decision aids has previously been found to increase both comprehension and risk recall³². In addition to improving informed consent, these interventions may increase overall satisfaction with the decision-making $process^{33}$. This is especially relevant to the craniosynostosis patient population, as parents described significant anxiety associated with therapeutic decision-making.

453 This study is not without limitations. Firstly, given the small, homogeneous group of 454 participants included, it is unclear whether our results accurately represent the experience of other

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

populations. All twelve families elected to have the patient's mother complete the interviews rather than the father, regardless of marital status. While this may reflect the traditional distribution of caregiver responsibilities, it prevents us from identifying potential meaningful gender differences in the family experience of craniosynostosis. For example, parental stress has previously been reported to be higher in mothers with children diagnosed with single suture craniosynostosis when compared to their paternal counterparts³⁴. Secondly, because our study design assigned recruitment responsibilities to the participating surgeons, the surgeons were not blinded to which families were enrolled. Although participants were ensured anonymity, it is unclear whether this influenced the interviews, potentially making participants more reluctant to identify points of dissatisfaction around their interactions with the surgeons. Despite these limitations, our study offers important insights for physicians caring for children with craniosynostosis and helps health care providers better understand the needs of families during the pre-, peri- and post-operative periods.

This study also suggests future avenues of research and development. Despite the fear expressed by parents in the pre-operative period, all families were ultimately pleased with their decision to proceed with corrective surgery. Future studies aim to explore the opinion of the patients themselves, and their views on their parents' decision regarding surgical correction of their craniosynostosis. Additionally, our findings speak to the importance of lifelong learning in the medical field and identify the need for additional craniosynostosis teaching among general practitioners to allow for earlier detection in the community.

475 CONCLUSION

The diagnosis of craniosynostosis has a significant impact on families. This study offers a detailed look into the experiences of families from the point of diagnosis through to the post-

BMJ Open

<text><text> operative recovery and transition home. Participants provide rich descriptions of their frustrations, accomplishments, supports and their suggestions for improvement. A better understanding of this experience will identify where further supports are needed and inform future practice, with the goal of improving the overall experience for other families moving forward.

2			
3 4	482	REFER	RENCES
5 6 7	483	1. 2	Zhang G, Tan H, Qian X, et al. A Systematic Approach to Predicting Spring Force for
7 8 9	484		Sagittal Craniosynostosis Surgery. J Craniofac Surg. 2016;27:636-43.
10 11	485	2. 0	Cornelissen M, Ottelander BD, Rizopoulos D, et al. Increase of prevalence of
12 13	486	(craniosynostosis. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2016;pii: S1010-5182(16)30130-5.
14 15	487	3.]	Lajeunie E, Merrer ML, Bonaïti-Pellie C, et al. Genetic study of nonsyndromic coronal
16 17 18	488	(craniosynostosis. Am. J. Med. Genet. 1995;55:500–504.
19 20	489	4. 0	Garza RM, Khosla RK. Nonsyndromic Craniosynostosis. Seminars in Plastic Surgery.
21 22	490	~	2012;26:53-63.
23 24 25	491	5. 1	Mandela R, Bellew M, Chumas P, Nash H. Impact of surgery timing for craniosynostosis
25 26 27	492	(on neurodevelopmental outcomes: a systematic review. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2019 Jan
28 29	493	~	25:1-13.
30 31	494	6.]	Kapp-Simon KA, Speltz ML, Cunningham ML, Patel PK, Tomita T: Neurodevelopment
32 33 34	495	(of children with single suture craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2007;23:269-
35 36	496	~	281.
37 38	497	7.]	Knight SJ, Anderson VA, Spencer-Smith MM, Da Costa AC: Neurodevelopmental
39 40 41	498	(outcomes in infants and children with single-suture craniosynostosis: a systematic
41 42 43	499	1	review. Dev Neuropsychol. 2014;39:159–186.
44 45	500	8.]	Kapp-Simon KA, Speltz ML, Cunningham ML, Patel PK, Tomita T. Neurodevelopment
46 47	501	(of children with single suture craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2007
48 49 50	502	l	Mar;23(3):269-81.
50 51 52			
53 54			
55			
56 57			
58			
59 60			For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 2

60

BMJ Open

1 2		
3 4	503	9. Speltz ML, Kapp-Simon KA, Cunningham M, Marsh J, Dawson G: Single-suture
5 6 7 8 9	504	craniosynostosis: a review of neurobehavioral research and theory. J Pediatr Psychol.
	505	2004;29:651–668.
10 11	506	10. Speltz ML, Collett BR, Wallace ER, Kapp-Simon K. Behavioral Adjustment of School-
12 13	507	Age Children with and without Single-Suture Craniosynostosis. Plast Reconstr Surg.
14 15	508	2016;138:435-45.
16 17 18	509	11. Singh VP, Moss TP. Psychological impact of visible differences in patients with
18 19 20	510	congenital craniofacial anomalies. Prog Orthod. 2015;16:5.
21 22	511	12. Rosenberg JM, Kapp-Simon KA, Starr JR, Cradock MM, Speltz ML. Mothers' and
23 24 25	512	fathers' reports of stress in families of infants with and without single-suture
25 26 27	513	craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2011 Sep;48(5):509-18.
28 29	514	13. Cloonan YK, Collett B, Speltz ML, Anderka M, Werler MM. Psychosocial outcomes in
30 31	515	children with and without non-syndromic craniosynostosis: findings from two studies.
32 33 34	516	Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2013;50:406–413.
35 36	517	14. Gray KE, Cradock MM, Kapp-Simon KA, Collett BR, Pullmann LD, Speltz ML.
37 38	518	Longitudinal analysis of parenting stress in mothers and fathers of infants with and
39 40 41	519	without single-suture craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2015;52:3–11.
42 43	520	15. Kapp-Simon KA, Leroux B, Cunningham M, Speltz ML. Multisite study of infants with
44 45	521	single-suture craniosynostosis: preliminary report of presurgery development. Cleft
46 47 48	522	Palate Craniofac J. 2005;42:377–384.
40 49 50	523	16. Lim J, Davis A, Tang AR, Shannon CN, Bonfield CM. Caregiver stress in children with
51 52	524	craniosynostosis: a systematic literature review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2019 Feb;35(2):217-
53 54 55	525	225.
56 57 58		

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies. Page 29

BMJ Open

1 2

2		
2 3 4	526	17. Wong-Gibbons DL, Kancherla V, Romitti PA, Tyler MC, Damiano PC, Druschel CM,
5 6	527	Robbins JM, Kizelnik-Freilich S, Burnett W. Maternal reports of satisfaction with care
7 8	528	and outcomes for children with craniosynostosis. J Craniofac Surg. 2009;20:138-142.
9 10 11	529	18. Kluba S, Rohleder S, Wolff M, Haas-Lude K, Schuhmann MU, Will BE, Reinert S,
12 13	530	Krimmel M. Parental perception of treatment and medical care in children with
14 15	531	craniosynostosis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2016;45:1341–1346.
16 17	532	19. Chapman E, Smith JA. Interpretative phenomenological analysis and the new genetics. J
18 19 20	533	Health Psychol. 2002 Mar;7(2):125-30.
21 22	534	20. Smith JA, Osborn M. Interpretative phenomenological analysis. Smith JA. Qual- itative
23 24	535	Psychology. Second Edi. London, UK: Sage Publications; 2008:53-80.
25 26 27	536	21. Larkin M, Watts S, Clifton E. Giving voice and making sense in interpretative
28 29	537	phenomenological analysis. Qual Res Psychol. 2006;3:102–120.
30 31	538	22. Mathijssen IMJ. Guideline for care of patients with the diagnoses of craniosynostosis:
32 33 34	539	working group on craniosynostosis. J Craniofac Surg. 2015;26:1735–1807.
35 36	540	23. Tamburrini G, Caldarelli M, Massimi L, et al. Intracranial pressure monitoring in
37 38	541	children with single suture and complex craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst.
39 40	542	2005;21:913-21.
41 42 43	543	24. Kuta V, McNeely PD, Walling S, Bezuhly M. Sagittal craniosynostosis: a utility
44 45	544	outcomes study. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2017 Aug;20(2):113-118.
46 47	545	25. Boltshauser E, Ludwig S, Dietrich F, Landolt MA. Sagittal craniosynostosis: cognitive
48 49 50	546	development, behaviour, and quality of life in unoperated children. Neuropediatrics.
51 52	547	2003;34:293-300.
53 54		
55 56		
57 58 59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 27 of 31

1

60

BMJ Open

2		
3 4	548	26. Klein, T., Pope, A. W., Getahun, E. & Thompson, J. Mothers' reflections on raising a
5 6	549	child with a craniofacial anomaly. The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal. 2006;43, 590-
7 8	550	597.
9 10 11	551	27. Johansson, B. & Ringsberg, K. C. Parents' experiences of having a child with cleft lip
12 13	552	and palate. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 2004;47, 165-173.
14 15	553	28. Nelson P, Glenny AM, Kirk S, Caress AL. Parents' experiences of caring for a child with
16 17	554	a cleft lip and/or palate: a review of the literature. Child Care Health Dev. 2012
18 19 20	555	Jan;38(1):6-20.
21 22	556	29. Coulter ML, Scheuerle J, Laude M, Habal MB. Psychological aspects of parents of
23 24	557	children with craniofacial anomalies. J Craniofac Surg. 1991;2:9–17.
25 26 27	558	30. Campis LB, DeMaso DR, Twente AW. The role of maternal factors in the adaptation of
28 29	559	children with craniofacial disfigurement. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 1995;32:55–61.
30 31	560	31. Pillemer FG, Cook KV. The psychosocial adjustment of pediatric craniofacial patients
32 33 34	561	after surgery. Cleft Palate J. 1989;26:201–207 discussion 207-208.
35 36	562	32. Papsin E, Haworth R, Chorney JM, Bezuhly M, Hong P. Pediatric otoplasty and informed
37 38	563	consent: do information handouts improve parental risk recall? Int J Pediatr
39 40 41	564	Otorhinolaryngol. 2014 Dec;78(12):2258-61.
41 42 43	565	33. Leatherman S, Warrick L. Effectiveness of decision aids: a review of the evidence. Med.
44 45	566	Care Res. Rev. 2008;65:79S-116S.
46 47 49	567	34. Rosenberg JM, Kapp-Simon KA, Starr JR, Cradock MM, Speltz ML. Mothers' and
48 49 50	568	fathers' reports of stress in families of infants with and without single-suture
51 52	569	craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2011;48:509-518.
53 54		
55 56 57		
58 59		2
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 2		
2 3 4	570	CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT
5 6	571	Dr. Victoria Kuta: Literature review, ethics submission, interviews, primary thematic analysis,
7 8 9	572	manuscript preparation and submission
9 10 11	573	Dr. Lauren Curry: Secondary reviewer of transcripts and themes
12 13	574	Dr. P. Daniel McNeely: Patient recruitment, surgery, manuscript preparation
14 15	575	Dr. Simon Walling: Patient recruitment, surgery, manuscript preparation
16 17 18	576	Dr. Jill M. Chorney: Ethics submission, study design, manuscript preparation
19 20	577	Dr. Michael Bezuhly: Primary supervisor, ethics submission, study design, patient recruitment,
21 22	578	surgery, manuscript preparation and submission
23 24 25	579	
26 27	580	
28 29	581	
30 31 32	582	
33 34	583	surgery, manuscript preparation and submission
35 36	584	
37 38 39	585	
40 41	586	
42 43	587	
44 45 46	588	
40 47 48	589	
49 50	590	
51 52	591	
53 54 55	592	
56 57		
58 59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml
00		For peer review only intep// onljopen.onlj.com/site/about/guidelines.Antim

	Variable	n (%)
	Age, y*	32.4 ± 6.3 (range, 19-42)
	Relationship to patient	
	Mother	12 (100)
	Father	0 (0)
	Location	
	Home address < 50 km from hospital	9 (75)
	Home address > 50 km from hospital	3 (25)
	Sex of Child	
	Male	10 (83.3)
	Female	2 (16.6)
	Craniosynostosis type	· L.
	Sagittal	6 (50.0)
	Coronal	4 (33.3)
	Metopic	2 (16.7)
93		

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/

Page/line no(s).

L

Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended	ed 1-2
Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of t intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results, and conclusions	the

Introduction

Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon	
studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	114-139
Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or	
questions	140-146

Methods Г

Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g.,	
ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research)	
	140 155, 101
and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g.,	149-155; 181
postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**	188
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may	
influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience,	
relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or	
actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research	
questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability	155-157
Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**	160-162
Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events	
were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g.,	
sampling saturation); rationale**	162-166;
Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an	
appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack	160-161; 179-
thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues	180
Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection	
procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and	
analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of	163-164; 182
procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**	193;197
procedures in response to evolving study findings, fationale	193,197

Data collection instruments and technologies - Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data	173-176; 1
collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	180
Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents,	
or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	196-198;60
Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis,	
including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of	160-161; 17
data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	181
Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and	
developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a	
specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	182-188
Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	
and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation);	
rationale**	189-193

Results/findings

Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with	
prior research or theory	199-393
Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts,	
photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	199-393

Discussion

Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and con the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how find conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclu	dings and	
scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; ide unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field		396-459
Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings		460-473
ther		

Other

Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on	
study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	27-28
Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection,	
interpretation, and reporting	30-32

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

L O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Academic Medicine, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014 DOI: 10.1097/ACM.00000000000388

BMJ Open

Understanding Families' Experiences Following a Diagnosis of Non-Syndromic Craniosynostosis: A Qualitative Study

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-033403.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Nov-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Kuta, Victoria; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Curry, Lauren; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Medicine McNeely, Daniel; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Walling, Simon; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Chorney, Jill; IWK Health Centre Bezuhly, Michael; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery
Primary Subject Heading :	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Surgery, Patient-centred medicine, Paediatrics
Keywords:	Craniosynostoses, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, parents, delayed diagnosis, outcome assessment (health care)





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

2		
3 4	1	Understanding Families' Experiences Following a Diagnosis of Non-Syndromic
5	2	
6	2	Craniosynostosis: A Qualitative Study
7	2	
8 9	3	
9 10	4	Victoria Kuta M D
11	4	Victoria Kuta M.D. ¹
12	5	Lauren Curry M.D. ²
13	5	Lauren Curry W.D.
14 15	6	P. Daniel McNeely M.D. ³
16	Ū	
17	7	Simon Walling M.B.Ch.B. ³
18		
19	8	Jill M. Chorney Ph.D. ⁴
20 21		
22	9	Michael Bezuhly M.D., M.Sc., S.M. ⁵
23		
24	10	
25 26		
27	11	¹ Division of Otolaryngology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
28	10	2 Division of Conserval Internal Madising Dalkarrais University Halifor Conserva
29	12	² Division of General Internal Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
30 31	13	³ Division of Neurosurgery, IWK Health Centre, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
32	15	Division of Neurosurgery, Twice fleature centre, Damousle Oniversity, flamax, Canada
33	14	⁴ Department of Anesthesia, Pain Management and Perioperative Medicine, IWK Health Centre,
34		
35 36	15	Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
30 37		
38	16	⁵ Division of Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery, IWK Health Centre, Dalhousie University,
39		
40	17	Halifax, Canada
41 42	10	
43	18	
44	10	Converse ding outhou
45	19	Corresponding author
46 47	20	Michael Bezuhly, MD, MSc, SM, FRCSC, FAAP, Division of Plastic and Reconstructive
48	20	Whender Dezamy, wid, wide, dw, r Kebe, r Mar, Division of r fastic and Keepist derive
49	21	Surgery, Dalhousie University, IWK Health Centre, 5850/5980 University Avenue, PO Box
50	- 1	Surgery, Duniousle om versity, 1111 freuten Centre, 0000/0900 om versity friende, 10 Don
51 52	22	9700, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, B3K 6R8; Tel: +1-902-470-8168, Fax: +1-902-470-7939;
52		
54	23	E-mail: <u>mbezuhly@dal.ca</u>
55		
56 57		
57 58		
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1		
2 3 4	24	Data Sharing
5 6	25	Transcript dataset available from the Dryad repository, DOI: 10.5061/dryad.fr9305r
7 8 9	26	
10 11	27	Conflicts of Interests
12 13	28	The authors have no conflicts to disclose.
14 15 16	29	
17 18	30	Funding
19 20	31	This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
21 22 23	32	not-for-profit sectors.
24 25	33	
26 27	34	
28 29	35	Keywords: Craniosynostoses; qualitative research; parents; delayed diagnosis; outcome
30 31 32	36	assessment (health care)
33 34	37	
35 36	38	Word count: 4,852
37 38 39	39	
40 41	40	
42 43	41	
44 45 46	42	
40 47 48	43	
49 50	44	
51 52	45	
53 54 55 56 57	46	
58 59		2
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

47 ABSTRACT

48 <u>Objectives</u>: Craniosynostosis is typically diagnosed and surgically corrected within the first year 49 of life. The diagnosis and surgical correction of the condition can be a very stressful experience 50 for families. Despite this, there is little research exploring the impact that craniosynostosis has on 51 families, especially in the period immediately following diagnosis and correction. In this study, 52 the authors aimed to qualitatively examine the psychosocial experience of families with a child 53 diagnosed with craniosynostosis.

54 <u>Design</u>: Qualitative study.

55 <u>Setting</u>: Tertiary care paediatric health centre.

56 <u>Participants</u>: Mothers of children newly diagnosed with single-suture, non-syndromic
 57 craniosynostosis

58 <u>Intervention</u>: Semistructured interviews regarding parental experience with the initial diagnosis, 59 their decision on corrective surgery for their child, the operative experience, the impact of 60 craniosynostosis on the family and the challenges they encountered throughout their journey.

Primary and Secondary Outcome Measures: Thematic analysis, a type of qualitative analysis that provides an in-depth account of participant's experiences, was used to analyze the interview data. Results: Over a four-year period, twelve families meeting eligibility criteria completed the study. Three main themes (6 subthemes) emerged from the pre-operative interviews: frustration with diagnostic delays (parental intuition and advocacy, hope for improved awareness), understanding what to expect (healthcare supports, interest in connecting with other families), and justifying the need for corrective surgery (influence of the surgeon, struggle with cosmetic indications). Two main themes (4 subthemes) were drawn from the post-operative interviews: overcoming fear (the

BMJ Open

role	e	of	ł
cos	me	eti	с
Con	ncl	us	i
the	m	to	fa
wil	1 h	lel	p
mo	vir	ıg	f
AR	T	IC	L
Str	en	gt	h
	•	-	Γ
		(of
		(li
	•	-	Γ
		(20
		t	r
	•		Γ
		6	ar
	•	(G
		1	e

role of healthcare professionals, transition home) and relief (reduction in parental anxiety, cosmetic improvements). <u>Conclusions</u>: Overall, the diagnosis of craniosynostosis has a profound impact on families, leading them to face many struggles throughout their journey. A better understanding of these experiences will help to inform future practice, with a hope to improve this experience for other families

- 74 moving forward.
- 77 ARTICLE SUMMARY

78 Strengths and limitations of this study

- The prospective, qualitative study involving semi-structured interviews allowed mothers
 of children with craniosynostosis to richly describe their journey from the point of
 diagnosis through to the post-operative period.
- This study examined both major pre-operative and post-operative themes within the same
 cohort, allowing for identification of how maternal concerns change over the course of the
 treatment of their child.
 - The themes of concern identified provide a helpful guide to both primary care physicians and members of craniofacial teams involved in the care of families with craniosynostosis.
 - Given the small, homogeneous group of participants included, it is unclear whether the results accurately represent the experience of other populations.

INTRODUCTION

Craniosynostosis, a congenital anomaly involving abnormal fusion of calvarial sutures, affects 1 in every 2,000 to 3,000 live births¹⁻⁴. It is traditionally classified as either syndromic or non-syndromic. Non-syndromic synostosis is not associated with other dysmorphisms outside the abnormal craniofacial morphology, and typically involves only a single suture. The most common subtypes include sagittal, metopic, unicoronal, bicoronal and lambdoidal. Non-syndromic craniosynostosis is classically treated with corrective surgery within the first year of life, with inconclusive evidence that earlier intervention may be beneficial for certain subtypes⁵.

While still controversial, there is increasing evidence that non-syndromic craniosynostosis may be associated with long term neurodevelopmental deficits, including difficulties with visuospatial skills, memory, speech and language, and learning disorders⁵. Further studies have suggested that these impairments will persist and cannot be prevented with corrective surgery⁶⁻⁹. Despite this inconclusive evidence, most parents opt for corrective surgery to remodel the skull and allow for normal head growth in their child.

Although the impact of non-syndromic craniosynostosis on neurocognitive development remains in question, children with this congenital anomaly may be faced with social and psychological barriers that negatively impact their self-esteem and social function owing to their abnormal appearance¹⁰⁻¹¹. While many reports document the psychosocial aspects of craniosynostosis from the perspective of the patient, they do not detail the experience of the family. Because corrective surgery is typically performed when patients are infants, parents are responsible for making proxy decisions and are actively involved in patient care. Thus, to obtain a true understanding of early experiences with craniosynostosis, it is important to expand our scope, and study not the just the patient, but the family.

Previous studies that attempted to quantify parental stress levels found no difference in the level of stress experienced by parents of children with and without single-suture craniosynostosis before corrective surgery¹²⁻¹⁶. Other studies have examined parental satisfaction with their child's postoperative results, with high satisfaction with surgical outcomes generally reported¹⁶⁻¹⁸.

The aim of the current study is to provide an in-depth qualitative description of families' experiences with craniosynostosis. By adopting a qualitative approach involving semi-structured interviews, we allowed families to richly describe their journey and freely communicate personally meaningful topics. This study prospectively explored the experience of families beginning at the time of diagnosis and continuing to the postoperative period. We aim to use our findings to inform future research and practice, with the hope of improving the overall experience for families facing this diagnosis in the future.

127 METHODS

Thematic analysis was used as the qualitative methodology. Thematic analysis is a method for identifying, analyzing and reporting, in detail, patterns within participants' experiences of an event^{19,20}. The role of the researcher in the interpretation is also recognised²¹. Rather than testing a specific hypothesis, this method allows for flexible exploration of a topic in a small, homogeneous sample of respondents for whom the topic is particularly relevant. Thematic analysis informed both the data collection and the reporting for the current study. Neither patients nor the public were involved in the study design. The interviewer received thematic analysis training under one of the senior authors (J.M.C) using previously described methodology²⁰. The interviewer was not directly involved in the management of patients.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Patient and public involvement

The research question was developed based on comments expressed to the corresponding author by several families with a diagnosis of craniosynostosis regarding the need for timelier referral to the craniofacial program and a need for additional teaching resources to primary care providers on the diagnosis. While these families were the impetus for the research question, they did not directly participate in the design or conduct of the study. As stated below, participants were given the opportunity to review a summary of the themes and provide feedback following data analysis.

Study sample

Institutional research ethics approval was obtained for this study from the IWK Health Centre Research Ethics Board. All families presenting to the IWK Health Centre with a child who received a new diagnosis of non-syndromic craniosynostosis were eligible for this study. These families were identified prospectively by participating surgeons between February 15, 2016 and February 15, 2018. Eligible families were informed of the study by one of the participating surgeons during their initial consult, after receiving a diagnosis. Families were then consented to have their contact information provided to the principle investigator of the study.

155 Data collection

Participants completed two phone interviews. The first interview was completed within a month of receiving the initial diagnosis. The second interview was completed three months postoperatively, or three months after the initial interview if the family decided not to proceed with surgery. All interviews were completed by the first author. Verbal consent was obtained over the phone before initiating the interviews. Interviews were semistructured using an interview guide

BMJ Open

based on the team's clinical experience and a scoping literature review. The initial interview guide
contained questions on the diagnostic experience as well as the decision on corrective surgery. The
second interview guide investigated the surgical experience and the recovery period.

165 Analysis method

Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim by a professional transcriptionist with subsequent deidentification. Transcripts were divided into pre-operative and post-operative categories. Initial coding was completed by the first author using thematic analysis methods. Transcripts were reviewed multiple times to assign codes to the main topics discussed by the participant. The codes identified in earlier transcripts informed the coding of later transcripts. New codes identified in later transcripts prompted earlier transcripts to be reviewed again to determine if these codes were also present in these. The organization of themes followed an iterative process aiming to identify the meaning behind participants' statements rather than solely the prevalence of topics discussed. Themes were then clustered, allowing for superordinate themes to be generated based on subsumption and abstraction techniques.

To ensure rigour, theme development was reviewed and discussed between the first and senior authors to confirm that the interpretations accurately represented the transcript data. A second author reviewed the transcripts independently to assess for representativeness. Member checking was also performed, where participants were given the opportunity to review a summary of the themes and provide feedback.

49 181

184 RESULTS 185 Twee

Twelve eligible families were identified and enrolled into the study over the enrollment period. This sample size is typical for thematic analysis studies to reach thematic saturation²⁰. Participant demographics are presented in Table 1. All participants were mothers and were interviewed individually.

Themes were organised into preoperative and postoperative categories. Three main themes emerged from the preoperative interviews: frustration with diagnostic delays, understanding what to expect, and justifying the need for corrective surgery. Two main themes emerged from the postoperative interviews: overcoming fear, and relief. Representative quotes are included throughout the text.

- - 195 Frustration with diagnostic delays

Most participants expressed some frustration around diagnostic delays, excepting two participants whose child was born at the tertiary care hospital and received a diagnosis immediately post-partum. Two subthemes emerged: parental intuition/advocacy and hope for improved awareness.

200 Parental intuition and advocacy

Ten families noticed the abnormal shape of their child's head at birth and expressed concerns (Participant 12 - "I knew something was wrong, but I couldn't prove it"). They were frequently offered the explanation that it was a result of the birthing process and were told it would resolve spontaneously (Participant 2 - "The day he was born at the hospital we started noticing that one of his eyes would not open, and his nose was crooked a bit and the opening in one of his

nostrils was very narrow. We were told it was because of what they call a traumatic birth, and itwould fix as he grows.")

Over time, when no aesthetic improvement was observed, families began seeking medical advice. One family requested an x-ray; however, the diagnosis of craniosynostosis was missed. Other families resorted to taking their child to the emergency room or requesting a referral to a paediatrician after feeling their concerns were not adequately addressed by their family physician. One family expressed feelings of guilt around not pushing for the referral to a specialist earlier (Participant 2 - "I started doing my own research online and that's when I realised something should have been done when he was younger. I was a bit frustrated with my doctor. I felt like I should have pushed for it sooner when he was younger").

216 Hope for improved awareness

Overall, families describe a lack of awareness among community family physicians around craniosynostosis. One mother explains her surprise that the craniosynostosis wasn't picked up by her family physician despite regular exams (Participant 5 - "At every doctor's appointment they are always doing measurements of his head and looking for his soft spot"). Another mother describes her own physical findings that she felt were discounted (Participant 6 - "I also noticed a ridge along the top of his skull that I brought up to my GP and he kind of passed if off as not a big deal"). When asked how their overall experience could be improved, many parents suggested efforts to increase craniosynostosis awareness to allow for earlier detection (Participant 10 – "Being able to have more education for family doctors, nurse practitioners, that sort of thing, around what is normal and what's not normal"; Participant 2 - "I think it's something they should be more educated on.")

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

1		
2 3 4	229	
5 6	230	
7 8 9	231	Understanding what to expect
10 11	232	Participants described the importance of being informed on what to expect and how this
12 13	233	helped them to feel more comfortable during the whole experience. Two subthemes emerged:
14 15 16	234	health care supports, and interest in connecting with other families.
17 18	235	Health care supports
19 20	236	Participants described feeling overwhelmed during their initial consultation, and most were
21 22 22	237	unaware that surgery would be recommended for their child. Many had come mentally prepared
23 24 25	238	with questions, but were then unable to recall these during the consult (Participant 1 -"So when he
26 27	239	said 'do you have any questions' I was like 'no' because I was just trying to take it all in''). Other
28 29	240	families chose to write down their questions ahead of time, which proved to be a more successful
30 31 32	241	strategy. One participant commented on too many learners being present in the room- a comment
33 34	242	that nursing staff later agreed with. This added to the overwhelming nature of the consult and
35 36	243	hindered this participant's ability to express themselves. All participants described receiving
37 38 39	244	verbal information; however, many suggested that additional written resources could have been
40 41	245	provided for review once they have had time to process things (Participant 10 - "So I would say
42 43	246	having a cheat sheet of something, where it's already written down that you leave with. Because
44 45 46	247	in the moment, you're listening and not thinking of writing it down yourself"). Skull models used
46 47 48	248	during the consult were helpful for participant education. As many participants were doing their
49 50	249	own research, they requested references to reputable resources for further information.
51 52	250	Additionally, participants appreciated having access to a specialised nurse after the consultation
53 54 55 56 57	251	with the surgeons who they could email or call with additional questions. All participants spoke

BMJ Open

very highly of this support system and felt that it significantly reduced their anxiety (Participant
10 - "It was so helpful to know that if we did [have questions], we had a way to get a hold of [the
clinic nurse]").

10 255

5 Interest in connecting with other families

While all of the participants felt their consultation visits were informative, they expressed a strong interest in connecting with other families who have been through a similar experience (Participant 8 – "The doctor told me what I could expect, what I'm going to see after the surgery and all this, but hearing it from a parent's perspective is a whole different story"). Participants felt it was important to hear other local success stories and mentioned that they would like access to pre- and post-operative photos from other families (Participant 7 - "As a mom and dad you really need to see that other children have risen through it"). Many participants reached out to other families through craniosynostosis support groups on social media platforms. They described the support and hope provided through these online chats (Participant 10 - "Those connections are important, I think, just to see that there are other people who are going through it and have made it through to the other side"). While most participants thought these types of communication would be helpful, one participant describes her emotional struggle after meeting with a family who experienced complications (Participant 12 - "I was scared. I'm even more scared now than I was then, because now that we're in support groups and see what's going to happen, we are scared about the surgery. It's always hard when you have a small sample size too. It can make things look like they are in different proportions than they are").

49 272

273 Justifying the need for corrective surgery

274 Participants describe the difficult process of reaching a decision on corrective surgery for 275 their child. Two subthemes emerged: influence of the surgeon, and struggle with cosmetic 276 indications.

277 <u>Influence of the surgeon</u>

All participants decided to proceed with corrective surgery for their child. This decision was reached during the initial consultation. The families described the importance of the information they received during this surgical visit and stated there were no outside influences factored into their decision. This speaks to the magnitude of the influence held by the surgeons. Many participants describe their positive relationship with the surgeons, and how it gave them confidence to consent to surgery during the first visit (Participant 7 - "I feel really confident with the doctors, I feel good with them, which I definitely think is a part of it"). Both bedside manner and the communication style of the surgeons were noted to help participants feel more comfortable with their decision on surgery (Participant 11 - "They talk to you like you're a human being. They talk to you in a fashion that, you know, we know what you're actually telling us. But it's easing my mind that we have such a great team"). Participants also appreciated surgeons speaking in lay terms during the consultation and consenting processes. Other families focused primarily on the evidence and risks communicated by the surgeon (Participant 4 - "When he told us there are 10-15% that have pressure build-up in their brain and it can affect development and also his vision, [...] I don't think we had to think very long to decide that we do not want to take that risk if we can definitely prevent it by doing a surgery"). While many families deliberated on this difficult decision, some families describe the feeling of not having a choice, that surgery was the only option (Participant 1 -"He was talking about how the shape of his head would just continue to grow

BMJ Open

this way, and his brain would be squeezed and there would be pressure. But yeah, I felt like thiswas our only option").

298 <u>Struggle with cosmetic indications</u>

The participants discussed their struggle weighing the importance of cosmetic indications, with most families stating that the decision would be much more difficult if the surgery was for aesthetic purposes alone (Participant 4 -"If it was just cosmetic it definitely would have taken us more time to think about it."). While most families identified potential neurological risks as their primary motivator, it seems that aesthetic concerns were still present, even if not directly vocalised (Participant 11 – "So we know that it's not a decision that we're being selfish and trying to fix her look. It needs to be completed"). Other families were more direct in voicing their cosmetic concerns and were worried about potential psychosocial difficulties later in life, especially after learning about the potentially progressive nature of the condition. This included concerns around future bullying, depression, and the even the risk of suicide if surgery was not performed (Participant 8 – "No child should grow up and develop that head shape"; Participant 12 – "When she was first diagnosed, I would have said no, but now, the asymmetry is so much that it wouldn't be fair to her not to repair it. She would always look very different from other children"; Participant 10 - "If we don't do the surgery, he's going to hate us later in life because we didn't fix this. He would probably be teased and picked on"). One family related their cosmetic concerns to the sex of their child, describing the gender-biased aesthetic standard they have experienced in society (Participant 12 - "[My husband] keeps saying specifically because she's a girl, and we live in a society where what a girl looks like is important").

1.

Overcoming fear

The participants describe fear at various stages of their journey and shared what helped them cope with this emotion. Two subthemes emerged: the role of healthcare professionals, and the transition home.

The role of healthcare professionals

Participants discussed at length how health care providers helped reduce their fear and anxiety while in hospital. Firstly, although parents found it very difficult to hand over their child for surgery, the were comforted by regular updates throughout the procedure (Participant 4 -"You're just waiting for that nurse to come and give us the news that everything is going well, and like it's supposed to. And she did, every time. That was great"). There was only one family who did not receive regular updates throughout the operation. This participant describes feeling extremely nervous in the waiting room after not being informed about a delay in the surgical start time (Participant 5 - "I would have liked to know that they started later than think something bad happened"). Overall, regardless of the stage in their journey, parents described feeling much calmer when they were kept informed. In addition, families commented on the importance of empathy in healthcare. For example, one participant (Participant 10) spoke of the impact that small gestures can have on a family during a difficult time: "They brought us out the bag of his hair. One of them had written on it 'baby's first haircut'. It let you know that they care about your child, that they see that it's not just another patient."

Transitioning Home

Most participants were very surprised with the short recovery time after discharge home (Participant 5 – "You don't think they are going to recover that quick [...], but within 2 or 3 days

they're their normal self"). This introduced a new fear for parents. Many families described difficulty allowing their child to return to regular activities out of fear they would hurt themselves (Participant 8 - "We're still really scared, like if he falls and bangs his head or something, we're like 'Ooohh!'"). These concerns were heightened if the child had young siblings (Participant 1-"And even now, it's hard, because [my other children] are so young, and he still has the soft spot on his head, but they don't understand"). When asked what helped ease their transition home, families stated that were very grateful to be given contact information to reach their healthcare team with questions after discharge. They felt comfortable emailing or calling members of the team with post-operative questions. Ultimately, the ongoing support for parents helped to reduce feelings of fear and anxiety after discharge. Relief All twelve participants expressed a sense of relief post-operatively, feeling confident they had made the right decision regarding corrective surgery. Two subthemes emerged: reduction in

356 parental anxiety and cosmetic improvements.

357 <u>Reduction in parental anxiety</u>

Participants described significant anxiety leading up to the operation, despite feeling very well informed. Many families feared that they would regret their decision regarding corrective surgery and felt a substantial amount of pressure to make the right choice (Participant 7 -"My fear was that he would be changed for the worse and that we would forever regret the decision to do it"). All participants felt their anxiety subside post-operatively after a successful operation.

 $^{1}_{2}$ 363

Page 18 of 32 BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

> Parents also described significant anxiety around the potential for neurological deficits associated with craniosynostosis, worrying that irreversible effects would occur before surgery (Participant 1 - "I was always making sure he could focus on me, and if he couldn't focus on me I'd think 'oh no, is he going blind"). Post-operatively, participants no longer worried about neurological deficits, and felt they were no longer anxious about their child meeting developmental milestones. Many families also described positive behavioural changes in their child that they attributed to the surgery (Participant 7 – "He is happier and a little more relaxed. He is able to play more"; Participant 12 – "She was almost, I would say, mute leading up to surgery. Within a week of surgery she started making sounds and now, three months later, has a full vocabulary").

Cosmetic improvements

Although most families claimed neurological deficits were their primary motivation for surgery, the cosmetic improvements were heavily commented upon in the post-operative interviews (Participant 3 - "The best part would be how he looked after surgery. Like three weeks after, how good he looked. He looked like a total different baby"). Participants expressed relief with the aesthetic success of the operation (Participant 4 -"It did really change the way that his face and features look. It wasn't the main reason for us to do the surgery, but it was definitely, like, 'oh wow!'"). One mother commented on the practical aspect of her child's new head shape (Participant 6 - "I appreciate being able to put a hat on him now"). Another reflected on the progressive nature of craniosynostosis, describing what she felt her child would have looked like now without the operation (Participant 8 - "If we never would have done that surgery [...], his head would be so much like a football right now"). Overall, parents seemed very satisfied that their child would no longer stand out due to a cranial deformity (Participant 6 - "He looks like a completely normal 8-month old now, besides the really faint scarring").

1 2		
3 4	387	
5 6	388	DISCUSSION
7 8 9	389	The diagnosis and treatment of craniosynostosis has a significant impact on families. This
10	390	qualitative analysis provides a rich description of families' experiences with craniosynostosis,
12 13	391	from the point of diagnosis through to the period of surgical recovery.
14 15	392	In the pre-operative interviews, most families described frustration around diagnostic
111112391from the point of diagnosis through to the per14392In the pre-operative interviews, most1617393delay, acknowledging the importance of adv1619394craniosynostosis awareness in community pra20394to expect, and the value in both healthcare su21395to expect, and the struggle to decide or23396They also discussed the struggle to decide or26397the surgeon and their difficulties weighing fu	393	delay, acknowledging the importance of advocating for their child and their hope for improved
	394	craniosynostosis awareness in community practice. They stressed the importance of knowing what
	395	to expect, and the value in both healthcare supports and making connections with other families.
	396	They also discussed the struggle to decide on corrective surgery, acknowledging the influence of
	the surgeon and their difficulties weighing functional and cosmetic indications.	
29	398	In the post-operative interviews, families discussed their journey of overcoming their fear.
21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39	399	They highlighted the contribution of healthcare professionals and emphasised the challenges of
	400	transitioning home. There was also a very different tone to the second round of interviews, one of
	401	relief. All families were happy with their decision to proceed with corrective surgery, and felt their
38	402	anxiety was reduced in the post-operative period. They also commented on their satisfaction with
39 40 41	403	the cosmetic improvement.
42 43	404	For most forms of non-syndromic craniosynostosis the prevention of elevated intracranial
44 45	405	pressure and associated neurocognitive deficits is the principal indication for surgery ²² . Sagittal
46 47 48	406	craniosynostosis may be an exception, as compensatory growth along patent sutures largely
49 50	407	prevents elevated intracranial pressure but produces a stigmatising head shape. To this end,
51 52	408	aesthetic concerns may be a greater motivation for surgical correction of sagittal
53 54	409	craniosynostosis ²³ . A recent health utility outcome study found relatively high utility scores for

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

sagittal craniosynostosis, suggesting that the cosmetic burden of this condition as perceived by the general population is low²⁴. This aligns with our findings, where most participants stated that the cosmetic indications for corrective surgery were secondary to the neurological ones. The observation that concerns regarding cognitive sequelae were the main motivation for corrective surgery underscores the need for ongoing clinical research into functional aspects of craniosynostosis management. Of note, all families decided to proceed with corrective surgery, including those who received a diagnosis of sagittal craniosynostosis. While families may find it difficult to choose a potentially morbid corrective surgery for aesthetic indications alone, it is important to remind parents of the potential psychosocial consequences of living with an uncorrected craniofacial abnormality²⁵. Interestingly, despite the difficulty justifying aesthetic indications pre-operatively, the satisfaction with cosmetic improvements was heavily commented on in the postoperative interviews.

Many of the themes developed in our study align with those reported by previous studies examining the experiences of families with children diagnosed with other craniofacial deformities. For example, parents with children diagnosed with cleft lip/palate described their anxiety around surgery and their need for emotional support throughout treatment, for both themselves and their child²⁶⁻²⁸. Furthermore, families of children diagnosed with craniofacial abnormalities have expressed fears that their child will be bullied and ostracised later in life^{26,28}. Previous studies have emphasised the importance of parental support in healthcare, suggesting that the emotional state of caregivers significantly influences the emotional development of children with craniofacial abnormalities²⁸⁻³⁰. Elevated caregiver stress was found to have long-lasting, negative psychosocial effects on children who received corrective surgery for craniofacial abnormalities and was also associated with increased levels of anxiety and depression among patients during childhood³¹.

While it is conceivable that surgical "normalisation" of appearance may have a salutary effect on parent-child interactions, the evidence for this is conflicting, with some demonstrating that mothers may be more protective of children with craniofacial differences thus leading to stronger attachment³²⁻³⁴. By better understanding the experience of craniosynostosis by families, supports can be appropriately tailored to address current areas of concern and improve the overall experience.

While many of our themes supported previous research, frustration with diagnostic delays was a key theme in our study and has not previously been reported for craniosynostosis. While there are currently no guidelines outlining the optimal age for surgical correction of craniosynostosis, much research has focussed on this issue. A systematic review by Mandela et al. found no conclusive evidence that earlier surgery may be beneficial to patients with sagittal synostosis, for example. There is no evidence that later surgery is beneficial for any of the craniosynostosis subtypes⁵. This speaks to the importance of early detection, as the age of diagnosis will affect when and what type of surgery is offered. One family in our study received the diagnosis of craniosynostosis early in the post-partum period. Due to the young age at detection, the child was eligible for less invasive endoscopic correction and helmet therapy. This option would not have been offered had the family experienced a diagnostic delay like that experienced by most families in our series.

In addition to improving craniosynostosis awareness, families also suggested that it would have been helpful to have received printed material during the initial consult to complement the information that was provided verbally. They expressed interest in receiving written pamphlets as well as a list of reliable and recommended internet sources where they could review the information further. The provision of these decision aids has previously been found to increase

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

both comprehension and risk recall³⁵. In addition to improving informed consent, these interventions may increase overall satisfaction with the decision-making process³⁶. This is especially relevant to the craniosynostosis patient population, as parents described significant anxiety associated with therapeutic decision-making.

This study is not without limitations. Firstly, given the small, homogeneous group of participants included, it is unclear whether our results accurately represent the experience of other populations. All twelve families elected to have the patient's mother complete the interviews rather than the father, regardless of marital status. While this may reflect the traditional distribution of caregiver responsibilities, it prevents us from identifying potential meaningful gender differences in the family experience of craniosynostosis. For example, parental stress has previously been reported to be higher in mothers with children diagnosed with single suture craniosynostosis when compared to their paternal counterparts³⁷. Secondly, because our study design assigned recruitment responsibilities to the participating surgeons, the surgeons were not blinded to which families were enrolled. Although participants were ensured anonymity, it is unclear whether this influenced the interviews, potentially making participants more reluctant to identify points of dissatisfaction around their interactions with the surgeons. Despite these limitations, our study offers important insights for physicians caring for children with craniosynostosis and helps health care providers better understand the needs of families during the pre-, peri- and post-operative periods.

This study also suggests future avenues of research and development. Despite the fear expressed by parents in the pre-operative period, all families were ultimately pleased with their decision to proceed with corrective surgery. Future studies aim to explore the opinion of the patients themselves, and their views on their parents' decision regarding surgical correction of their craniosynostosis. Additionally, our findings speak to the importance of lifelong learning in

BMJ Open

479 the medical field and identify the need for additional craniosynostosis teaching among general480 practitioners to allow for earlier detection in the community.

10 482 **CONCLUSION**

The diagnosis of craniosynostosis has a significant impact on families. This study offers a detailed look into the experiences of families from the point of diagnosis through to the postoperative recovery and transition home. Participants provide rich descriptions of their frustrations, accomplishments, supports and their suggestions for improvement. A better understanding of this experience will identify where further supports are needed and inform future practice, with the goal of improving the overall experience for other families moving forward.

2			
3 4	489	REFE	RENCES
5 6 7	490	1.	Zhang G, Tan H, Qian X, et al. A Systematic Approach to Predicting Spring Force for
7 8 9	491		Sagittal Craniosynostosis Surgery. J Craniofac Surg. 2016;27:636-43.
10 11	492	2.	Cornelissen M, Ottelander BD, Rizopoulos D, et al. Increase of prevalence of
12 13	493		craniosynostosis. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2016;pii: S1010-5182(16)30130-5.
14 15 16	494	3.	Lajeunie E, Merrer ML, Bonaïti-Pellie C, et al. Genetic study of nonsyndromic coronal
17 18	495		craniosynostosis. Am. J. Med. Genet. 1995;55:500-504.
19 20	496	4.	Garza RM, Khosla RK. Nonsyndromic Craniosynostosis. Seminars in Plastic Surgery.
21 22 23	497		2012;26:53-63.
23 24 25	498	5.	Mandela R, Bellew M, Chumas P, Nash H. Impact of surgery timing for craniosynostosis
26 27	499		on neurodevelopmental outcomes: a systematic review. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2019 Jan
28 29 20	500		25:1-13.
30 31 32	501	6.	Kapp-Simon KA, Speltz ML, Cunningham ML, Patel PK, Tomita T: Neurodevelopment
33 34	502		of children with single suture craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2007;23:269–
35 36	503		281.
37 38 39	504	7.	Knight SJ, Anderson VA, Spencer-Smith MM, Da Costa AC: Neurodevelopmental
40 41	505		outcomes in infants and children with single-suture craniosynostosis: a systematic
42 43	506		review. Dev Neuropsychol. 2014;39:159–186.
44 45 46	507	8.	Kapp-Simon KA, Speltz ML, Cunningham ML, Patel PK, Tomita T. Neurodevelopment
40 47 48	508		of children with single suture craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2007
49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56	509		Mar;23(3):269-81.
57 58 59			2

BMJ Open

1 2		
3 4	510	9. Speltz ML, Kapp-Simon KA, Cunningham M, Marsh J, Dawson G: Single-suture
5 6	511	craniosynostosis: a review of neurobehavioral research and theory. J Pediatr Psychol.
7 8 9	512	2004;29:651–668.
9 10 11	513	10. Speltz ML, Collett BR, Wallace ER, Kapp-Simon K. Behavioral Adjustment of School-
12 13	514	Age Children with and without Single-Suture Craniosynostosis. Plast Reconstr Surg.
14 15	515	2016;138:435-45.
16 17 18	516	11. Singh VP, Moss TP. Psychological impact of visible differences in patients with
19 20	517	congenital craniofacial anomalies. Prog Orthod. 2015;16:5.
21 22	518	12. Rosenberg JM, Kapp-Simon KA, Starr JR, Cradock MM, Speltz ML. Mothers' and
23 24 25	519	fathers' reports of stress in families of infants with and without single-suture
25 26 27	520	craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2011 Sep;48(5):509-18.
28 29	521	13. Cloonan YK, Collett B, Speltz ML, Anderka M, Werler MM. Psychosocial outcomes in
30 31	522	children with and without non-syndromic craniosynostosis: findings from two studies.
32 33 34	523	Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2013;50:406–413.
35 36	524	14. Gray KE, Cradock MM, Kapp-Simon KA, Collett BR, Pullmann LD, Speltz ML.
37 38	525	Longitudinal analysis of parenting stress in mothers and fathers of infants with and
39 40 41	526	without single-suture craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2015;52:3–11.
41 42 43	527	15. Kapp-Simon KA, Leroux B, Cunningham M, Speltz ML. Multisite study of infants with
44 45	528	single-suture craniosynostosis: preliminary report of presurgery development. Cleft
46 47	529	Palate Craniofac J. 2005;42:377-384.
48 49 50	530	16. Lim J, Davis A, Tang AR, Shannon CN, Bonfield CM. Caregiver stress in children with
51 52	531	craniosynostosis: a systematic literature review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2019 Feb;35(2):217-
53 54	532	225.
55 56 57		
57 58 59		2.

1

60

1 2		
2 3 4	533	17. Wong-Gibbons DL, Kancherla V, Romitti PA, Tyler MC, Damiano PC, Druschel CM,
5 6	534	Robbins JM, Kizelnik-Freilich S, Burnett W. Maternal reports of satisfaction with care
7 8 9	535	and outcomes for children with craniosynostosis. J Craniofac Surg. 2009;20:138-142.
9 10 11	536	18. Kluba S, Rohleder S, Wolff M, Haas-Lude K, Schuhmann MU, Will BE, Reinert S,
12 13	537	Krimmel M. Parental perception of treatment and medical care in children with
14 15	538	craniosynostosis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2016;45:1341-1346.
16 17	539	19. Attride-Stirling J. Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research.
18 19 20	540	Qualitative Research. 2001; 1:385-405.
21 22	541	20. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis. Qual Res Psychol. 2006;3:77–101.
23 24	542	21. Taylor GW, Ussher JM. Making sense of S&M: a discourse analytic account. Sexualities
25 26 27	543	2002; 4:293-314.
27 28 29	544	22. Tamburrini G, Caldarelli M, Massimi L, et al. Intracranial pressure monitoring in
30 31	545	children with single suture and complex craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst.
32 33	546	2005;21:913-21.
34 35 36	547	23. Mathijssen IMJ. Guideline for care of patients with the diagnoses of craniosynostosis:
37 38	548	working group on craniosynostosis. J Craniofac Surg. 2015;26:1735–1807.
39 40	549	24. Kuta V, McNeely PD, Walling S, Bezuhly M. Sagittal craniosynostosis: a utility
41 42	550	outcomes study. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2017;20:113-118.
43 44 45	551	25. Boltshauser E, Ludwig S, Dietrich F, Landolt MA. Sagittal craniosynostosis: cognitive
43 46 47	552	development, behaviour, and quality of life in unoperated children. Neuropediatrics.
48 49	553	2003;34:293-300.
50 51	554	26. Klein T, Pope AW, Getahun E & Thompson J. Mothers' reflections on raising a child
52 53		
54 55 56	555	with a craniofacial anomaly. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2006;43, 590–597.
57 58		
59 60		For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 27 of 32

1 2

59

60

BMJ Open

3 4	556	27. Johansson, B. & Ringsberg, K. C. Parents' experiences of having a child with cleft lip
5 6	557	and palate. J Adv Nursing. 2004;47, 165-173.
7 8 9	558	28. Nelson P, Glenny AM, Kirk S, Caress AL. Parents' experiences of caring for a child with
9 10 11	559	a cleft lip and/or palate: a review of the literature. Child Care Health Dev. 2012
12 13	560	Jan;38(1):6-20.
14 15	561	29. Coulter ML, Scheuerle J, Laude M, Habal MB. Psychological aspects of parents of
16 17 18	562	children with craniofacial anomalies. J Craniofac Surg. 1991;2:9–17.
19 20	563	30. Campis LB, DeMaso DR, Twente AW. The role of maternal factors in the adaptation of
21 22	564	children with craniofacial disfigurement. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 1995;32:55-61.
23 24 25	565	31. Pillemer FG, Cook KV. The psychosocial adjustment of pediatric craniofacial patients
26 27	566	after surgery. Cleft Palate J. 1989;26:201–207 discussion 207-208.
28 29	567	32. Despars J, Peter C, Borghini A, Pierrehumbert B, Habersaat S, Müller-Nix C, Ansermet
30 31 32	568	F, Hohlfeld J. Impact of a cleft lip and/or palate on maternal stress and attachment
33 34	569	representations. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2011;48:419-24.
35 36	570	33. Coy K, Speltz ML, Jones K. Facial appearance and attachment in infants with orofacial
37 38 30	571	clefts: a replication. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2002;39:66-72.
39 40 41	572	34. Maris CL, Endriga MC, Speltz ML, Jones K, DeKlyen M. Are infants with orofacial
42 43	573	clefts at risk for insecure mother-child attachments? Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2000;
44 45	574	37:257-65.
46 47 48	575	35. Papsin E, Haworth R, Chorney JM, Bezuhly M, Hong P. Pediatric otoplasty and informed
49 50	576	consent: do information handouts improve parental risk recall? Int J Pediatr
51 52	577	Otorhinolaryngol. 2014 Dec;78(12):2258-61.
53 54 55		
56		
57 58		

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text

BMJ Open

36. Leatherman S, Warrick L. Effectiveness of decision aids: a review of the evidence. Med. Care Res. Rev. 2008;65:79S-116S.

- 37. Rosenberg JM, Kapp-Simon KA, Starr JR, Cradock MM, Speltz ML. Mothers' and
- fathers' reports of stress in families of infants with and without single-suture
- craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2011;48:509-518.

tor beet terien only

1	
2 3 4	583
5 6	584
7 8 9	585
10 11	586
12 13	587
14 15	588
16 17 18	589
19 20	590
21 22	591
23 24	592
25 26 27	593
28 29	594
30 31	595
32 33	596
34 35 36	597
37 38	598
39 40	599
41 42 43	600
45 44 45	601
46 47	602
48 49	603
50 51 52	604
52 53 54	605
55 56	
57 58	
58 59 60	

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

- Dr. Victoria Kuta: Literature review, ethics submission, interviews, primary thematic analysis,
- manuscript preparation and submission
- Dr. Lauren Curry: Secondary reviewer of transcripts and themes
- Dr. P. Daniel McNeely: Patient recruitment, surgery, manuscript preparation
- Dr. Simon Walling: Patient recruitment, surgery, manuscript preparation
- Dr. Jill M. Chorney: Ethics submission, study design, manuscript preparation
- Dr. Michael Bezuhly: Primary supervisor, ethics submission, study design, patient recruitment,
- surgery, manuscript preparation and submission

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) .

data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and

2
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22 23
23 24
24 25
25 26
20
27
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
37 38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 47
47 48
48 49
49 50
50 51
52
52 53
53 54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Variable	n (%)
Age, y*	32.4 ± 6.3 (range, 19-42)
Relationship to patient	
Mother	12 (100)
Father	0 (0)
Location	
Home address < 50 km from hospital	9 (75)
Home address > 50 km from hospital	3 (25)
Sex of Child	
Male	10 (83.3)
Female	2 (16.6)
Craniosynostosis type	
Sagittal	6 (50.0)
Coronal	4 (33.3)
Metopic	2 (16.7)
	1

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/

Page/line no(s).

Т

Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the	
study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded	
theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended	1-2
Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the	
intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results,	
and conclusions	47-75

Introduction

Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon	
studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	114-139
Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or	
questions	140-146

Methods

Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g.,	
ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research)	
and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g.,	149-155; 181
postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**	188
	100
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may	
influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience,	
relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or	
actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research	
questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability	155-157
Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**	160-162
Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events	
were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g.,	
sampling saturation); rationale**	162-166;
	,
Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an	100 101 170
appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack	160-161; 179-
thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues	180
Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection	
procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and	
analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of	163-164; 182
procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**	193;197

Data collection instruments and technologies - Description of instruments (e.g., interview guides, guestionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data	172 176, 17
interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data	173-176; 179 180
collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	180
Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents,	
or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	196-198;600
Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis,	
including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of	160-161; 179
data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	181
Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and	
developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	182-188
Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	
and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation);	
rationale**	189-193

Results/findings

Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and	
themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with	
prior research or theory	199-393
Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts,	
photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	199-393

Discussion

Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contribution(s) to	
the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how findings and	
conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusions of earlier	
scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; identification of	
unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field	396-459
Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings	460-473

Other

Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on	
study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	27-28
Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection,	
interpretation, and reporting	30-32

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Academic Medicine, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014 DOI: 10.1097/ACM.00000000000388

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES)

Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies

BMJ Open

Understanding Families' Experiences Following a Diagnosis of Non-Syndromic Craniosynostosis: A Qualitative Study

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-033403.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Jul-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Kuta, Victoria; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Curry, Lauren; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Medicine McNeely, Daniel; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Walling, Simon; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery Chorney, Jill; IWK Health Centre Bezuhly, Michael; Dalhousie University Faculty of Medicine, Surgery
Primary Subject Heading :	Qualitative research
Secondary Subject Heading:	Surgery, Patient-centred medicine, Paediatrics
Keywords:	Craniosynostoses, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, parents, delayed diagnosis, outcome assessment (health care)





I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

terez oni

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies



2		
3 4	1	Understanding Families' Experiences Following a Diagnosis of Non-Syndromic
5	2	Craniosynostosis: A Qualitative Study
6 7	2	Cramosynostosis. A Quantative Study
8	3	
9		
10 11	4	Victoria Kuta M.D. ¹
12	-	
13	5	Lauren Curry M.D. ²
14	6	P. Daniel McNeely M.D. ³
15 16	0	T. Damer Werveery W.D.
17	7	Simon Walling M.B.Ch.B. ³
18		
19 20	8	Jill M. Chorney Ph.D. ⁴
20		
22	9	Michael Bezuhly M.D., M.Sc., S.M. ⁵
23 24	10	
24 25	10	
26	11	¹ Division of Otolaryngology, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
27		
28 29	12	² Division of General Internal Medicine, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
30		
31	13	³ Division of Neurosurgery, IWK Health Centre, Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
32 33	14	4Demontrant of American Dein Mennessen and Deinestine Medicine IWW Health Contra
34	14	⁴ Department of Anesthesia, Pain Management and Perioperative Medicine, IWK Health Centre,
35	15	Dalhousie University, Halifax, Canada
36 37	10	
38	16	⁵ Division of Plastic & Reconstructive Surgery, IWK Health Centre, Dalhousie University,
39		
40 41	17	Halifax, Canada
42	10	
43	18	
44 45	19	Corresponding author
45 46		
47	20	Michael Bezuhly, MD, MSc, SM, FRCSC, FAAP, Division of Plastic and Reconstructive
48		
49 50	21	Surgery, Dalhousie University, IWK Health Centre, 5850/5980 University Avenue, PO Box
51	22	0700 Halifar Nava Santia Canada D2K (D9: Tal: 1 002 470 9169 Ear. 1 002 470 7020;
52	22	9700, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada, B3K 6R8; Tel: +1-902-470-8168, Fax: +1-902-470-7939;
53 54	23	E-mail: mbezuhly@dal.ca
55		
56		
57 58		
59		
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 2		
2 3 4	24	Data Sharing
5 6	25	Extra data can be accessed via the Dryad data repository at http://datadryad.org/ with the
7 8 9	26	doi:10.5061/dryad.fr9305r
9 10 11	27	Conflicts of Interests
12 13	28	The authors have no conflicts to disclose.
14 15	29	
16 17 18	30	Funding
19 20	31	This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
21 22	32	not-for-profit sectors.
23 24 25	33	
26 27	34	
28 29	35	Keywords: Craniosynostoses; qualitative research; parents; delayed diagnosis; outcome
30 31 32	36	assessment (health care)
33 34	37	
35 36	38	Word count: 5,042
37 38 39	39	
40 41	40	
42 43	41	
44 45 46	42	
47 48	43	
49 50	44	
51 52 53	45	
53 54 55	46	
56 57		
58 59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml 2

47 ABSTRACT

48 <u>Objectives</u>: Craniosynostosis is typically diagnosed and surgically corrected within the first year 49 of life. The diagnosis and surgical correction of the condition can be a very stressful experience 50 for families. Despite this, there is little research exploring the impact that craniosynostosis has on 51 families, especially in the period immediately following diagnosis and correction. In this study, 52 the authors aimed to qualitatively examine the psychosocial experience of families with a child 53 diagnosed with craniosynostosis.

54 <u>Design</u>: Qualitative study.

55 <u>Setting</u>: Tertiary care paediatric health centre.

56 <u>Participants</u>: Mothers of children newly diagnosed with single-suture, non-syndromic
 57 craniosynostosis

58 <u>Intervention</u>: Semistructured interviews regarding parental experience with the initial diagnosis, 59 their decision on corrective surgery for their child, the operative experience, the impact of 60 craniosynostosis on the family and the challenges they encountered throughout their journey.

61 <u>Primary and Secondary Outcome Measures</u>: Thematic analysis, a type of qualitative analysis that 62 provides an in-depth account of participant's experiences, was used to analyze the interview 63 data.

64 <u>Results</u>: Over a four-year period, twelve families meeting eligibility criteria completed the study. 65 Three main themes (6 subthemes) emerged from the pre-operative interviews: frustration with 66 diagnostic delays (parental intuition and advocacy, hope for improved awareness), understanding 67 what to expect (healthcare supports, interest in connecting with other families), and justifying the 68 need for corrective surgery (influence of the surgeon, struggle with cosmetic indications). Two 69 main themes (4 subthemes) were drawn from the post-operative interviews: overcoming fear (the

BMJ Open

role of healthcare professionals, transition home) and relief (reduction in parental anxiety, cosmetic improvements). Conclusions: Overall, the diagnosis of craniosynostosis has a profound impact on families, leading them to face many struggles throughout their journey. A better understanding of these experiences will help to inform future practice, with a hope to improve this experience for other families moving forward. **ARTICLE SUMMARY** Strengths and limitations of this study The prospective, qualitative study involving semi-structured interviews allowed mothers of children with craniosynostosis to richly describe their journey from the point of diagnosis through to the post-operative period. This study examined both major pre-operative and post-operative themes within the same cohort, allowing for identification of how maternal concerns change over the course of the treatment of their child. Given the small, homogeneous group of participants included, it is unclear whether the results accurately represent the experience of other populations.

93 INTRODUCTION

Craniosynostosis, a congenital anomaly involving abnormal fusion of calvarial sutures, affects 1 in every 2,000 to 3,000 live births¹⁻⁴. It is traditionally classified as either syndromic or non-syndromic. Non-syndromic synostosis is not associated with other dysmorphisms outside the abnormal craniofacial morphology, and typically involves only a single suture. The most common subtypes include sagittal, metopic, unicoronal, bicoronal and lambdoidal. Nonsyndromic craniosynostosis is classically treated with corrective surgery within the first year of life, with inconclusive evidence that earlier intervention may be beneficial for certain subtypes⁵.

While still controversial. there is increasing evidence that non-syndromic craniosynostosis may be associated with long term neurodevelopmental deficits, including difficulties with visuospatial skills, memory, speech and language, and learning disorders⁵. Further studies have suggested that these impairments will persist and cannot be prevented with corrective surgery⁶⁻⁹. Despite this inconclusive evidence, most parents opt for corrective surgery to remodel the skull and allow for normal head growth in their child.

Although the impact of non-syndromic craniosynostosis on neurocognitive development remains in question, children with this congenital anomaly may be faced with social and psychological barriers that negatively impact their self-esteem and social function owing to their abnormal appearance¹⁰⁻¹¹. While many reports document the psychosocial aspects of craniosynostosis from the perspective of the patient, they do not detail the experience of the family. Because corrective surgery is typically performed when patients are infants, parents are responsible for making proxy decisions and are actively involved in patient care. Thus, to obtain a true understanding of early experiences with craniosynostosis, it is important to expand our scope, and study not the just the patient, but the family.

Previous studies that attempted to quantify parental stress levels found no difference in the level of stress experienced by parents of children with and without single-suture craniosynostosis before corrective surgery¹²⁻¹⁶. Other studies have examined parental satisfaction with their child's postoperative results, with high satisfaction with surgical outcomes generally reported¹⁶⁻¹⁸.

The aim of the current study is to provide an in-depth qualitative description of families' experiences with craniosynostosis. By adopting a qualitative approach involving semi-structured interviews, we allowed families to richly describe their journey and freely communicate personally meaningful topics. This study prospectively explored the experience of families beginning at the time of diagnosis and continuing to the postoperative period. We aim to use our findings to inform future research and practice, with the hope of improving the overall experience for families facing this diagnosis in the future.

i.e.

- 130 METHODS

131 Thematic analysis was used as the qualitative methodology. Thematic analysis is a 132 method for identifying, analyzing and reporting, in detail, patterns within participants' 133 experiences of an event^{19,20}. The role of the researcher in the interpretation is also recognised²¹. 134 Rather than testing a specific hypothesis, this method allows for flexible exploration of a topic in 135 a small, homogeneous sample of respondents for whom the topic is particularly relevant. 136 Thematic analysis informed both the data collection and the reporting for the current study. The 137 interviewer received thematic analysis training under one of the senior authors (J.M.C) using previously described methodology²⁰. The interviewer was not directly involved in the
management of patients.

Patient and public involvement

Neither patients nor the public were involved in the study design. The research question was developed based on comments expressed to the corresponding author by several families with a diagnosis of craniosynostosis regarding the need for timelier referral to the craniofacial program and a need for additional teaching resources to primary care providers on the diagnosis. While these families were the impetus for the research question, they did not directly participate in the design or conduct of the study. As stated below, participants were given the opportunity to review a summary of the themes and provide feedback following data analysis.

150 Study sample

Institutional research ethics approval was obtained for this study from the IWK Health Centre Research Ethics Board. All families presenting to the IWK Health Centre with a child who received a new diagnosis of non-syndromic craniosynostosis were eligible for this study. These families were identified prospectively by participating surgeons between February 15, 2016 and February 15, 2018. Eligible families were informed of the study by one of the participating surgeons during their initial consult, after receiving a diagnosis. Families were then consented to have their contact information provided to the principle investigator of the study. Twelve eligible families were identified and enrolled into the study over the enrollment period. This sample size is typical for thematic analysis studies to reach thematic saturation²⁰. Participant

BMJ Open

demographics are presented in Table 1. All participants were mothers and were interviewed individually.

Data collection

Participants completed two phone interviews. The first interview was completed within a month of receiving the initial diagnosis. The second interview was completed three months post-operatively, or three months after the initial interview if the family decided not to proceed with surgery. All interviews were completed by the first author. Verbal consent was obtained over the phone before initiating the interviews. Interviews were semistructured using an interview guide based on the team's clinical experience and a scoping literature review. The initial interview guide (supplementary file) contained questions on the diagnostic experience as well as the decision on corrective surgery. The second interview guide investigated the surgical experience ich and the recovery period.

Analysis method

Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim by a professional transcriptionist with subsequent deidentification. Transcripts were divided into pre-operative and post-operative categories. Initial coding was completed by the first author using thematic analysis methods. Transcripts were reviewed multiple times to assign codes to the main topics discussed by the participant. The codes identified in earlier transcripts informed the coding of later transcripts. New codes identified in later transcripts prompted earlier transcripts to be reviewed again to determine if these codes were also present in these. The organization of themes followed an iterative process aiming to identify the meaning behind participants' statements rather than solely

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

the prevalence of topics discussed. Themes were then clustered, allowing for superordinatethemes to be generated based on subsumption and abstraction techniques.

To ensure rigour, theme development was reviewed and discussed between the first and senior authors to confirm that the interpretations accurately represented the transcript data. A second author reviewed the transcripts independently to assess for representativeness. Member checking was also performed, where participants were given the opportunity to review a summary of the themes and provide feedback.

RESULTS

Themes were organised into preoperative and postoperative categories. Three main themes emerged from the preoperative interviews: frustration with diagnostic delays, understanding what to expect, and justifying the need for corrective surgery. Two main themes emerged from the postoperative interviews: overcoming fear, and relief. Representative quotes are included throughout the text.

- - 198 Frustration with diagnostic delays

Most participants expressed some frustration around diagnostic delays, excepting two participants whose child was born at the tertiary care hospital and received a diagnosis immediately post-partum. Two subthemes emerged: parental intuition/advocacy and hope for improved awareness.

203 Parental intuition and advocacy

Ten families noticed the abnormal shape of their child's head at birth and expressed concerns (Participant 12 - "I knew something was wrong, but I couldn't prove it"). They were Page 11 of 35

BMJ Open

frequently offered the explanation that it was a result of the birthing process and were told it would resolve spontaneously (Participant 2 - "The day he was born at the hospital we started noticing that one of his eyes would not open, and his nose was crooked a bit and the opening in one of his nostrils was very narrow. We were told it was because of what they call a traumatic birth, and it would fix as he grows.")

Over time, when no aesthetic improvement was observed, families began seeking medical advice. One family requested an x-ray; however, the diagnosis of craniosynostosis was missed. Other families resorted to taking their child to the emergency room or requesting a referral to a paediatrician after feeling their concerns were not adequately addressed by their family physician. One family expressed feelings of guilt around not pushing for the referral to a specialist earlier (Participant 2 - "I started doing my own research online and that's when I realised something should have been done when he was younger. I was a bit frustrated with my doctor. I felt like I should have pushed for it sooner when he was younger").

219 <u>Hope for improved awareness</u>

Overall, families describe a lack of awareness among community family physicians around craniosynostosis. One mother explains her surprise that the craniosynostosis wasn't picked up by her family physician despite regular exams (Participant 5 - "At every doctor's appointment they are always doing measurements of his head and looking for his soft spot"). Another mother describes her own physical findings that she felt were discounted (Participant 6 -"I also noticed a ridge along the top of his skull that I brought up to my GP and he kind of passed if off as not a big deal"). When asked how their overall experience could be improved, many parents suggested efforts to increase craniosynostosis awareness to allow for earlier detection (Participant 10 - "Being able to have more education for family doctors, nurse practitioners, that

sort of thing, around what is normal and what's not normal"; Participant 2 - "I think it's

something they should be more educated on.")

232 Understanding what to expect

Participants described the importance of being informed on what to expect and how this
helped them to feel more comfortable during the whole experience. Two subthemes emerged:
health care supports, and interest in connecting with other families.

236 <u>Health care supports</u>

Participants described feeling overwhelmed during their initial consultation, and most were unaware that surgery would be recommended for their child. Many had come mentally prepared with questions, but were then unable to recall these during the consult (Participant 1 -"So when he said 'do you have any questions' I was like 'no' because I was just trying to take it all in"). Other families chose to write down their questions ahead of time, which proved to be a more successful strategy. One participant commented on too many learners being present in the room- a comment that nursing staff later agreed with. This added to the overwhelming nature of the consult and hindered this participant's ability to express themselves. All participants described receiving verbal information; however, many suggested that additional written resources could have been provided for review once they have had time to process things (Participant 10 - "So I would say having a cheat sheet of something, where it's already written down that you leave with. Because in the moment, you're listening and not thinking of writing it down yourself'). Skull models used during the consult were helpful for participant education. As many participants were doing their own research, they requested references to reputable resources for further information. Additionally, participants appreciated having access to a

Page 13 of 35

BMJ Open

252 specialised nurse after the consultation with the surgeons who they could email or call with 253 additional questions. All participants spoke very highly of this support system and felt that it 254 significantly reduced their anxiety (Participant 10 - "It was so helpful to know that if we did 255 [have questions], we had a way to get a hold of [the clinic nurse]").

256 Interest in connecting with other families

Justifying the need for corrective surgery

While all of the participants felt their consultation visits were informative, they expressed a strong interest in connecting with other families who have been through a similar experience (Participant 8 – "The doctor told me what I could expect, what I'm going to see after the surgery and all this, but hearing it from a parent's perspective is a whole different story"). Participants felt it was important to hear other local success stories and mentioned that they would like access to pre- and post-operative photos from other families (Participant 7 - "As a mom and dad you really need to see that other children have risen through it"). Many participants reached out to other families through craniosynostosis support groups on social media platforms. They described the support and hope provided through these online chats (Participant 10 - "Those connections are important, I think, just to see that there are other people who are going through it and have made it through to the other side"). While most participants thought these types of communication would be helpful, one participant describes her emotional struggle after meeting with a family who experienced complications (Participant 12 - "I was scared. I'm even more scared now than I was then, because now that we're in support groups and see what's going to happen, we are scared about the surgery. It's always hard when you have a small sample size too. It can make things look like they are in different proportions than they are").

52 273

54 274

1:

> 275 Participants describe the difficult process of reaching a decision on corrective surgery for 276 their child. Two subthemes emerged: influence of the surgeon, and struggle with cosmetic 277 indications.

278 <u>Influence of the surgeon</u>

All participants decided to proceed with corrective surgery for their child. This decision was reached during the initial consultation. The families described the importance of the information they received during this surgical visit and stated there were no outside influences factored into their decision. This speaks to the magnitude of the influence held by the surgeons. Many participants describe their positive relationship with the surgeons, and how it gave them confidence to consent to surgery during the first visit (Participant 7 - "I feel really confident with the doctors, I feel good with them, which I definitely think is a part of it"). Both bedside manner and the communication style of the surgeons were noted to help participants feel more comfortable with their decision on surgery (Participant 11 - "They talk to you like you're a human being. They talk to you in a fashion that, you know, we know what you're actually telling us. But it's easing my mind that we have such a great team"). Participants also appreciated surgeons speaking in lay terms during the consultation and consenting processes. Other families focused primarily on the evidence and risks communicated by the surgeon (Participant 4 -"When he told us there are 10-15% that have pressure build-up in their brain and it can affect development and also his vision, [...] I don't think we had to think very long to decide that we do not want to take that risk if we can definitely prevent it by doing a surgery"). While many families deliberated on this difficult decision, some families describe the feeling of not having a choice, that surgery was the only option (Participant 1 -"He was talking about how the shape of

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

his head would just continue to grow this way, and his brain would be squeezed and there would be pressure. But yeah, I felt like this was our only option").

Struggle with cosmetic indications

The participants discussed their struggle weighing the importance of cosmetic indications, with most families stating that the decision would be much more difficult if the surgery was for aesthetic purposes alone (Participant 4 -"If it was just cosmetic it definitely would have taken us more time to think about it."). While most families identified potential neurological risks as their primary motivator, it seems that aesthetic concerns were still present, even if not directly vocalised (Participant 11 – "So we know that it's not a decision that we're being selfish and trying to fix her look. It needs to be completed"). Other families were more direct in voicing their cosmetic concerns and were worried about potential psychosocial difficulties later in life, especially after learning about the potentially progressive nature of the condition. This included concerns around future bullying, depression, and the even the risk of suicide if surgery was not performed (Participant 8 – "No child should grow up and develop that head shape"; Participant 12 – "When she was first diagnosed, I would have said no, but now, the asymmetry is so much that it wouldn't be fair to her not to repair it. She would always look very different from other children"; Participant 10 - "If we don't do the surgery, he's going to hate us later in life because we didn't fix this. He would probably be teased and picked on"). One family related their cosmetic concerns to the sex of their child, describing the gender-biased aesthetic standard they have experienced in society (Participant 12 - "[My husband] keeps saying specifically because she's a girl, and we live in a society where what a girl looks like is important").

1.

Overcoming fear The participants describe fear at various stages of their journey and shared what helped them cope with this emotion. Two subthemes emerged: the role of healthcare professionals, and the transition home. The role of healthcare professionals Participants discussed at length how health care providers helped reduce their fear and anxiety while in hospital. Firstly, although parents found it very difficult to hand over their child for surgery, the were comforted by regular updates throughout the procedure (Participant 4 -"You're just waiting for that nurse to come and give us the news that everything is going well, and like it's supposed to. And she did, every time. That was great"). There was only one family who did not receive regular updates throughout the operation. This participant describes feeling extremely nervous in the waiting room after not being informed about a delay in the surgical start time (Participant 5 - "I would have liked to know that they started later than think something bad happened"). Overall, regardless of the stage in their journey, parents described feeling much calmer when they were kept informed. In addition, families commented on the importance of empathy in healthcare. For example, one participant (Participant 10) spoke of the impact that small gestures can have on a family during a difficult time: "They brought us out the bag of his hair. One of them had written on it 'baby's first haircut'. It let you know that they care about your child, that they see that it's not just another patient." **Transitioning Home**

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 17 of 35

BMJ Open

Most participants were very surprised with the short recovery time after discharge home (Participant 5 – "You don't think they are going to recover that quick $[\dots]$, but within 2 or 3 days they're their normal self"). This introduced a new fear for parents. Many families described difficulty allowing their child to return to regular activities out of fear they would hurt themselves (Participant 8 - "We're still really scared, like if he falls and bangs his head or something, we're like 'Ooohh!'"). These concerns were heightened if the child had young siblings (Participant 1-"And even now, it's hard, because [my other children] are so young, and he still has the soft spot on his head, but they don't understand"). When asked what helped ease their transition home, families stated that were very grateful to be given contact information to reach their healthcare team with questions after discharge. They felt comfortable emailing or calling members of the team with post-operative questions. Ultimately, the ongoing support for parents helped to reduce feelings of fear and anxiety after discharge. Relief All twelve participants expressed a sense of relief post-operatively, feeling confident they had made the right decision regarding corrective surgery. Two subthemes emerged: reduction in parental anxiety and cosmetic improvements. Reduction in parental anxiety Participants described significant anxiety leading up to the operation, despite feeling very well informed. Many families feared that they would regret their decision regarding corrective surgery and felt a substantial amount of pressure to make the right choice (Participant 7 - "My fear was that he would be changed for the worse and that we would forever regret the decision to do it'). All participants felt their anxiety subside post-operatively after a successful operation.

Parents also described significant anxiety around the potential for neurological deficits associated with craniosynostosis, worrying that irreversible effects would occur before surgery (Participant 1 - "I was always making sure he could focus on me, and if he couldn't focus on me I'd think 'oh no, is he going blind""). Post-operatively, participants no longer worried about neurological deficits, and felt they were no longer anxious about their child meeting developmental milestones. Many families also described positive behavioural changes in their child that they attributed to the surgery (Participant 7 -"He is happier and a little more relaxed. He is able to play more"; Participant 12 – "She was almost, I would say, mute leading up to surgery. Within a week of surgery she started making sounds and now, three months later, has a full vocabulary").

376 <u>Cosmetic improvements</u>

Although most families claimed neurological deficits were their primary motivation for surgery, the cosmetic improvements were heavily commented upon in the post-operative interviews (Participant 3 - "The best part would be how he looked after surgery. Like three weeks after, how good he looked. He looked like a total different baby"). Participants expressed relief with the aesthetic success of the operation (Participant 4 – "It did really change the way that his face and features look. It wasn't the main reason for us to do the surgery, but it was definitely, like, 'oh wow!'"). One mother commented on the practical aspect of her child's new head shape (Participant 6 - "I appreciate being able to put a hat on him now"). Another reflected on the progressive nature of craniosynostosis, describing what she felt her child would have looked like now without the operation (Participant 8 - "If we never would have done that surgery [...], his head would be so much like a football right now"). Overall, parents seemed very

BMJ Open

satisfied that their child would no longer stand out due to a cranial deformity (Participant 6 - "He looks like a completely normal 8-month old now, besides the really faint scarring"). DISCUSSION The diagnosis and treatment of craniosynostosis has a significant impact on families. This qualitative analysis provides a rich description of families' experiences with craniosynostosis, from the point of diagnosis through to the period of surgical recovery. In the pre-operative interviews, most families described frustration around diagnostic delay, acknowledging the importance of advocating for their child and their hope for improved craniosynostosis awareness in community practice. They stressed the importance of knowing what to expect, and the value in both healthcare supports and making connections with other families. They also discussed the struggle to decide on corrective surgery, acknowledging the influence of the surgeon and their difficulties weighing functional and cosmetic indications. In the post-operative interviews, families discussed their journey of overcoming their fear. They highlighted the contribution of healthcare professionals and emphasised the challenges of transitioning home. There was also a very different tone to the second round of interviews, one of relief. All families were happy with their decision to proceed with corrective surgery, and felt their anxiety was reduced in the post-operative period. They also commented on their satisfaction with the cosmetic improvement. Overall, the pre-operative themes centered around feelings of uncertainty and illustrate

the struggle families experience in the early stages of this process. Parents were often left questioning their decisions and wondering if they were making the right choice for their child. In this period of uncertainty, parents tended to place significant weight on the opinion of their child's surgeon and draw confidence from this interaction. In contrast, the post-operative period

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 20 of 35 BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

was characterized by themes illustrating strength and independence. Although uncertainty still existed throughout the recovery period, parents appeared well equipped to handle these challenges as a family unit, needing less reassurance from healthcare professionals. All parents included in this study described a positive change in their child after surgery. Parents appeared to draw strength from the fact that their decision to proceed with surgery was what led to this positive outcome. Also, while parents acted as advocates for their own children in the preoperative period, they advocated for the craniosynostosis community at large in the post-operative period, once again illustrating their personal growth and confidence.

For most forms of non-syndromic craniosynostosis the prevention of elevated intracranial pressure and associated neurocognitive deficits is the principal indication for surgery²². Sagittal craniosynostosis may be an exception, as compensatory growth along patent sutures largely prevents elevated intracranial pressure but produces a stigmatising head shape. To this end, aesthetic concerns may be a greater motivation for surgical correction of sagittal craniosynostosis²³. A recent health utility outcome study found relatively high utility scores for sagittal craniosynostosis, suggesting that the cosmetic burden of this condition as perceived by the general population is low^{24} . This aligns with our findings, where most participants stated that the cosmetic indications for corrective surgery were secondary to the neurological ones. The observation that concerns regarding cognitive sequelae were the main motivation for corrective surgery underscores the need for ongoing clinical research into functional aspects of craniosynostosis management. Of note, all families decided to proceed with corrective surgery, including those who received a diagnosis of sagittal craniosynostosis. While families may find it difficult to choose a potentially morbid corrective surgery for aesthetic indications alone, it is important to remind parents of the potential psychosocial consequences of living with an

Page 21 of 35

BMJ Open

uncorrected craniofacial abnormality²⁵. Interestingly, despite the difficulty justifying aesthetic
indications pre-operatively, the satisfaction with cosmetic improvements was heavily commented
on in the postoperative interviews.

Many of the themes developed in our study align with those reported by previous studies examining the experiences of families with children diagnosed with other craniofacial deformities. For example, parents with children diagnosed with cleft lip/palate described their anxiety around surgery and their need for emotional support throughout treatment, for both themselves and their child²⁶⁻²⁸. Furthermore, families of children diagnosed with craniofacial abnormalities have expressed fears that their child will be bullied and ostracised later in life^{26,28}. Previous studies have emphasised the importance of parental support in healthcare, suggesting that the emotional state of caregivers significantly influences the emotional development of children with craniofacial abnormalities²⁸⁻³⁰. Elevated caregiver stress was found to have long-lasting, negative psychosocial effects on children who received corrective surgery for craniofacial abnormalities and was also associated with increased levels of anxiety and depression among patients during childhood³¹. While it is conceivable that surgical "normalisation" of appearance may have a salutary effect on parent-child interactions, the evidence for this is conflicting, with some demonstrating that mothers may be more protective of children with craniofacial differences thus leading to stronger attachment³²⁻³⁴. By better understanding the experience of craniosynostosis by families, supports can be appropriately tailored to address current areas of concern and improve the overall experience.

454 While many of our themes supported previous research, frustration with diagnostic delays 455 was a key theme in our study and has not previously been reported for craniosynostosis. While 456 there are currently no guidelines outlining the optimal age for surgical correction of

Page 22 of 35

craniosynostosis, much research has focussed on this issue. A systematic review by Mandela et al. found no conclusive evidence that earlier surgery may be beneficial to patients with sagittal synostosis, for example. There is no evidence that later surgery is beneficial for any of the craniosynostosis subtypes⁵. This speaks to the importance of early detection, as the age of diagnosis will affect when and what type of surgery is offered. One family in our study received the diagnosis of craniosynostosis early in the post-partum period. Due to the young age at detection, the child was eligible for less invasive endoscopic correction and helmet therapy. This option would not have been offered had the family experienced a diagnostic delay like that experienced by most families in our series.

BMJ Open

In addition to improving craniosynostosis awareness, families also suggested that it would have been helpful to have received printed material during the initial consult to complement the information that was provided verbally. They expressed interest in receiving written pamphlets as well as a list of reliable and recommended internet sources where they could review the information further. The provision of these decision aids has previously been found to increase both comprehension and risk recall³⁵. In addition to improving informed consent, these interventions may increase overall satisfaction with the decision-making process³⁶. This is especially relevant to the craniosynostosis patient population, as parents described significant anxiety associated with therapeutic decision-making.

This study is not without limitations. Firstly, given the small, homogeneous group of participants included, it is unclear whether our results accurately represent the experience of other populations. All twelve families elected to have the patient's mother complete the interviews rather than the father, regardless of marital status. While this may reflect the traditional distribution of caregiver responsibilities, it prevents us from identifying potential Page 23 of 35

BMJ Open

meaningful gender differences in the family experience of craniosynostosis. For example, parental stress has previously been reported to be higher in mothers with children diagnosed with single suture craniosynostosis when compared to their paternal counterparts³⁷. Secondly, because our study design assigned recruitment responsibilities to the participating surgeons, the surgeons were not blinded to which families were enrolled. Although participants were ensured anonymity, it is unclear whether this influenced the interviews, potentially making participants more reluctant to identify points of dissatisfaction around their interactions with the surgeons. Despite these limitations, our study offers important insights for physicians caring for children with craniosynostosis and helps health care providers better understand the needs of families during the pre-, peri- and post-operative periods.

This study also suggests future avenues of research and development. Despite the fear expressed by parents in the pre-operative period, all families were ultimately pleased with their decision to proceed with corrective surgery. Future studies aim to explore the opinion of the patients themselves, and their views on their parents' decision regarding surgical correction of their craniosynostosis. Additionally, our findings speak to the importance of lifelong learning in the medical field and identify the need for additional craniosynostosis teaching among general practitioners to allow for earlier detection in the community.

498 CONCLUSION

The diagnosis of craniosynostosis has a significant impact on families. This study offers a detailed look into the experiences of families from the point of diagnosis through to the postoperative recovery and transition home. Participants provide rich descriptions of their frustrations, accomplishments, supports and their suggestions for improvement. A better

understanding of this experience will identify where further supports are needed and inform future practice, with the goal of improving the overall experience for other families moving forward.

.en proving th

Page 25 of 35

60

BMJ Open

1 2			
3 4	506	REFE	RENCES
5 6 7	507	1.	Zhang G, Tan H, Qian X, et al. A Systematic Approach to Predicting Spring Force for
7 8 9	508		Sagittal Craniosynostosis Surgery. J Craniofac Surg. 2016;27:636-43.
10 11	509	2.	Cornelissen M, Ottelander BD, Rizopoulos D, et al. Increase of prevalence of
12 13	510		craniosynostosis. J Craniomaxillofac Surg. 2016;pii: S1010-5182(16)30130-5.
14 15 16	511	3.	Lajeunie E, Merrer ML, Bonaïti-Pellie C, et al. Genetic study of nonsyndromic coronal
17 18	512		craniosynostosis. Am. J. Med. Genet. 1995;55:500-504.
19 20	513	4.	Garza RM, Khosla RK. Nonsyndromic Craniosynostosis. Seminars in Plastic Surgery.
21 22 23	514		2012;26:53-63.
23 24 25	515	5.	Mandela R, Bellew M, Chumas P, Nash H. Impact of surgery timing for craniosynostosis
26 27	516		on neurodevelopmental outcomes: a systematic review. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2019 Jan
28 29	517		25:1-13.
30 31 32	518	6.	Kapp-Simon KA, Speltz ML, Cunningham ML, Patel PK, Tomita T: Neurodevelopment
33 34	519		of children with single suture craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2007;23:269–
35 36	520		281.
37 38 39	521	7.	Knight SJ, Anderson VA, Spencer-Smith MM, Da Costa AC: Neurodevelopmental
40 41	522		outcomes in infants and children with single-suture craniosynostosis: a systematic
42 43	523		review. Dev Neuropsychol. 2014;39:159–186.
44 45	524	8.	Kapp-Simon KA, Speltz ML, Cunningham ML, Patel PK, Tomita T. Neurodevelopment
46 47 48	525		of children with single suture craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2007
49 50 51 52	526		Mar;23(3):269-81.
53 54 55			
55 56 57			
57 58 59			2.

2		
3 4	527	9. Speltz ML, Kapp-Simon KA, Cunningham M, Marsh J, Dawson G: Single-suture
5 6	528	craniosynostosis: a review of neurobehavioral research and theory. J Pediatr Psychol.
7 8 9	529	2004;29:651–668.
9 10 11	530	10. Speltz ML, Collett BR, Wallace ER, Kapp-Simon K. Behavioral Adjustment of School-
12 13	531	Age Children with and without Single-Suture Craniosynostosis. Plast Reconstr Surg.
14 15	532	2016;138:435-45.
16 17 18	533	11. Singh VP, Moss TP. Psychological impact of visible differences in patients with
19 20	534	congenital craniofacial anomalies. Prog Orthod. 2015;16:5.
21 22	535	12. Rosenberg JM, Kapp-Simon KA, Starr JR, Cradock MM, Speltz ML. Mothers' and
23 24 25	536	fathers' reports of stress in families of infants with and without single-suture
25 26 27	537	craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2011 Sep;48(5):509-18.
28 29	538	13. Cloonan YK, Collett B, Speltz ML, Anderka M, Werler MM. Psychosocial outcomes in
30 31	539	children with and without non-syndromic craniosynostosis: findings from two studies.
32 33 34	540	Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2013;50:406–413.
35 36	541	14. Gray KE, Cradock MM, Kapp-Simon KA, Collett BR, Pullmann LD, Speltz ML.
37 38	542	Longitudinal analysis of parenting stress in mothers and fathers of infants with and
39 40 41	543	without single-suture craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2015;52:3–11.
42 43	544	15. Kapp-Simon KA, Leroux B, Cunningham M, Speltz ML. Multisite study of infants with
44 45	545	single-suture craniosynostosis: preliminary report of presurgery development. Cleft
46 47	546	Palate Craniofac J. 2005;42:377–384.
48 49 50	547	16. Lim J, Davis A, Tang AR, Shannon CN, Bonfield CM. Caregiver stress in children with
51 52	548	craniosynostosis: a systematic literature review. Childs Nerv Syst. 2019 Feb;35(2):217-
53 54	549	225.
55 56 57		
57		

1 2		
2 3 4	550	17. Wong-Gibbons DL, Kancherla V, Romitti PA, Tyler MC, Damiano PC, Druschel CM,
5 6	551	Robbins JM, Kizelnik-Freilich S, Burnett W. Maternal reports of satisfaction with care
7 8 9	552	and outcomes for children with craniosynostosis. J Craniofac Surg. 2009;20:138-142.
9 10 11	553	18. Kluba S, Rohleder S, Wolff M, Haas-Lude K, Schuhmann MU, Will BE, Reinert S,
12 13	554	Krimmel M. Parental perception of treatment and medical care in children with
14 15 16	555	craniosynostosis. Int J Oral Maxillofac Surg. 2016;45:1341–1346.
17 17 18	556	19. Attride-Stirling J. Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research.
19 20	557	Qualitative Research. 2001; 1:385-405.
21 22	558	20. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis. Qual Res Psychol. 2006;3:77–101.
23 24 25	559	21. Taylor GW, Ussher JM. Making sense of S&M: a discourse analytic account. Sexualities
26 27	560	2002; 4:293-314.
28 29	561	22. Tamburrini G, Caldarelli M, Massimi L, et al. Intracranial pressure monitoring in
30 31 22	562	children with single suture and complex craniosynostosis: a review. Childs Nerv Syst.
32 33 34	563	2005;21:913-21.
35 36	564	23. Mathijssen IMJ. Guideline for care of patients with the diagnoses of craniosynostosis:
37 38	565	working group on craniosynostosis. J Craniofac Surg. 2015;26:1735–1807.
39 40 41	566	24. Kuta V, McNeely PD, Walling S, Bezuhly M. Sagittal craniosynostosis: a utility
42 43	567	outcomes study. J Neurosurg Pediatr. 2017;20:113-118.
44 45	568	25. Boltshauser E, Ludwig S, Dietrich F, Landolt MA. Sagittal craniosynostosis: cognitive
46 47	569	development, behaviour, and quality of life in unoperated children. Neuropediatrics.
48 49 50	570	2003;34:293-300.
51 52	571	26. Klein T, Pope AW, Getahun E & Thompson J. Mothers' reflections on raising a child
53 54 55 56	572	with a craniofacial anomaly. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2006;43, 590-597.
57 58		
59 60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 2		
- 3 4	573	27. Johansson, B. & Ringsberg, K. C. Parents' experiences of having a child with cleft lip
5 6	574	and palate. J Adv Nursing. 2004;47, 165–173.
7 8 9	575	28. Nelson P, Glenny AM, Kirk S, Caress AL. Parents' experiences of caring for a child with
9 10 11	576	a cleft lip and/or palate: a review of the literature. Child Care Health Dev. 2012
12 13	577	Jan;38(1):6-20.
14 15	578	29. Coulter ML, Scheuerle J, Laude M, Habal MB. Psychological aspects of parents of
16 17 18	579	children with craniofacial anomalies. J Craniofac Surg. 1991;2:9–17.
19 20	580	30. Campis LB, DeMaso DR, Twente AW. The role of maternal factors in the adaptation of
21 22	581	children with craniofacial disfigurement. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 1995;32:55-61.
23 24 25	582	31. Pillemer FG, Cook KV. The psychosocial adjustment of pediatric craniofacial patients
25 26 27	583	after surgery. Cleft Palate J. 1989;26:201–207 discussion 207-208.
28 29	584	32. Despars J, Peter C, Borghini A, Pierrehumbert B, Habersaat S, Müller-Nix C, Ansermet
30 31 32	585	F, Hohlfeld J. Impact of a cleft lip and/or palate on maternal stress and attachment
32 33 34	586	representations. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2011;48:419-24.
35 36	587	33. Coy K, Speltz ML, Jones K. Facial appearance and attachment in infants with orofacial
37 38	588	clefts: a replication. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2002;39:66-72.
39 40 41	589	34. Maris CL, Endriga MC, Speltz ML, Jones K, DeKlyen M. Are infants with orofacial
42 43	590	clefts at risk for insecure mother-child attachments? Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2000;
44 45	591	37:257-65.
46 47 48	592	35. Papsin E, Haworth R, Chorney JM, Bezuhly M, Hong P. Pediatric otoplasty and informed
40 49 50	593	consent: do information handouts improve parental risk recall? Int J Pediatr
51 52	594	Otorhinolaryngol. 2014 Dec;78(12):2258-61.
53 54		
55 56 57		

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.	BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-033403 on 24 September 2020. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on June 7, 2025 at Agence Bibliographique de l
---	---

1 2		
3 4	595	36. Leatherman S, Warrick L. Effectiveness of decision aids: a review of the evidence. Med.
5 6	596	Care Res. Rev. 2008;65:79S-116S.
7 8 9	597	37. Rosenberg JM, Kapp-Simon KA, Starr JR, Cradock MM, Speltz ML. Mothers' and
10	598	fathers' reports of stress in families of infants with and without single-suture
$\begin{array}{c} 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41 \end{array}$	598 599	fathers' reports of stress in families of infants with and without single-suture craniosynostosis. Cleft Palate Craniofac J. 2011;48:509–518.
42 43		
44 45 46		
47 48		
49 50		
51 52 53		
53 54 55		
56 57		
58 59		,
60		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

500	CONTRIBUTORSHIP	STATEMENT
000	CONTRIDUTORSHI	STATENENT

- Dr. Victoria Kuta: Literature review, ethics submission, interviews, primary thematic analysis,
- manuscript preparation and submission
- Dr. Lauren Curry: Secondary reviewer of transcripts and themes
- Dr. P. Daniel McNeely: Patient recruitment, surgery, manuscript preparation
- Dr. Simon Walling: Patient recruitment, surgery, manuscript preparation
- Dr. Jill M. Chorney: Ethics submission, study design, manuscript preparation
- Dr. Michael Bezuhly: Primary supervisor, ethics submission, study design, patient recruitment,
- d subm. surgery, manuscript preparation and submission



	Variable	n (%)
_	Age, y*	32.4 ± 6.3 (range, 19-42)
_	Relationship to patient	
	Mother	12 (100)
	Father	0 (0)
_	Location	
	Home address < 50 km from hospital	9 (75)
	Home address > 50 km from hospital	3 (25)
_	Sex of Child	
	Male	10 (83.3)
	Female	2 (16.6)
_	Craniosynostosis type	
	Sagittal	6 (50.0)
	Coronal	4 (33.3)
	Metopic	2 (16.7)
3 -		

Understanding Families' Experiences Following a Non-Syndromic Craniosynostosis Diagnosis: A Qualitative Study - Parent Interview Guide ID # _____

Interview Guide #1

Thank you for agreeing to this first interview to discuss your child's craniosynostosis diagnosis.

<u>Pre Diagnosis</u> – When you first learned that your child might have something wrong with the development of their skull. Thinking back to *before your visit with the surgeon* here today;

- 1. Can you tell me when and how you noticed there was an issue for your child and who was the first person to notice it?
- 2. After realizing something was wrong, did you have any main concerns or worries?
- **3.** Can you tell me who referred you and your child to the health centre? Do you recall how long you waited before you received this appointment?
- 4. Can you tell me about what you were feeling before the consultation with your child's surgeon?
 - a. Did you do any research on your own?
 - b. Did you know what craniosynostosis was before the consultation?
 - c. What did you want to address at the consultation today?
- 5. Were you aware of the potential need for surgery?
 - a. If so, what were your thoughts on corrective surgery going into the consultation?
 - b. If not, what did you think the option(s) may be for your child?

Post Consultation- Once the diagnosis was made;

- 6. Please tell me about the consultation with your surgeon.
 - a. What were your thoughts and feelings during the consult?
 - b. Did you have questions for the surgeon? Was the surgeon able to provide you with the information that you needed?
 - c. What type of information did you receive during the consult? What format did you receive the information (written, verbal)?
 - d. Do you have access to other resources should you have additional questions before the surgery?
- 7. Please tell me about how you made the decision to have corrective surgery for your child.
 - a. Did the consultation have any influence on your decision?
 - b. Were there any factors that influenced your decision?
 - c. Do you believe this will impact the quality of life of your child?
- 8. In closing, is there anything else you would like to include?

Understanding Families' Experiences Following a Non-Syndromic Craniosynostosis Diagnosis: A Qualitative Study - Parent Interview Guide ID # _____

Interview Guide #2

Thank you for meeting with me for a second interview. It's been about three months since your child's surgery; today we will discuss your experience with your child's surgery and recovery.

Following Surgery

- 1. Please tell me about the days leading up to the surgery.
 - a. How were you feeling?
 - b. Did you have a thorough understanding of what the surgery entailed?
 - c. Were you comfortable with your decision to go ahead with surgery?
- 2. Please tell me what your experience with your child's surgery was like.
 - a. How did you feel in the days and weeks following the surgery?
 - b. How did others respond to you during your child's recovery?
 - c. Were there any particularly challenges in the recovery?
 - d. How did you deal with the challenges that arose?
- 3. Please tell me how you feel now about your decision to have reconstructive surgery for your child?
 - a. Is there anything you would change about the experience?
 - b. If you were making the decision now, would you do it again?
- 4. Has this experience impacted your life for you and your child?
- 5. What do you think health professionals should know about parents' experiences with craniosynostosis?
- 6. In closing, is there anything else you would like to include?

Standards for Reporting Qualitative Research (SRQR)*

http://www.equator-network.org/reporting-guidelines/srqr/

Page/line no(s).

Title and abstract

Title - Concise description of the nature and topic of the study Identifying the	
study as qualitative or indicating the approach (e.g., ethnography, grounded	1.2
theory) or data collection methods (e.g., interview, focus group) is recommended	1-2
Abstract - Summary of key elements of the study using the abstract format of the	2
intended publication; typically includes background, purpose, methods, results,	
and conclusions	47-75

Introduction

Problem formulation - Description and significance of the problem/phenomenon	
studied; review of relevant theory and empirical work; problem statement	114-139
Purpose or research question - Purpose of the study and specific objectives or	
questions	140-146

Methods

Qualitative approach and research paradigm - Qualitative approach (e.g.,	
ethnography, grounded theory, case study, phenomenology, narrative research)	
and guiding theory if appropriate; identifying the research paradigm (e.g.,	149-155; 181
postpositivist, constructivist/ interpretivist) is also recommended; rationale**	188
Researcher characteristics and reflexivity - Researchers' characteristics that may	
influence the research, including personal attributes, qualifications/experience,	
relationship with participants, assumptions, and/or presuppositions; potential or	
actual interaction between researchers' characteristics and the research	
questions, approach, methods, results, and/or transferability	155-157
Context - Setting/site and salient contextual factors; rationale**	160-162
Sampling strategy - How and why research participants, documents, or events	
were selected; criteria for deciding when no further sampling was necessary (e.g.,	
sampling saturation); rationale**	162-166;
Ethical issues pertaining to human subjects - Documentation of approval by an	
appropriate ethics review board and participant consent, or explanation for lack	160-161; 179-
thereof; other confidentiality and data security issues	180
	100
Data collection methods - Types of data collected; details of data collection	
procedures including (as appropriate) start and stop dates of data collection and	
analysis, iterative process, triangulation of sources/methods, and modification of	163-164; 182
procedures in response to evolving study findings; rationale**	193;197

Data collection instruments and technologies - Description of instruments (e.g.,	
interview guides, questionnaires) and devices (e.g., audio recorders) used for data	173-176; 17
collection; if/how the instrument(s) changed over the course of the study	180
Units of study - Number and relevant characteristics of participants, documents,	
or events included in the study; level of participation (could be reported in results)	196-198;60
Data processing - Methods for processing data prior to and during analysis,	
including transcription, data entry, data management and security, verification of	160-161; 17
data integrity, data coding, and anonymization/de-identification of excerpts	181
Data analysis - Process by which inferences, themes, etc., were identified and	
developed, including the researchers involved in data analysis; usually references a	
specific paradigm or approach; rationale**	182-188
Techniques to enhance trustworthiness - Techniques to enhance trustworthiness	
and credibility of data analysis (e.g., member checking, audit trail, triangulation);	
rationale**	189-193

Results/findings

Synthesis and interpretation - Main findings (e.g., interpretations, inferences, and themes); might include development of a theory or model, or integration with	
prior research or theory	199-393
Links to empirical data - Evidence (e.g., quotes, field notes, text excerpts,	
photographs) to substantiate analytic findings	199-393

Discussion

Integration with prior work, implications, transferability, and contrib		
the field - Short summary of main findings; explanation of how finding conclusions connect to, support, elaborate on, or challenge conclusion		
scholarship; discussion of scope of application/generalizability; identifi		
unique contribution(s) to scholarship in a discipline or field		396-459
Limitations - Trustworthiness and limitations of findings		460-473
	21	·
er		

Other

Conflicts of interest - Potential sources of influence or perceived influence on	
study conduct and conclusions; how these were managed	27-28
Funding - Sources of funding and other support; role of funders in data collection,	
interpretation, and reporting	30-32

*The authors created the SRQR by searching the literature to identify guidelines, reporting standards, and critical appraisal criteria for qualitative research; reviewing the reference lists of retrieved sources; and contacting experts to gain feedback. The SRQR aims to improve the transparency of all aspects of qualitative research by providing clear standards for reporting qualitative research.

**The rationale should briefly discuss the justification for choosing that theory, approach, method, or technique rather than other options available, the assumptions and limitations implicit in those choices, and how those choices influence study conclusions and transferability. As appropriate, the rationale for several items might be discussed together.

Reference:

L O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Academic Medicine, Vol. 89, No. 9 / Sept 2014 DOI: 10.1097/ACM.00000000000388