

BMJ Paediatrics Open

BMJ Paediatrics 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 Paediatrics 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 (<http://bmjpaedsopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Paediatrics Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjpo@bmj.com

BMJ Paediatrics Open

Incorporating parent, former patient, and clinician perspectives in the design of a national UK double-cluster, randomised controlled trial addressing uncertainties in preterm nutrition

Journal:	<i>BMJ Paediatrics Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjpo-2021-001112
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	29-Mar-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Lammons, William; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine Moss, Becky; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine Battersby, Cheryl; Imperial College London, Neonatal Medicine Cornelius, Victoria; Imperial College London, Imperial Clinical Trials Unit Babalís, Daphne; Imperial College London, Imperial Clinical Trials Unit Modi, Neena; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine
Keywords:	Neonatology, Qualitative research, Health services research

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



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 [licence](#).

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 [Creative Commons](#) 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.

1
2
3 **Incorporating parent, former patient, and clinician perspectives in the design of a national UK**
4 **double-cluster, randomised controlled trial addressing uncertainties in preterm nutrition**

5 Word count: 2362/2500; excluding title page, abstract, tables, figures, and references;
6

7 Structured abstract: 258/300
8

9 **Authors**

10 William Lammons, MA 1; Becky Moss, PhD 1; Cheryl Battersby, PhD BMBS BMedSci FRCPCH 1;
11 Victoria R Cornelius, PhD 2; Daphne Babalis, PhD 2; Prof Neena Modi MB ChB MD FRCP FRCPCH
12 FFPM FMedSci 1
13
14
15

16 1 Section of Neonatal Medicine, Chelsea and Westminster NHS Foundation Trust campus,
17 School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK
18

19 2 Imperial Clinical Trials Unit, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College
20 London, London, UK
21
22

23 **Corresponding Author**

24 William Lammons; Imperial College London; Chelsea and Westminster Hospital Campus
25
26 369 Fulham Road, Chelsea, London SW10 9NH; w.lammons@imperial.ac.uk
27
28

29 **Keywords**

30 Patient and public involvement, PPI, parent involvement, neonatal medicine, qualitative
31 methodology, patient information leaflet, patient information sheet, opt-out consent
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background

Comparative effectiveness randomised controlled trials are powerful tools to resolve uncertainties in existing treatments and care processes. We sought parent and patient perspectives on the design of a planned national, double-cluster randomised controlled trial (COLLABORATE) to resolve two longstanding uncertainties in preterm nutrition.

Methods

We used qualitative focus groups and interviews with parents, former patients and clinicians. We followed the COREQ checklist (Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research) and conducted inductive and deductive thematic analysis.

Results

We identified support for the trial's methodology and vision, and elicited themes illustrating parents' emotional needs in relation to clinical research. These were: relieving the pressure on mothers to breastfeed; opt-out consent as reducing parent stress; the desire for research to be a partnership between clinicians, parents, and researchers; the value of presenting trial information in a collaborative tone; and in a format that allows assimilation by parents at their own pace. We identified anxiety and cognitive dissonance among some clinicians in which they recognised the uncertainties that justify the trial but felt unable to participate because of their strongly held views.

Conclusions

The early involvement of parents and former patients identified the centrality of parents' emotional needs in the design of comparative effectiveness research. These insights have been incorporated into trial enrolment processes and information provided to participants. Specific outputs were a two-sided leaflet providing very brief as well as more detailed information, and use of language that parents perceive as inclusive and participatory. Further work is warranted to support clinicians to address personal biases that inhibit trial participation.

KEY MESSAGES

What is known about the subject?

- Comparative effectiveness randomised controlled trials are powerful means of resolving uncertainties in existing treatments and care processes.
- Many areas of neonatal practice lack an adequate evidence base, hence treatments often vary, within and between centres.
- The uncertainty around optimal practice creates risks for patients, anxiety for parents, and confusion among staff.

What this study adds?

- In addition to resolving practice uncertainties, comparative effectiveness research can help alleviate parent anxieties through metered study information, and partnership to improve newborn care.
- Early involvement of parents and former patients in trial development also enables researchers to support parents emotional needs through appropriate recruitment materials and methods.
- Incorporating clinicians as stakeholders has potential to understand and address their personal biases that inhibit trial participation.

INTRODUCTION

Many areas of neonatal practice lack an adequate evidence base, hence treatments often vary, within and between centres. Comparative effectiveness research refers to approaches to try and resolve uncertainties in established treatments.

COLLABORATE is a planned national, UK, double-cluster randomised controlled trial aiming to recruit at least 4700 babies to resolve two longstanding global uncertainties in preterm nutrition, the benefits of i) pasteurised human donor milk in comparison with preterm formula to supplement a baby's own mother's milk when more milk is needed and ii) routine versus no routine protein-carbohydrate fortification of human milk.[1, 2] The co-primary outcomes are survival to 36 weeks postmenstrual age without surgery for necrotising enterocolitis (NEC) and survival to age two-years without moderate-severe neurodevelopment impairment.

Currently in the UK less than twenty percent of very preterm babies receive any pasteurised donor milk and less than forty percent receive any fortifier.[3] The uncertainty around optimal practice creates risks for patients, anxiety for parents, and confusion among staff.

COLLABORATE offers a pragmatic response to these uncertainties. COLLABORATE will use data from the National Neonatal Research Database to minimise clinical burden,[4-6] and evaluate two-year language and cognitive outcomes with a parent-completed questionnaire, the Parent Report of Children's Abilities-Revised (PARCA-R).[7] Our aim at this preliminary stage was to involve parents, former patients, and clinicians in trial development.

METHODS

We recruited former neonatal intensive care patients and parents of patients from across the UK through a network of individuals with experience of preterm birth who had consented to be invited to participate in neonatal research activities.[8] We invited the participation of healthcare professionals through a national webinar. We held six virtual focus groups and semi-structured interviews with patients and parents in October 2020, and clinician-centred focus groups with eleven participants in November 2020, with group attendance for all capped at four.[9, 10] Sessions with single participants utilised the same topic guide. No clinicians attended the parent-patient groups to avoid inhibiting or influencing the discussions.[9, 10] Participants gave verbal consent for participation and recording at the start of every discussion session.

We followed the COREQ checklist (Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research) for qualitative studies and created a topic guide to probe parent-patient and clinician experiences and understanding of the trial, based upon a hybrid blend of deductive and inductive approaches to facilitate discussion and allow themes to emerge.[11, 12] We provided a draft Parent Information Leaflet (Supplementary Materials). Each session lasted approximately 90 minutes, and all were recorded with participant consent. WL and BM, non-clinical qualitative researchers led the discussions and conducted interviews. They transcribed recordings using Descript software, coded the data,[13] and organised the transcripts thematically using NVivo

software, Version 1.3.[14] Participants were provided contact information for psychological support services in the event that discussions elicited strong emotions.

Patient and Public Involvement

At this preliminary stage of the development of COLLABORATE, we have utilised patient-public involvement to assist in developing the consent process and trial information leaflet. We have also involved clinicians to understand and address concerns related to their perspectives on opt-out consent, cluster randomisation, and clinical uncertainties. This paper embodies the first phase of the study's public involvement strategy which includes parents, adults born preterm, and clinicians as research collaborators throughout the research cycle.[15]

RESULTS

Nine volunteers, all women (seven parents, one former patient, and one parent who is also a former patient) participated in parent-patient focus groups (Table 1). Eleven volunteers for clinician focus groups included eight neonatologists, a dietician and an infant feeding specialist midwife. One non-clinician adult born preterm also chose to attend a clinician focus group. Seven of the eleven participants were men. No participant required the psychological support services that were offered.

Table 1 Parent and Patient Participant Characteristics i

Participant	Gestational Age of Child or Patient	Position Attributing Knowledge	Feeding Method	Single/Multiple Birth	Incidence of necrotising enterocolitis [NEC]?	Survival of Baby(ies)	Support for Trial
Parent 1	33+3 weeks	Pharmacist w/RCT experience	Mum's milk	Single	N	Y	Y
Parent 2	n/a	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	Y	Y	N
Parent 3	n/a	Breastfeeding peer supporter	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	N	Y	Y
Parent 4	22 weeks	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Mum's milk & Donor milk	Twins	N/N	Y/N	Y
Parent 5	33 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Fortifier	Single	Y	N	Unsure
Parent 6	29+5 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Formula	Twins	Suspected NEC/N	Y/Y	Y
Parent 7	28 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	Y	Y	Y

i Please note that we have excluded details on clinician participants to protect clinician identities and anonymity.

Patient/Parent 1ii	29 weeks	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Formula & Donor Milk/Formula & Donor Milk	Single/Single	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y
Patient 1	28+4weeks	Paediatric nurse	Mum's milk & Formula	Twin	N/suspected NEC	Y/Niii	Y

We identified four parent-patient themes, two of which also emerged in the clinician discussions, and an additional clinician theme. We provide extended quotations in Table 2.

Table 2 Extended Versions of Quotes	
Participant	Quotation
Theme 1: Pressure to breastfeed	
Patient 1	...my mum will share with me that she cried with her breasts bleeding, trying to express because she was told it was the best... And she had a woman sitting next to her in the expressing room who had, you know, 500 mls of milk sitting there...and this woman was saying, 'Oh, it's not enough.' My mom was like, 'you're kidding me. I've got five ml from the last four hours. And I'm bleeding into it.'
Patient/Parent 1	I remember when they talked about putting him onto formula, I said to the consultant, 'I'm really, really worried about him getting NEC [necrotising enterocolitis]. I'm really worried.' Cause I had it and...I know how bad it is...they assured me that the risk with formula was just as high as it was with donor milk. So I was like...if they need to gain weight and it's such a balancing act, isn't it?...I suppose it's the same for the doctors. They're just trying to balance the best options.
Parent 7	... And at the end of the day, it has to be what's best...for your circumstances and what's best for your baby because your mom's milk is best, but if mom's milk is not available... you shouldn't make mums feel as if they're kind of a failure.
Theme 2: Consent process	
Parent 2	...I appreciate the opt-out allows a much larger number of people, and often families don't go there. Not because they don't necessarily want to do it, but for whatever reason they have...they're not thinking about it or they read...and forget to fill out...
Theme 3: Collaboration and inclusivity	
Parent 6	They need to be able to sometimes slightly dumb it down so we can understand it really well... I'm focusing on 'add extra protein and carbohydrate' [in the parent information leaflet.] I've never heard of that before...if I was in NICU [Neonatal Intensive Care Unit] and...I was still in the theatre and coming out of all of that and I had that to read, I'd be like, What?
Clinician 1	'On a ward round, one negative sentence, a loose comment about something ... just spoils everything. We try to police that to some extent [and] share all our anxieties and disagreement beforehandwe have our own personal agendas or personal biases but keep them to ourselves when we are ... in front of other people.'
Theme 4: Trauma, powerlessness, and parental learning in the neonatal unit	
Parent 7	...I had this baby ripped from me...I didn't see her after birth. It was horrific...her first nappy was changed by somebody else... All her cares were done by somebody else. The first person she saw was somebody else...

ii Participant had NEC as a preterm baby and mothered a preterm baby who had NEC.

iii Patient 1 was one of 2 preterm twins. Her twin had suspected NEC and passed away thereafter.

Parent 1	...when you're in hospital and you've just had a new baby, especially if the baby's premature and you just have so little time... between trying to express and then trying to clean equipment
Parent 2	At the same time often you do have a lot of time to kill in the neonatal unit...you will read every leaflet front to back, back to front, out of sheer boredom, more than anything else.
Parent 7	I'm the sort of person that likes to know everything, so I would want to read every tiny little detail of everything...but I know from speaking to other parents in the neonatal unit that a lot of parents...don't want to be involved as much and they don't want to know things.
Theme 5: Equipoise and personal beliefs	
Clinician 1	We [clinicians] have our own personal agendas or...biases...that's where I see the issue about [a] unit that's sort of consenting to participate, but not then sticking to the protocol...and then bringing some of their own ideas into the consenting ... [and] recruitment process"
Clinician 6	'We've been asking these questions for so long and we still haven't got the answer'

Theme 1 Pressure to breastfeed

Participants almost universally cited the refrain, "breast is best," but mothers' experiences of expressing milk and breastfeeding provoked stress and feelings of inadequacy. One former patient articulated the challenges of breastfeeding with an anecdote from her own mother:

'... my mum will share with me that she cried with her breasts bleeding, trying to express because she was told it was the best ...'

Parents showed understanding of the trial's aim of resolving feeding uncertainties. The discussion identified confusion around feeding options that were brought to the fore by the challenges of expressing sufficient milk.

'I'm really, really worried about him getting NEC [necrotising enterocolitis] ...' they assured me that the risk with formula was just as high as it was with donor milk. So I was like ... it's such a balancing act, isn't it?'

Participants emphasised sensitivity was needed to support mothers when discussing feeding.

'... if mum's milk is not available ... you shouldn't make mums feel as if they're kind of a failure ...'

Theme 2 Consent process

Parent-patient participants and most clinicians supported opt-out as minimising the added stress of trial consent in an already stressful environment. One parent stated

'... often families don't go there ... for whatever reason they have ... they're not thinking about it or they read ... and forget to fill out ...'.

Other participants echoed this sentiment noting that usual trial consent and information processes are often cumbersome and confusing. Some clinicians went further, suggesting that cluster randomisation meant that opt-out consent was required only from a neonatal unit rather than from parents themselves.

1
2
3 However, worries around transparency led some clinicians to feel uncomfortable with opt-out
4 consent. For example, one told us they felt opt-out was only appropriate when a rapid decision
5 was needed for a time-critical intervention.
6

7 8 **Theme 3 Collaboration and inclusivity**

9
10 Parent-patient participants emphasised the confusion and anxiety that results from lack of
11 clarity or consistency in medical information communicated to them. They felt researchers can
12 help alleviate these anxieties through the tone they adopt as well as the clarity of their
13 communications.
14

15
16 'I'm focusing on 'add extra protein and carbohydrate' [in the parent information leaflet.]
17 I've never heard of that before...'
18

19 They recommended we remove phrases in the draft parent information leaflet such as "if a
20 mother has insufficient milk" (Supplementary Materials). They encouraged general use of
21 words and phrases that expressed empathy for mothers' difficulties as opposed to ones that
22 provoked feelings of guilt or inadequacy, supportive of an "inclusive" tone.
23

24
25 'The document, as it reads, is looking to me like dumbed down 'science-y' stuff.
26 Whereas I think it needs to come from a person to person, like where you have concerns
27 and fears, and this is what we are trying to do together as a community of NICU
28 [neonatal intensive care unit] survivors and clinicians ...'
29

30
31 This parent's reference to a "community of survivors" illustrates their need for empathy.
32

33 Clinician participants recognized the importance of fostering a collaborative relationship with
34 parents:
35

36
37 'I think this whole thing about us having to approach parents in a really
38 collaborative way around the importance of ... feeding [is key] ...'
39

40 They perceived a tension between ensuring information was shared transparently and
41 managing parental anxiety. Offering clear and consistent explanations was seen as paramount,
42 but this was sometimes difficult because of clinical uncertainties and professional differences of
43 opinion.
44

45 46 **Theme 4 Trauma, powerlessness, and parental learning in the neonatal unit**

47 Mothers experience trauma and feelings of powerlessness, when their babies were "taken
48 away" for intensive care almost immediately following birth.
49

50
51 ... I had this baby ripped from me ... I didn't see her after birth. It was horrific ...
52

53 A lack of knowledge of neonatal care typically amplified these emotional experiences and
54 participants described feelings of urgency to obtain more information.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ... when you're in hospital and you've just had a new baby, especially if the baby's
4 premature and you just have so little time ...
5

6 At the same time, often, you do have a lot of time to kill in the neonatal unit ... you will
7 read every leaflet front to back ...
8
9

10 Pursuing knowledge helped remedy feelings of powerlessness for some mothers, though a
11 broader awareness of dangers facing babies often increased anxiety for others.
12

13 I would want to read every tiny little detail of everything ... but ... other parents in the
14 neonatal unit ... don't want to be involved as much and they don't want to know things.
15

16 In summary, parents reported varying degrees of desire for knowledge, from those who wanted
17 to know “everything” and those who wanted a more general understanding.
18
19

20 **Theme 5: Equipose and personal beliefs**

21 Clinicians described the difficulty of managing their own anxieties about treatments in
22 discussions with parents to minimise parent feelings of emotional distress and ensure
23 equipose across the unit.
24
25

26 ‘On a ward round, one negative sentence, a loose comment about something ... just
27 spoils everything. We try to police that to some extent [and] share all our anxieties and
28 disagreement beforehand ...
29
30

31 Clinicians identified that the anxieties, disagreements, and biases that are common to care
32 could amount to complications in trial procedures for some units. Despite broad acceptance of
33 the need for a trial, many clinicians predicted neonatal units with a standardised feeding
34 regimen would not agree to change them and would therefore decline to participate.
35
36

37 We [clinicians] have our own personal agendas or ... biases ... that's where I see the issue
38 about [a] unit that's sort of consenting to participate, but not then sticking to the
39 protocol ... and then bringing some of their own ideas into the consenting ... [and]
40 recruitment process ...
41
42

43 Clinical focus group participants accepted the existence of clinical uncertainties and understood
44 the need for a definitive trial. For example, one said:
45

46 ‘We've been asking these questions for so long and we still haven't got the answer’.
47

48 **DISCUSSION**

49
50 Our study of parent, former patient and clinician views about a planned national double-cluster
51 randomised controlled trial involved participants with intimate knowledge of neonatal care,
52 and the corresponding relevance and depth of their contributions provide novel insights. We
53 identified support for the rationale and proposed methodology, and themes within and across
54 groups. Particularly powerful themes related to the emotional needs of parents and the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 personal beliefs of clinicians. Parents experience stress and anxiety because of their baby's
4 admission to intensive care. A novel insight provided by our study is that comparative
5 effectiveness research might help alleviate parent anxieties in several ways. Clinician
6 participants identified anxieties arising from the tension between their personal views and their
7 acknowledgement of the need for evidence to guide practice.
8
9

10 Participants voiced support for the use of opt-out consent, noting it reduced the anxiety of
11 decision making. Some authors have criticised opt-out consent as not supporting informed
12 consent.[16] However, the stress of neonatal intensive care complicates parent understanding
13 of studies.[17] Our group has previously shown opt-out taps "into parents' desire for normality
14 in an abnormal situation." [18] We have also have shown that opt-out can be viewed as an
15 ongoing consent process, leaving parents able to withdraw participation at any time, and that
16 this approach is acceptable to the UK National Research Ethics Service.[19] Opt-out also allows
17 parents to understand the trial and decline to participate without imposing a burden of
18 additional information processing.[18]
19
20
21
22

23 The insights provided by study participants indicated the Parent Information Leaflet could be
24 structured to provide emotional assistance by minimising the anxiety provoked by varying
25 desires for information. This could be achieved by presenting information in a collaborative
26 tone that situates the research as a partnership between clinicians, parents, and researchers,
27 and employing a format that allows parents to assimilate information at their own pace. The
28 language used can also help avoid making mothers feel inadequate by recognising the
29 challenges of providing milk for their babies and alleviating the pressure to breastfeed. Our
30 participants advised metering trial information to accommodate the needs of parents who
31 want only a small amount of information as well as those who want to know more. The
32 rationale for comparative effectiveness research is the relevance to patient safety of resolving
33 uncertainties in care. However, "uncertain" does not necessarily describe how parents
34 experience the moment of selecting a nutritional option. What is "uncertain" in terms of
35 clinical practice is experienced as "worry", guilt, and even trauma by parents. This stems from a
36 mixture of a shortfall in knowledge and the requirement to process substantial new
37 information. The information provided through research participation enables parents to
38 understand the issues facing their babies, providing direct benefit and a safe space to learn
39 about neonatal treatments. As a consequence of these insights we undertook a redesign of the
40 information leaflet to allow parents to adjust how much information they would receive by
41 converting it into a two-sided format with a very brief explanation of the study on the front and
42 a more detailed explanation on the back (Supplementary Materials).
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 We identified anxiety among clinicians that manifest as a strong tendency to focus on the detail
51 of the trial rather than the bigger picture even though the trial compares standard clinical
52 practices. The main driver of anxiety was difficulty in managing uncertainty, both in terms of
53 explaining this to parents and in accommodating it in their own practice. We found a cognitive
54 dissonance at play, whereby the rationale for the trial is acceptable, yet involvement and being
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 forced to confront their own personal views and biases led many to reject participation. In
4 contrast, parents and patients felt that the proposed trial helped allay the anxieties invoked by
5 the very uncertainties that justified the trial.
6

7
8 Our research has identified important areas for incorporation into the design of COLLABORATE
9 and other comparative-effectiveness studies. Participating in research provides parents with a
10 forum in which to learn about neonatal treatments, participate in knowledge production, and
11 shape future care. Furthermore, in addition to the baby's medical care needs, our study, along
12 with others, has identified that the provision of information to participants and enrolment to
13 trials should consider the emotional needs of the parents as affected by study decision making,
14 information processing, and language in study materials.[20, 21] Our study illustrates the need
15 for further work to address the anxieties described and experienced by healthcare
16 professionals. We hope this will help spearhead a truly collaborative research culture between
17 parents, clinicians, and researchers.
18
19
20

21 **Acknowledgements**

22
23 We would like to thank Saulius Satas, Juliette Lee, Sara Clarke, Nadia Leake, Geoff Miller,
24 Shalabh Garg, Nicola Pritchard, Ganka Taneva and also the other parents, adults born preterm,
25 and clinicians who participated in this pre-study of the COLLABORATE trial.
26
27

28 **Funding Statement**

29
30 This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or
31 not-for-profit sectors.
32

33 **Competing Interests Statement**

34
35 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf
36 and declare: no financial support for the submitted work; CB reports grants and personal awards
37 funded by the NIHR, NM reports grants from Medical Research Council, grants from National
38 Institute for Health Research, grants from Prolacta Life Sciences, grants from Chiesi International,
39 grants from Westminster Children's Research Trust, grants from European Health Data and
40 Evidence Network, grants from HCA International, grants from Health Data Research UK, grants
41 from Shire Pharmaceuticals, grants from March of Dimes, outside the submitted work; CB is
42 deputy chair of the NIHR Health Technology Assessment Prioritisation Committee for Hospital
43 based care, NM is a member of the Nestle International Scientific Advisory Board (accepts no
44 personal remuneration for this role).
45
46
47
48

49 **Contributors**

50
51 All authors contributed to the research design of the parent, patient, and public involvement,
52 qualitative methods, the revision of this manuscript, approval of the final draft for publication,
53 and responsibility for the intellectual content within. Specific specialisations are described
54 below.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 WL – Writing, draft editing, thematic analysis, qualitative design, public involvement design,
4 and data collection
5

6 BM – Writing, draft editing, thematic analysis, qualitative design, public involvement design,
7 and data collection
8

9 CB – Writing, draft editing, qualitative participant recruitment
10

11 VC – Writing, Draft editing, randomised controlled trial (RCT) design
12

13 DB – Writing, Draft editing, RCT design
14

15 NM – Writing, draft editing, qualitative design, public involvement design, RCT Design
16
17

18 **Patient Consent for Publication**

19
20 This manuscript was shared with all participants to receive feedback and improve the paper's
21 integrity. Participant names have been included only if participants have given explicit
22 permission for their names to be published under our acknowledgements section.
23

24 **Research Ethics Approval**

25
26 Participation was voluntary. Parents and former patients were approached through the
27 neoWONDER collaboration (REC reference: 20/YH/0330).
28

29 **Data Availability Statement**

30
31 Anonymised data are available upon request from the corresponding author.
32
33
34
35

36 **References**

37
38 1 McGuire, W., Quigley, M., & Embleton, N. Formula versus donor breast milk for feeding preterm or low birth
39 weight infants. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2019;7:1-65. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002972.pub3

40
41 2 Brown, J., Lin, L., Embleton, N., et al. Multi-nutrient fortification of human milk for preterm infants. *Cochrane*
42 *Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013;6:1-64. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000343.pub4.

43
44 3 Greenbury SF, Ougham K, Wu J, Battersby C, Gale C, Modi N, Angelini ED Identification of variation in nutritional
45 practice in neonatal units in England and association with clinical outcomes using agnostic machine learning.
46 *Scientific Reports*. In press.

47
48 4 Webbe, J. W. H., Duffy, J. M. N., Afonso, E., et al. Core outcomes in neonatology: Development of a core outcome
49 set for neonatal research. *Archives of Disease in Childhood: Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2020;105(4):425–431.
doi:10.1136/archdischild-2019-317501

50
51 5 Modi, N., Ashby, D., Battersby, C., et al. Developing routinely recorded clinical data from electronic patient
52 records as a national resource to improve neonatal health care: the Medicines for Neonates research programme.
53 *Programme Grants for Applied Research* 2019;7(6):1–396. doi:10.3310/pgfar07060)

54
55 6 Modi N Information technology infrastructure, quality improvement and research: the UK National Neonatal
56 Research Database. *Translational Pediatrics* 2019; 8:193-8. doi: dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp.2019.07.08
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 7 Johnson S, Bountziouka V, Brocklehurst P, et al. Standardisation of the Parent Report of Children's Abilities-
4 Revised (PARCA-R): a norm-referenced assessment of cognitive and language development at age 2 years. *Lancet*
5 *Child Adolesc Health*. 2019 Oct;3(10):705-712. doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(19)30189-0.
6
- 7 8 NeoWONDER: Neonatal Whole Population Data linkage to improve lifelong health and wellbeing of preterm
8 babies 2020 <https://www.neowonder.org.uk/> Accessed 2/2021.
9
- 10 9 Finch, Helen and Lewis, Jane "Focus Groups" In: Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J., eds. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide*
11 *for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2003:170-198.
12
- 13 10 Barbour, Rosaline S. and Schostak, John "Interviewing and Focus Groups" In: Somekh, B., & Lewin, C., eds.
14 *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2005:41-48.
15
- 16 11 Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item
17 checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 2007;19(6):349-357. doi:
18 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
19
- 20 12 Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of
21 Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*,
22 2006;5(1):80-92. doi:10.1177/160940690600500107
23
- 24 13 Saldaña, J. *The Coding Manual for Qualitative Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2013.
25
- 26 14 QSR International Pty Ltd. NVivo 2020;3. [https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-](https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home)
27 [software/home](https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home)
28
- 29 15 Greenhalgh, T., Hinton, L., Finlay, T., et al. Frameworks for supporting patient and public involvement in
30 research: Systematic review and co-design pilot. *Health Expectations* 2019;22(4):785-801. doi:10.1111/hex.12888
31
- 32 16 Berry, J. G., Ryan, P., Duszynski, K. M., et al. Parent perspectives on consent for the linkage of data to evaluate
33 vaccine safety: A randomised trial of opt-in and opt-out consent. *Clinical Trials* 2013;10(3):483-494.
34 doi:10.1177/1740774513480568
35
- 36 17 Mason S, Allmark P for the Euricon Study Group (Allmark P, Megone C, Bratlid D, et al.) Obtaining informed
37 consent to neonatal randomised controlled trials: interviews with parents and clinicians in the Euricon Study.
38 *Lancet* 2000; 356:2045-51 doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(00)03401-2.
39
- 40 18 McLeish, J., Alderdice, F., Robberts, H., et al. Challenges of a simplified opt- out consent process in a neonatal
41 randomised controlled trial: qualitative study of parents' and health professionals' views and experiences. *Archives*
42 *of Disease in Childhood - Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2020;0:F1-F7. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2020-319545
43
- 44 19 Gale, C., Hyde, M. J., & Modi, N. Research ethics committee decision-making in relation to an efficient neonatal
45 trial. *Archives of Disease in Childhood: Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2017;102:F291-F298. doi:10.1136/archdischild-
46 2016-310935
47
- 48 20 Neu, M., Klawetter, S., Greenfield, J. C., et al. Mothers' Experiences in the NICU before Family-Centered Care
49 and in NICUs Where It Is the Standard of Care. *Advances in Neonatal Care* 2020;20(1):68-79.
50 doi:10.1097/ANC.0000000000000671
51
- 52 21 Mörelius, E., Kling, K., Eva, R. N., et al. You can't flight, you need to fight — A qualitative study of mothers'
53 experiences of feeding extremely preterm infants. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 2020;29:2420-2428.
54 doi:10.1111/jocn.15254
55
56
57
58
59
60

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Draft Parent Information Leaflet

This information sheet provides details of a landmark approach to improve the care of very preterm babies. Please read it carefully and ask us if anything is unclear.

Background: This neonatal unit is taking part in a large, national study to find out the best way to feed very preterm babies. This will involve using data that doctors and nurses record routinely for all babies admitted to neonatal units. This leaflet is to provide you with information. You do not need to do anything unless you do not wish us to use your baby's data.

You can "opt-out" at any time by telling [NAME OF STAFF MEMBER]. If you opt-out, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected. However, your baby's data will not be included in the analysis of the results.

What we are trying to find out: We ask all mothers who have a very preterm baby to express milk. However, if a mother has insufficient milk we do not know whether it is beneficial for a baby to receive pasteurised donated milk or formula specially made for preterm babies. We also do not know whether it is beneficial to very preterm babies to add extra protein and carbohydrate routinely to human milk. These are important questions affecting the care of all very preterm babies.

Why there is uncertainty: Preterm formula is made from cow's milk in a factory to strict regulatory standards. It has a consistent amount of nutrition and is used very widely. However, some clinicians believe cow's milk may increase the risks in very preterm babies of a gut inflammation called necrotising enterocolitis that can be very serious. About 3 in 100 very preterm babies in the UK develop severe necrotising enterocolitis.

Human milk provides more than just nutrition, for example, it has factors that strengthen immunity. However, human milk from a donor must be pasteurised to reduce the risk of transmitting infection. Pasteurisation reduces or destroys some beneficial properties of human milk; therefore, donor milk is not the same as milk from a baby's own mother. Pasteurised human donor milk is expensive and has very variable nutrition. This means that doctors may need to add extra protein and carbohydrate from cow's milk which some feel may also be a risk for necrotising enterocolitis.

What happens at present: Because we do not know which options are better for babies, some neonatal units use preterm formula and some use pasteurised human donor milk; some routinely add extra protein and carbohydrate to human milk feeds for very preterm babies and some do not. Overall, in the UK, the majority of babies receive their own mother's milk with some formula; less than 20% receive any donor milk, and about 40% receive some extra protein and carbohydrate.

How to resolve these uncertainties: The most reliable way to resolve uncertainties is by fairly allocating neonatal units to a feeding strategy, using a computer programme that makes the choice without influence so that half will use one approach and half will use the other, for each of the two uncertainties. This is ethical because it gives patients an equal, fair chance of receiving any of the alternative treatments. We will need to compare information from about 4700 babies to find out which options are more beneficial. In this neonatal unit we will be using [X] and [Y].

Other information: There are no risks to your baby from participation in this study because all feeding options are already widely used. Standard NHS indemnity operates in relation to the clinical treatment your baby receives. The UK Health Research Authority has approved the study. Imperial College London is coordinating the study and [x] is funding it. We will keep all details about your baby private. The only people allowed to look at your baby's data are the team running the study and the regulatory authorities responsible for checking it is carried out correctly.

Thank you for reading this.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS (CONTINUED)

Revised Parent Information Leaflet

SIDE ONE

This information sheet provides details of a landmark approach to improve the care of very preterm babies.

This neonatal unit is taking part in a large, national study to find out the best way to feed very preterm babies (born at less than 29 weeks gestation).

This will involve using data that doctors and nurses record routinely for all babies admitted to neonatal units.

This sheet is to provide you with information. You do not need to do anything unless you do not wish us to use your baby's data.

You can "opt-out" at any time by telling [NAME OF STAFF MEMBER].

If you opt-out, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected. However, your baby's data will not be included in the analysis of the results.

If you are interested in learning more about why the study is taking place, please turn overleaf.

SIDE TWO

What we are trying to find out: We ask all mothers who have a very preterm baby to express milk, as we know this is the optimum way to feed neonates. However, breast-feeding a premature baby can often present challenges, despite their mother's effort and commitment. This means that sometimes a baby will need an additional source of nutrition. At present, we do not know whether it is beneficial for a baby to receive pasteurised donated milk or formula specially made for preterm babies. We also do not know whether it is beneficial to very preterm babies to add extra protein and carbohydrate routinely to human milk. These are important questions affecting the care of all very preterm babies.

Why there is uncertainty: Preterm formula is made from cow's milk in a factory to strict regulatory standards. It has a consistent amount of nutrition and is used very widely. However, some clinicians believe cow's milk may increase the risks in very preterm babies of a gut inflammation called necrotising enterocolitis that can be very serious. About 3 in 100 very preterm babies in the UK develop severe necrotising enterocolitis.

Human milk provides more than just nutrition, for example, it has factors that strengthen immunity. However, human milk from a donor must be pasteurised to reduce the risk of transmitting infection. Pasteurisation reduces or destroys some beneficial properties of human milk and for these and other reasons, donor milk is not the same as milk from a baby's own mother. Pasteurised human donor milk is expensive and has very variable nutrition. This means that doctors may need to add extra protein and carbohydrate from cow's milk which some feel may also be a risk for necrotising enterocolitis.

What happens at present: Because we do not know which options are better for babies, some neonatal units use preterm formula and some use pasteurised human donor milk; some routinely add extra protein and carbohydrate to human milk feeds for very preterm babies and some do not. Overall, in the UK, the majority of babies receive their own mother's milk with some formula; less than 20% receive any donor milk, and about 40% receive some extra protein and carbohydrate.

How to resolve these uncertainties: The most reliable way to resolve uncertainties is by fairly allocating neonatal units to a feeding strategy, using a computer programme that makes the choice without influence so that half will use one approach and half will use the other, for each of the two uncertainties. This is ethical because it gives patients an equal, fair chance of receiving any of the alternative treatments. We will need to compare information from about 4700 babies to find out which options are more beneficial. In this neonatal unit we will be using [X] and [Y].

Other information: There are no risks to your baby from participation in this study because all feeding options are already widely used. Standard NHS indemnity operates in relation to the clinical treatment your baby receives. The UK Health Research Authority has approved the study. Imperial College London is coordinating the study and [x] is funding it. We will keep all details about your baby private. The only people allowed to look at your baby's data are the team running the study and the regulatory authorities responsible for checking it is carried out correctly.

Once again, if you opt-out of the research study, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected.

Thank you for reading this. Please ask us if anything is unclear.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS (CONTINUED)

Completed Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ)

Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity

Personal Characteristics

1. Interviewer/facilitator – Lammons and Moss
2. Credentials – Lammons, MA; Moss, PhD
3. Occupation: Lammons, PPI Research Lead; Moss, PPI Research Lead
4. Gender – Lammons, male; Moss, female
5. Experience and training – Lammons, Imperial College London PPI Training; Moss, original PPI research on improving outcomes for aphasia patients

Relationship with participants

6. Relationship established – No relationship was established between Lammons, Moss and participants prior to this research. Parent and public were recruited through the neoWONDER network of interested participants who had given consent to contact, which is managed by Battersby. Clinician participants were recruited through a national webinar on the COLLABORATE trial.
7. Participant knowledge of the researchers – Lammons and Moss clearly stated the research goals, vision, and purposes at the start of every focus group and interview. They asserted that their goals were to understand parent, former patient, and clinician experiences, then use these to improve the trial's success in terms of recruitment, retention, relevance, and efficacy.
8. Interviewer characteristics – interviewers clearly stated their motivations and interests in the research topic throughout each focus group and interview. Interviewers shared personal experiences, such as parenthood or lack thereof which impacted their vision and understanding of these phenomena. Most importantly, researchers situated themselves as intermediaries who could receive critiques of the research design, then transmit these to improve the research's inclusivity and engagement with participants and stakeholders.

Domain 2: study design

Theoretical framework

9. Methodological orientation – Qualitative research, qualitative analysis, and patient and public involvement

Participant selection

10. Sampling – Parent and former patient participants were notified of the COLLABORATE qualitative pre-trial from the neoWONDER research participant network, managed by Battersby, which is a network of parents of premature babies and adults born premature who have consented to contact for neonatal medicine related research studies. Given time constraints the research team faced, we opted for this as the most efficient, effective, convenient, and purposeful means for getting feedback on the

COLLABORATE trial prior in tandem with its protocol development. This occurred in tandem with a national webinar presenting the COLLABORATE trial to clinicians. Through the webinar, clinicians were invited to voluntarily participate in the pre-trial focus groups.

11. Method of approach – email invitation for voluntary participation through neoWONDER research participant network, led by Battersby. A separate email invitation for voluntary participation following the webinar was emailed to clinicians. Interested individuals who responded were offered participation times and dates.

12. Sample size – 19

13. Non-participation – 9 showed interest in participating but did not attend due to various reasons, including illness or lack of clear confirmation; follow-up contact and rescheduling was attempted with all four of these individuals twice via email, but no responses were received to schedule additional meeting dates. Two clinicians confirmed attendance but were absent.

Setting

14. Setting of data collection – virtual focus groups and interviews held via Zoom and Microsoft Teams. Participants joined the sessions from their personal computers/devices at their homes or offices.

15. Presence of non-participants – only research participants and researchers (Moss and Lammons) were present during sessions

16. Description of sample – Parent and patient participants were all female between the ages of 22 and 55; 7 were mothers of neonatal patients, 1 was a former neonatal patient, and 1 was a mother and former neonatal patient. Eleven volunteers for clinician focus groups included eight neonatologists, a dietician and an infant feeding specialist midwife. One non-clinician adult born preterm also chose to attend a clinician focus group. Seven of the eleven participants were men.

Data collection

17. Interview guide – Two separate but similar topic guides were created by Lammons and Moss, one for patients and parents, one for clinicians. Both were shared with the broader research team. Guides were not pilot tested, nor did participants request a copy of the guide, though it was available upon request.

18. Repeat interviews – none were conducted

19. Audio/visual recording – sessions were video recorded using in-app recording functions of Zoom and/or Teams. Audio recordings were extracted from the videos and used to create transcriptions with Descript software. These transcriptions were edited for correctness and understanding, then video recordings were deleted. Audio recordings were saved. One session encountered extensive technical difficulties and was correspondingly conducted by Moss via phone. As a result of technical issues, this session was not recorded.

20. Field notes – Lammons and Moss took field notes during and after interview/focus group sessions. These were included in the NVivo workflow and theming process along with raw data.

21. Duration – Each session lasted roughly 90 minutes.

1
2
3 22. Data saturation – Moss and Lammons reached thematic saturation at the conclusion of all focus
4 groups and review of data.
5

6 23. Transcripts returned – transcripts were not returned to participants for comment and/or correction,
7 though quotations used throughout the manuscript have been reviewed and verified by participants.
8

9 **Domain 3: analysis and findings**

10 **Data analysis**

11
12 24. Number of data coders – 2, Moss and Lammons

13
14 25. Description of the coding tree – The coding tree has not been included in the manuscript but is
15 available on request.
16

17
18 26. Derivation of themes – Moss and Lammons used a “hybrid approach” of deductive themes identified
19 prior to the data collection and inductive themes derived from the data itself.
20

21 27. Software – NVivo 1.3 (QSR Technologies)

22
23 28. Participant checking – Participants have been included in the writing process as reviewers of
24 findings. When they have given permission to do so, their names have been specifically included in the
25 acknowledgements section.
26

27 **Reporting**

28
29 29. Quotations presented – Quotations are presented in the results section in brief, with their
30 corresponding long-form versions and identifying participant numbers in Table 2.
31

32 30. Data and findings consistent – Data has been used to guide findings, discussion, and analysis. Copies
33 of transcripts and coding are available upon request.
34

35 31. Clarity of major themes – Quotes were clearly paired with theme headings and discussions for
36 optimum clarification.
37

38 32. Clarity of minor themes – Quotes were clearly paired with theme headings and discussions for
39 optimum clarification.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Paediatrics Open

Incorporating parent, former patient, and clinician perspectives in the design of a national UK double-cluster, randomised controlled trial addressing uncertainties in preterm nutrition

Journal:	<i>BMJ Paediatrics Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjpo-2021-001112.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-May-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Lammons, William; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine Moss, Becky; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine Battersby, Cheryl; Imperial College London, Neonatal Medicine Cornelius, Victoria; Imperial College London, Imperial Clinical Trials Unit Babalís, Daphne; Imperial College London, Imperial Clinical Trials Unit Modi, Neena; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine
Keywords:	Neonatology, Qualitative research, Health services research

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



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 [licence](#).

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 [Creative Commons](#) 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.

1
2
3 **Incorporating parent, former patient, and clinician perspectives in the design of a national UK**
4 **double-cluster, randomised controlled trial addressing uncertainties in preterm nutrition**

5 Word count: 2977/2500; excluding title page, abstract, tables, figures, and references;
6
7

8 Structured abstract: 258/300
9

10 **Authors**

11 William Lammons, MA 1; Becky Moss, PhD 1; Cheryl Battersby, PhD BMBS BMedSci FRCPCH 1;
12 Victoria R Cornelius, PhD 2; Daphne Babalis, PhD 2; Prof Neena Modi MB ChB MD FRCP FRCPCH
13 FFPM FMedSci 1
14
15

16 1 Section of Neonatal Medicine, Chelsea and Westminster NHS Foundation Trust campus,
17 School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK
18

19 2 Imperial Clinical Trials Unit, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College
20 London, London, UK
21
22

23 **Corresponding Author**

24 William Lammons; Imperial College London; Chelsea and Westminster Hospital Campus
25
26 369 Fulham Road, Chelsea, London SW10 9NH; w.lammons@imperial.ac.uk
27
28

29 **Keywords**

30 Patient and public involvement, PPI, parent involvement, neonatal medicine, qualitative
31 methodology, patient information leaflet, patient information sheet, opt-out consent
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background

Comparative effectiveness randomised controlled trials are powerful tools to resolve uncertainties in existing treatments and care processes. We sought parent and patient perspectives on the design of a planned national, double-cluster randomised controlled trial (COLLABORATE) to resolve two longstanding uncertainties in preterm nutrition.

Methods

We used qualitative focus groups and interviews with parents, former patients and clinicians. We followed the COREQ checklist (Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research) and conducted inductive and deductive thematic analysis.

Results

We identified support for the trial's methodology and vision, and elicited themes illustrating parents' emotional needs in relation to clinical research. These were: relieving the pressure on mothers to breastfeed; opt-out consent as reducing parent stress; the desire for research to be a partnership between clinicians, parents, and researchers; the value of presenting trial information in a collaborative tone; and in a format that allows assimilation by parents at their own pace. We identified anxiety and cognitive dissonance among some clinicians in which they recognised the uncertainties that justify the trial but felt unable to participate because of their strongly held views.

Conclusions

The early involvement of parents and former patients identified the centrality of parents' emotional needs in the design of comparative effectiveness research. These insights have been incorporated into trial enrolment processes and information provided to participants. Specific outputs were a two-sided leaflet providing very brief as well as more detailed information, and use of language that parents perceive as inclusive and participatory. Further work is warranted to support clinicians to address personal biases that inhibit trial participation.

KEY MESSAGES

What is known about the subject?

- Comparative effectiveness randomised controlled trials are powerful means of resolving uncertainties in existing treatments and care processes.
- Many areas of neonatal practice lack an adequate evidence base, hence treatments often vary, within and between centres.
- The uncertainty around optimal practice creates risks for patients, anxiety for parents, and confusion among staff.

What this study adds?

- In addition to resolving practice uncertainties, comparative effectiveness research can help alleviate parent anxieties through metered study information, and partnership to improve newborn care.
- Early involvement of parents and former patients in trial development also enables researchers to support parents emotional needs through appropriate recruitment materials and methods.
- Incorporating clinicians as stakeholders has potential to understand and address their personal biases that inhibit trial participation.

INTRODUCTION

Many areas of neonatal practice lack an adequate evidence base, hence treatments often vary, within and between centres. Comparative effectiveness research refers to approaches to try and resolve uncertainties in established treatments.

COLLABORATE is a planned national, UK, double-cluster randomised controlled trial aiming to recruit at least 4700 babies to resolve two longstanding global uncertainties in preterm nutrition, the benefits of i) pasteurised human donor milk in comparison with preterm formula to supplement a baby's own mother's milk when more milk is needed and ii) routine versus no routine protein-carbohydrate fortification of human milk.[1, 2] The co-primary outcomes are survival to 36 weeks postmenstrual age without surgery for necrotising enterocolitis (NEC) and survival to age two-years without moderate-severe neurodevelopment impairment.

Currently in the UK less than twenty percent of very preterm babies receive any pasteurised donor milk and less than forty percent receive any fortifier.[3] The uncertainty around optimal practice creates risks for patients, anxiety for parents, and confusion among staff.

COLLABORATE offers a pragmatic response to these uncertainties. COLLABORATE will use data from the National Neonatal Research Database to minimise clinical burden,[4-6] and evaluate two-year language and cognitive outcomes with a parent-completed questionnaire, the Parent Report of Children's Abilities-Revised (PARCA-R).[7] Our aim at this preliminary stage was to involve parents, former patients, and clinicians in trial development.

These clinical uncertainties, which affect the care provided to babies as well as the information provided to families, present an opportunity to understand how parents of very preterm babies can improve the recruitment materials for the COLLABORATE trial and clarify the acceptability of consent methods, as well as compare their views and reactions with those of clinicians. PPI consultations are enriching mechanisms to improve design, making studies more successful and relevant to their stakeholders [8-12]. In paediatric research they have identified important guiding themes for future research, largely through centring the narratives and experiences of survivors and families [13, 14].

METHODS

We recruited former neonatal intensive care patients and parents of patients from across the UK through a network of individuals with experience of preterm birth who had consented to be invited to participate in neonatal research activities.[15] We invited the participation of healthcare professionals through a national webinar. In total, twenty volunteers; ten clinicians, seven parents, two former patients, and one parent/former patient; participated in virtual focus groups or semi-structured interviews [16, 17]. Sessions with single participants utilised the same topic guide. No clinicians attended the parent-patient groups to avoid inhibiting or influencing the discussions.[16, 17] Participants gave verbal consent for participation and recording at the start of every discussion session.

1
2
3 We followed the COREQ checklist (Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research) for
4 qualitative studies and created a topic guide to probe parent-patient and clinician experiences
5 and understanding of the trial, based upon a hybrid blend of deductive and inductive
6 approaches to facilitate discussion and allow themes to emerge.[18, 19] We provided a draft
7 Parent Information Leaflet (Supplementary Materials). Each session lasted approximately 90
8 minutes, and all were recorded with participant consent. WL and BM, non-clinical qualitative
9 researchers led the discussions and conducted interviews. They transcribed recordings and
10 conducted interviews.
11
12

13
14 WL and BM analysed all qualitative data using Framework Analysis. [20] Initial themes and
15 concepts were identified through reviewing the data, then used to construct a thematic index
16 and assign an index label to each phrase or passage of the transcripts. [20] The labelled raw
17 data was then summarised and synthesised into the thematic charts to facilitate systematic
18 exploration of the range of views, both between cases and within cases, to produce both
19 descriptive and explanatory accounts of the data. [20] Data were organised and analysed using
20 NVivo, version 1.0 (QSR International) [21]. Participants were provided contact information for
21 psychological support services in the event that discussions elicited strong emotions.
22
23

24 **Patient and Public Involvement**

25
26 At this preliminary stage of the development of COLLABORATE, we have utilised patient-public
27 involvement to assist in developing the consent process and trial information leaflet. We have
28 also involved clinicians to understand and address concerns related to their perspectives on
29 opt-out consent, cluster randomisation, and clinical uncertainties. This paper embodies the first
30 phase of the study's public involvement strategy which includes parents, adults born preterm,
31 and clinicians as research collaborators throughout the research cycle.[22]
32
33

34 **RESULTS**

35
36 Nine volunteers, all women (seven parents, one former patient, and one parent who is also a
37 former patient) participated in parent-patient focus groups (Table 1). Eleven volunteers for
38 clinician focus groups included eight neonatologists, a dietician and an infant feeding specialist
39 midwife. One non-clinician adult born preterm also chose to attend a clinician focus group.
40 Seven of the eleven participants were men. No participant required the psychological support
41 services that were offered.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1 Parent and Patient Participant Characteristics i

Participant	Gestational Age of Child or Patient	Reason for Interest in Participating	Feeding Method	Single/Multiple Birth	Incidence of necrotising enterocolitis [NEC]?	Survival of Baby(ies)	Support for Trial
Parent 1	33+3 weeks	Pharmacist w/RCT experience	Mum's milk	Single	N	Y	Y
Parent 2	n/a	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	Y	Y	N
Parent 3	n/a	Breastfeeding peer supporter	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	N	Y	Y
Parent 4	22 weeks	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Mum's milk & Donor milk	Twins	N/N	Y/N	Y
Parent 5	33 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Fortifier	Single	Y	N	Unsure
Parent 6	29+5 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Formula	Twins	Suspected NEC/N	Y/Y	Y
Parent 7	28 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	Y	Y	Y
Patient/Parent 1ii	29 weeks	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Formula & Donor Milk/Formula & Donor Milk	Single/Single	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y
Patient 1	28+4weeks	Paediatric nurse	Mum's milk & Formula	Twin	N/suspected NEC	Y/Niii	Y

We identified three parent-patient themes; “pressure to breastfeed”, “consent process”, and “emotional trauma”; one clinician theme, “equipoise and personal beliefs”; and one theme combining parent-patient and clinician discussions, “collaboration and inclusivity.”

Theme 1 Pressure to breastfeed

Participants almost universally cited the refrain, “breast is best,” but mothers’ experiences of expressing milk and breastfeeding provoked stress and feelings of inadequacy. One former patient articulated the challenges of breastfeeding with an anecdote from her own mother:

“...my mum will share with me that she cried with her breasts bleeding, trying to express because she was told it was the best... And she had a woman sitting next to her in the expressing room who had, you know, 500 mls of milk sitting there...and this woman was

i Please note that we have excluded details on clinician participants to protect clinician identities and anonymity.

ii Participant had NEC as a preterm baby and mothered a preterm baby who had NEC.

iii Patient 1 was one of 2 preterm twins. Her twin had suspected NEC and passed away thereafter.

1
2
3 saying, 'Oh, it's not enough.' My mum was like, 'you're kidding me. I've got five ml from
4 the last four hours. And I'm bleeding into it.' (NICU patient born at 28+4 weeks, now a
5 paediatric nurse)
6

7
8 Parents showed understanding of the trial's aim of resolving feeding uncertainties. The
9 discussion identified confusion around feeding options that were brought to the fore by the
10 challenges of expressing sufficient milk.
11

12 "I remember when they talked about putting him onto formula, I said to the consultant,
13 'I'm really, really worried about him getting NEC [necrotising enterocolitis]. I'm really
14 worried.' Cause I had it and...I know how bad it is...they assured me that the risk with
15 formula was just as high as it was with donor milk. So I was like...if they need to gain
16 weight and it's such a balancing act, isn't it?...I suppose it's the same for the doctors.
17 They're just trying to balance the best options." (Mother who had NEC as a preterm
18 baby, whose baby was born at 29 weeks)
19
20
21

22 Participants emphasised sensitivity was needed to support mothers when discussing feeding.
23

24 "... And at the end of the day, it has to be what's best...for your circumstances and what's
25 best for your baby because your mum's milk is best, but if mum's milk is not available...
26 you shouldn't make mums feel as if they're kind of a failure." (Mother of twins born at
27 29+5 weeks)
28
29

30 **Theme 2 Consent process**

31
32 Parent-patient participants and most clinicians supported opt-out as minimising the added
33 stress of trial consent in an already stressful environment. One parent stated
34

35 "...I appreciate the opt-out allows a much larger number of people, and often families
36 don't go there. Not because they don't necessarily want to do it, but for whatever reason
37 they have...they're not thinking about it or they read [the consent form]...and forget to
38 fill out..." (Mother of a preterm baby who had NEC)
39
40

41 Other participants echoed this sentiment noting that usual trial consent and information
42 processes are often cumbersome and confusing. Some clinicians went further, suggesting that
43 cluster randomisation meant that opt-out consent was required only from a neonatal unit
44 rather than from parents themselves.
45
46

47 However, worries around transparency led some clinicians to feel uncomfortable with opt-out
48 consent. For example, one told us they felt opt-out was only appropriate when a rapid decision
49 was needed for a time-critical intervention.
50
51

52 **Theme 3 Collaboration and inclusivity**

53
54 Parent-patient participants emphasised the confusion and anxiety that results from lack of
55 clarity or consistency in medical information communicated to them. They felt researchers can
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 help alleviate these anxieties through the tone they adopt as well as the clarity of their
4 communications.
5

6 *“They need to be able to sometimes slightly dumb it down so we can understand it really*
7 *well... I'm focusing on ‘add extra protein and carbohydrate’ [in the parent information*
8 *leaflet.] I've never heard of that before...” (Mother of twin boys born at 22 weeks, one of*
9 *whom did not survive)*
10
11

12 They recommended we remove phrases in the draft parent information leaflet such as “if a
13 mother has insufficient milk” (Supplementary Materials). They encouraged general use of
14 words and phrases that expressed empathy for mothers’ difficulties as opposed to ones that
15 provoked feelings of guilt or inadequacy, supportive of an “inclusive” tone.
16
17

18 *“The document, as it reads, is looking to me like dumbed down ‘science-y’ stuff. Whereas*
19 *I think it needs to come from a person to person, like where you have concerns and fears,*
20 *and this is what we are trying to do together as a community of NICU [neonatal intensive*
21 *care unit] survivors and clinicians...” (Mother of twin boys born at 22 weeks, one of*
22 *whom did not survive)*
23
24

25 This parent’s reference to a “community of survivors” illustrates their need for empathy.
26

27 Clinician participants recognized the importance of fostering a collaborative relationship with
28 parents:
29
30

31 *“I think this whole thing about us having to approach parents in a really collaborative*
32 *way around the importance of...feeding...managing their expectations and their*
33 *understanding of what is happening with that baby's gut, and that we're trying to help*
34 *promote a healthy gut, not just for the time when they're in their unit, but beyond that*
35 *time as a healthy gut for life – here is the one of the fundamental things that's going to*
36 *influence their feeding for not just weeks, but months and years to come.” (Neonatal*
37 *clinician)*
38
39

40 They perceived a tension between ensuring information was shared transparently and
41 managing parental anxiety. Offering clear and consistent explanations was seen as paramount,
42 but this was sometimes difficult because of clinical uncertainties and professional differences of
43 opinion.
44
45

46 **Theme 4 Trauma, powerlessness, and parental learning in the neonatal unit**

47

48 Mothers experience trauma and feelings of powerlessness, when their babies were “taken
49 away” for intensive care almost immediately following birth.
50

51 *“...I had this baby ripped from me...I didn't see her after birth. It was horrific...her first*
52 *nappy was changed by somebody else... All her cares were done by somebody else. The*
53 *first person she saw was somebody else” (Mother of a preterm baby with NEC)*
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A lack of knowledge of neonatal care typically amplified these emotional experiences and
4 participants described feelings of urgency to obtain more information.
5

6
7 *... when you're in hospital and you've just had a new baby, especially if the baby's*
8 *premature and you just have...so little time..." (Mother of a baby born at 33+3 weeks,*
9 *pharmacist)*

10
11 *At the same time, often, you do have a lot of time to kill in the neonatal unit ... you will*
12 *read every leaflet front to back" (Mother of a preterm baby)*

13
14 Pursuing knowledge helped remedy feelings of powerlessness for some mothers, though a
15 broader awareness of dangers facing babies often increased anxiety for others.
16

17
18 *"I'm the sort of person that likes to know everything, so I would want to read every tiny*
19 *little detail of everything...but I know from speaking to other parents in the neonatal unit*
20 *that a lot of parents...don't want to be involved as much and they don't want to know*
21 *things. (Mother of a preterm baby who had NEC)"*

22
23 In summary, parents reported varying degrees of desire for knowledge, from those who wanted
24 to know "everything" and those who wanted a more general understanding.
25
26

27 **Theme 5: Equipose and personal beliefs**

28
29 Clinicians described the difficulty of managing their own anxieties about treatments in
30 discussions with parents to minimise parent feelings of emotional distress and ensure
31 equipose across the unit.
32

33
34 *"On a ward round, one negative sentence, a loose comment about something ...*
35 *just spoils everything. We try to police that to some extent [and] share all our*
36 *anxieties and disagreement beforehandwe have our own personal agendas or*
37 *personal biases but keep them to ourselves when we are ... in front of other people.*
38 *that's where I see the issue about [a] unit that's sort of consenting to participate,*
39 *but not then sticking to the protocol...and then bringing some of their own ideas*
40 *into the consenting ... [and] recruitment process." (Neonatal clinician)*

41
42
43 Clinicians identified that the anxieties, disagreements, and biases that are common to care
44 could amount to complications in trial procedures for some units. Despite broad acceptance of
45 the need for a trial, many clinicians predicted neonatal units with a standardised feeding
46 regimen would not agree to change them and would therefore decline to participate. Clinical
47 focus group participants accepted the existence of clinical uncertainties and understood the
48 need for a definitive trial. For example, one said:
49
50

51
52 *'We've been asking these questions for so long and we still haven't got the*
53 *answer" (Neonatal clinician)*

54 **DISCUSSION**

1
2
3 This PPI consultation with parent, former patient and clinician views about a planned national
4 double-cluster randomised controlled trial involved participants with intimate knowledge of
5 neonatal care, and the corresponding relevance and depth of their contributions provide novel
6 insights. We identified support for the rationale and proposed methodology, and themes within
7 and across groups. Particularly powerful themes related to the emotional needs of parents and
8 the personal beliefs of clinicians. Parents experience stress and anxiety because of their baby's
9 admission to intensive care. A novel insight provided by this consultation is that comparative
10 effectiveness research might help alleviate parent anxieties in several ways. Clinician
11 participants identified anxieties arising from the tension between their personal views and their
12 acknowledgement of the need for evidence to guide practice. The methodology around PPI
13 consultations continues to evolve [23]. Utilising PPI consultations in a study's early stages can
14 assure relevance for patients and parents in the study's recruitment methods, ethics
15 application, research protocol, and outcomes.[8] Our group illustrated an example of PPI
16 consultations to identify a core outcome set for neonatology through consensus meetings
17 around stakeholder viewpoints.[4] Others have called for "integration" of parents in research
18 by frequently inviting their feedback.[14]

19
20
21
22
23
24 Participants voiced support for the use of opt-out consent, noting it reduced the anxiety of
25 decision making. Some authors have criticised opt-out consent as not supporting informed
26 consent.[24] However, the stress of neonatal intensive care complicates parent understanding
27 of studies.[25] Our group has previously shown opt-out taps "into parents' desire for normality
28 in an abnormal situation." [26] We have also shown that opt-out, as with opt-in consent, can be
29 viewed as an ongoing consent process, leaving parents able to withdraw participation at any
30 time, and that this approach is acceptable to the UK National Research Ethics Service.[27] Opt-
31 out also allows parents to understand the trial and decline to participate without imposing a
32 burden of additional information processing.[26]

33
34
35
36
37 The insights provided by consultation participants indicated the Parent Information Leaflet
38 could be structured to provide emotional assistance by minimising the anxiety provoked by
39 varying desires for information. This could be achieved by presenting information in a
40 collaborative tone that situates the research as a partnership between clinicians, parents, and
41 researchers, and employing a format that allows parents to assimilate information at their own
42 pace. The language used can also help avoid making mothers feel inadequate by recognising
43 the challenges of providing milk for their babies and alleviating the pressure to breastfeed. Our
44 participants advised metering trial information to accommodate the needs of parents who
45 want only a small amount of information as well as those who want to know more. The
46 rationale for comparative effectiveness research is the relevance to patient safety of resolving
47 uncertainties in care. However, "uncertain" does not necessarily describe how parents
48 experience the moment of selecting a nutritional option. What is "uncertain" in terms of
49 clinical practice is experienced as "worry", guilt, and even trauma by parents. This stems from a
50 mixture of a shortfall in knowledge and the requirement to process substantial new
51 information. The information provided through research participation enables parents to
52 understand the issues facing their babies, providing direct benefit and a safe space to learn
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 about neonatal treatments. As a consequence of these insights we undertook a redesign of the
4 information leaflet to allow parents to adjust how much information they would receive by
5 converting it into a two-sided format with a very brief explanation of the study on the front and
6 a more detailed explanation on the back (Supplementary Materials).
7
8

9 We identified anxiety among clinicians that manifest as a strong tendency to focus on the detail
10 of the trial rather than the bigger picture even though the trial compares standard clinical
11 practices. The main driver of anxiety was difficulty in managing uncertainty, both in terms of
12 explaining this to parents and in accommodating it in their own practice. We found a cognitive
13 dissonance at play, whereby the rationale for the trial is acceptable, yet involvement and being
14 forced to confront their own personal views and biases led many to reject participation. In
15 contrast, parents and patients felt that the proposed trial helped allay the anxieties invoked by
16 the very uncertainties that justified the trial.
17
18
19

20 Our research has identified important areas for incorporation into the design of COLLABORATE
21 and other comparative-effectiveness studies. Participating in research provides parents with a
22 forum in which to learn about neonatal treatments, participate in knowledge production, and
23 shape future care. Furthermore, in addition to the baby's medical care needs, this consultation,
24 along with others, has identified that the provision of information to participants and
25 enrolment to trials should consider the emotional needs of the parents as affected by study
26 decision making, information processing, and language in study materials.[28, 29] This
27 consultation illustrates the need for further work to address the anxieties described and
28 experienced by healthcare professionals. We hope this will help spearhead a truly collaborative
29 research culture between parents, clinicians, and researchers.
30
31
32
33

34 **Acknowledgements**

35
36 We would like to thank Saulius Satas, Juliette Lee, Sara Clarke, Nadia Leake, Shalabh Garg,
37 Nicola Pritchard, Ganka Taneva and also the other parents, adults born preterm, and clinicians
38 who participated in this PPI consultation for the COLLABORATE trial.
39
40

41 **Funding Statement**

42
43 There was no specific funding for this work.
44

45 **Competing Interests Statement**

46
47 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf
48 and declare: no financial support for the submitted work; CB reports grants and personal awards
49 funded by the NIHR, NM reports grants from Medical Research Council, grants from National
50 Institute for Health Research, grants from Prolacta Life Sciences, grants from Chiesi International,
51 grants from Westminster Children's Research Trust, grants from European Health Data and
52 Evidence Network, grants from HCA International, grants from Health Data Research UK, grants
53 from Shire Pharmaceuticals, grants from March of Dimes, outside the submitted work; CB is
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 deputy chair of the NIHR Health Technology Assessment Prioritisation Committee for Hospital
4 based care, NM is a member of the Nestle International Scientific Advisory Board (accepts no
5 personal remuneration for this role).
6

7 8 **Contributors**

9
10 All authors contributed to the research design of the parent, patient, and public involvement,
11 qualitative methods, the revision of this manuscript, approval of the final draft for publication,
12 and responsibility for the intellectual content within. Specific specialisations are described
13 below.
14

15
16 WL – Writing, draft editing, thematic analysis, qualitative design, public involvement design,
17 and data collection
18

19
20 BM – Writing, draft editing, thematic analysis, qualitative design, public involvement design,
21 and data collection
22

23
24 CB – Writing, draft editing, qualitative participant recruitment
25

26
27 VC – Writing, Draft editing, randomised controlled trial (RCT) design
28

29
30 DB – Writing, Draft editing, RCT design
31

32
33 NM – Writing, draft editing, qualitative design, public involvement design, RCT Design
34

35 36 **Patient Consent for Publication**

37
38 This manuscript was shared with all participants to receive feedback and improve the paper's
39 integrity. Participant names have been included only if participants have given explicit
40 permission for their names to be published under our acknowledgements section.
41

42 43 **Research Ethics Approval**

44
45 Research ethics approval for PPI consultations is not required [9]. However, we approached
46 parents and former patients through the neoWONDER group that has agreed to be invited to
47 participate in consultations (REC reference: 20/yh/0330).
48

49 50 **Data Availability Statement**

51
52 Anonymised data are available upon request from the corresponding author.
53

54 55 **References**

- 56
57 1 McGuire, W., Quigley, M., & Embleton, N. Formula versus donor breast milk for feeding preterm or low birth
58 weight infants. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2019;7:1-65. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002972.pub3
59
60 2 Brown, J., Lin, L., Embleton, N., et al. Multi-nutrient fortification of human milk for preterm infants. *Cochrane
Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013;6:1-64. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000343.pub4.

- 1
2
3 Greenbury SF, Ougham K, Wu J, Battersby C, Gale C, Modi N, Angelini ED Identification of variation in nutritional
4 practice in neonatal units in England and association with clinical outcomes using agnostic machine learning.
5 *Scientific Reports*. In press.
- 6
7 4 Webbe, J. W. H., Duffy, J. M. N., Afonso, E., et al. Core outcomes in neonatology: Development of a core outcome
8 set for neonatal research. *Archives of Disease in Childhood: Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2020;105(4):425–431.
9 doi:10.1136/archdischild-2019-317501
- 10
11 5 Modi, N., Ashby, D., Battersby, C., et al. Developing routinely recorded clinical data from electronic patient
12 records as a national resource to improve neonatal health care: the Medicines for Neonates research programme.
13 *Programme Grants for Applied Research* 2019;7(6):1–396. doi:10.3310/pgfar07060
- 14
15 6 Modi N Information technology infrastructure, quality improvement and research: the UK National Neonatal
16 Research Database. *Translational Pediatrics* 2019; 8:193-8. doi: dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp.2019.07.08
- 17
18 7 Johnson S, Bountziouka V, Brocklehurst P, et al. Standardisation of the Parent Report of Children's Abilities-
19 Revised (PARCA-R): a norm-referenced assessment of cognitive and language development at age 2 years. *Lancet*
20 *Child Adolesc Health*. 2019 Oct;3(10):705-712. doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(19)30189-0.
- 21
22 8 Fiori, M., Endacott, R., & Latour, J. M. Public involvement in designing a study on patient-witnessed
23 cardiopulmonary resuscitation in hospital. *Nursing in Critical Care*, 2020;25:313–320.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nicc.12429>;
- 25
26 9 INVOLVE, NIHR. Patient and public involvement in research and research ethics committee review. NIHR. Version
27 1. 2009. <https://www.invo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/INVOLVENRESfinalStatement310309.pdf>.
28 Accessed 5/2021.
- 29
30 10 INVOLVE, NIHR (National Institute of Health Research). Public involvement in research: impact on ethical
31 aspects of research. 2014. www.involve.nihr.ac.uk. Accessed 05/2021.
- 32
33 11 Bliss: For babies born premature or sick. Our approach to research. [https://www.bliss.org.uk/research-](https://www.bliss.org.uk/research-campaigns/research)
34 [campaigns/research](https://www.bliss.org.uk/research-campaigns/research). Accessed 05/2021.
- 35
36 12 National Institute for Health Research. Patient and public involvement in health and social care research: A
37 handbook for researchers by Research Design Service London. 2014:1–40. [http://www.rds.nihr.ac.uk/wp-](http://www.rds.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/RDS-PPI-Handbook-2014-v8-FINAL.pdf)
38 [content/uploads/RDS-PPI-Handbook-2014-v8-FINAL.pdf](http://www.rds.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/RDS-PPI-Handbook-2014-v8-FINAL.pdf);
- 39
40 13 Manning, J. C., Hemingway, P., & Redsell, S. A. Survived so what? Identifying priorities for research with children
41 and families post-paediatric intensive care unit. *Nursing in Critical Care*, 2017;23(2):68–74.
42 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nicc.12298>).
- 43
44 14 Janvier, A., Bourque, C. J., Dahan, S., Robson, K., & Barrington, K. J. Integrating Parents in Neonatal and Pediatric
45 Research. *Neonatology*, 2019;115:283–291. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000492502>
- 46
47 15 NeoWONDER: Neonatal Whole Population Data linkage to improve lifelong health and wellbeing of preterm
48 babies 2020 <https://www.neowonder.org.uk/> Accessed 2/2021.
- 49
50 16 Finch, Helen and Lewis, Jane “Focus Groups” In: Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J., eds. *Qualitative Research Practice: A*
51 *Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2003:170-198.
- 52
53 17 Barbour, Rosaline S. and Schostak, John "Interviewing and Focus Groups" In: Somekh, B., & Lewin, C., eds.
54 *Research Methods in the Social Sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2005:41-48.
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 18 Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item
4 checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 2007;19(6):349–357. doi:
5 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
6
7 19 Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of
8 Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*,
9 2006;5(1):80–92. doi:10.1177/160940690600500107
10
11 20 Ritchie, Jane; Spencer, Liz; and O'Connor, William. "Carrying out Qualitative Analysis" In: Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J.,
12 eds. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
13 Publications 2003:170-198.
14
15 21 QSR International Pty Ltd. NVivo 2020;3. [https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-](https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home)
16 [software/home](https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home)
17
18 22 Greenhalgh, T., Hinton, L., Finlay, T., et al. Frameworks for supporting patient and public involvement in
19 research: Systematic review and co-design pilot. *Health Expectations* 2019;22(4):785–801. doi:10.1111/hex.12888
20
21 23 Ocloo, J., & Matthews, R. From tokenism to empowerment: Progressing patient and public involvement in
22 healthcare improvement. *BMJ Quality and Safety*, 2016;25:26–632. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004839> "
23
24 24 Berry, J. G., Ryan, P., Duszynski, K. M., et al. Parent perspectives on consent for the linkage of data to evaluate
25 vaccine safety: A randomised trial of opt-in and opt-out consent. *Clinical Trials* 2013;10(3):483–494.
26 doi:10.1177/1740774513480568
27
28 25 Mason S, Allmark P for the Euricon Study Group (Allmark P, Megone C, Bratlid D, et al.) Obtaining informed
29 consent to neonatal randomised controlled trials: interviews with parents and clinicians in the Euricon Study.
30 *Lancet* 2000; 356:2045-51 doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(00)03401-2.
31
32 26 McLeish, J., Alderdice, F., Robberts, H., et al. Challenges of a simplified opt- out consent process in a neonatal
33 randomised controlled trial: qualitative study of parents' and health professionals' views and experiences. *Archives*
34 *of Disease in Childhood - Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2020;0:F1–F7. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2020-319545
35
36 27 Gale, C., Hyde, M. J., & Modi, N. Research ethics committee decision-making in relation to an efficient neonatal
37 trial. *Archives of Disease in Childhood: Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2017;102:F291–F298. doi:10.1136/archdischild-
38 2016-310935
39
40 28 Neu, M., Klawetter, S., Greenfield, J. C., et al. Mothers' Experiences in the NICU before Family-Centered Care
41 and in NICUs Where It Is the Standard of Care. *Advances in Neonatal Care* 2020;20(1):68–79.
42 doi:10.1097/ANC.0000000000000671
43
44 29 Mörelius, E., Kling, K., Eva, R. N., et al. You can't flight, you need to fight — A qualitative study of mothers'
45 experiences of feeding extremely preterm infants. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 2020;29:2420–2428.
46 doi:10.1111/jocn.15254
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplementary Materials

Draft Parent Information Leaflet

This information sheet provides details of a landmark approach to improve the care of very preterm babies. Please read it carefully and ask us if anything is unclear.

Background: This neonatal unit is taking part in a large, national study to find out the best way to feed very preterm babies. This will involve using data that doctors and nurses record routinely for all babies admitted to neonatal units. This leaflet is to provide you with information. You do not need to do anything unless you do not wish us to use your baby's data.

You can "opt-out" at any time by telling [NAME OF STAFF MEMBER]. If you opt-out, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected. However, your baby's data will not be included in the analysis of the results.

What we are trying to find out: We ask all mothers who have a very preterm baby to express milk. However, if a mother has insufficient milk we do not know whether it is beneficial for a baby to receive pasteurised donated milk or formula specially made for preterm babies. We also do not know whether it is beneficial to very preterm babies to add extra protein and carbohydrate routinely to human milk. These are important questions affecting the care of all very preterm babies.

Why there is uncertainty: Preterm formula is made from cow's milk in a factory to strict regulatory standards. It has a consistent amount of nutrition and is used very widely. However, some clinicians believe cow's milk may increase the risks in very preterm babies of a gut inflammation called necrotising enterocolitis that can be very serious. About 3 in 100 very preterm babies in the UK develop severe necrotising enterocolitis.

Human milk provides more than just nutrition, for example, it has factors that strengthen immunity. However, human milk from a donor must be pasteurised to reduce the risk of transmitting infection. Pasteurisation reduces or destroys some beneficial properties of human milk; therefore, donor milk is not the same as milk from a baby's own mother. Pasteurised human donor milk is expensive and has very variable nutrition. This means that doctors may need to add extra protein and carbohydrate from cow's milk which some feel may also be a risk for necrotising enterocolitis.

What happens at present: Because we do not know which options are better for babies, some neonatal units use preterm formula and some use pasteurised human donor milk; some routinely add extra protein and carbohydrate to human milk feeds for very preterm babies and some do not. Overall, in the UK, the majority of babies receive their own mother's milk with some formula; less than 20% receive any donor milk, and about 40% receive some extra protein and carbohydrate.

How to resolve these uncertainties: The most reliable way to resolve uncertainties is by fairly allocating neonatal units to a feeding strategy, using a computer programme that makes the choice without influence so that half will use one approach and half will use the other, for each of the two uncertainties. This is ethical because it gives patients an equal, fair chance of receiving any of the alternative treatments. We will need to compare information from about 4700 babies to find out which options are more beneficial. In this neonatal unit we will be using [X] and [Y].

Other information: There are no risks to your baby from participation in this study because all feeding options are already widely used. Standard NHS indemnity operates in relation to the clinical treatment your baby receives. The UK Health Research Authority has approved the study. Imperial College London is coordinating the study and [x] is funding it. We will keep all details about your baby private. The only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
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
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

people allowed to look at your baby’s data are the team running the study and the regulatory authorities responsible for checking it is carried out correctly.

Thank you for reading this.

Confidential: For Review Only

Supplementary Materials (Continued)

Revised Parent Information Leaflet

SIDE ONE

This information sheet provides details of a landmark approach to improve the care of very preterm babies.

This neonatal unit is taking part in a large, national study to find out the best way to feed very preterm babies (born at less than 29 weeks gestation).

This will involve using data that doctors and nurses record routinely for all babies admitted to neonatal units.

This sheet is to provide you with information. You do not need to do anything unless you do not wish us to use your baby's data.

You can "opt-out" at any time by telling [NAME OF STAFF MEMBER].

If you opt-out, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected. However, your baby's data will not be included in the analysis of the results.

If you are interested in learning more about why the study is taking place, please turn overleaf.

SIDE TWO

What we are trying to find out: We ask all mothers who have a very preterm baby to express milk, as we know this is the optimum way to feed neonates. However, breast-feeding a premature baby can often present challenges, despite their mother's effort and commitment. This means that sometimes a baby will need an additional source of nutrition. At present, we do not know whether it is beneficial for a baby to receive pasteurised donated milk or formula specially made for preterm babies. We also do not know whether it is beneficial to very preterm babies to add extra protein and carbohydrate routinely to human milk. These are important questions affecting the care of all very preterm babies.

Why there is uncertainty: Preterm formula is made from cow's milk in a factory to strict regulatory standards. It has a consistent amount of nutrition and is used very widely. However, some clinicians believe cow's milk may increase the risks in very preterm babies of a gut inflammation called necrotising enterocolitis that can be very serious. About 3 in 100 very preterm babies in the UK develop severe necrotising enterocolitis.

Human milk provides more than just nutrition, for example, it has factors that strengthen immunity. However, human milk from a donor must be pasteurised to reduce the risk of transmitting infection. Pasteurisation reduces or destroys some beneficial properties of human milk and for these and other reasons, donor milk is not the same as milk from a baby's own mother. Pasteurised human donor milk is expensive and has very variable nutrition. This means that doctors may need to add extra protein and carbohydrate from cow's milk which some feel may also be a risk for necrotising enterocolitis.

What happens at present: Because we do not know which options are better for babies, some neonatal units use preterm formula and some use pasteurised human donor milk; some routinely add extra protein and carbohydrate to human milk feeds for very preterm babies and some do not. Overall, in the UK, the majority of babies receive their own mother's milk with some formula; less than 20% receive any donor milk, and about 40% receive some extra protein and carbohydrate.

How to resolve these uncertainties: The most reliable way to resolve uncertainties is by fairly allocating neonatal units to a feeding strategy, using a computer programme that makes the choice without influence so that half will use one approach and half will use the other, for each of the two uncertainties. This is ethical because it gives patients an equal, fair chance of receiving any of the alternative treatments. We will need to compare information from about 4700 babies to find out which options are more beneficial. In this neonatal unit we will be using [X] and [Y].

Other information: There are no risks to your baby from participation in this study because all feeding options are already widely used. Standard NHS indemnity operates in relation to the clinical treatment your baby receives. The UK Health Research Authority has approved the study. Imperial College London is coordinating the study and [x] is funding it. We will keep all details about your baby private. The only people allowed to look at your baby's data are the team running the study and the regulatory authorities responsible for checking it is carried out correctly.

Once again, if you opt-out of the research study, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected.

Thank you for reading this. Please ask us if anything is unclear.

Supplementary Materials (Continued)

Completed Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ)

Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity

Personal Characteristics

1. Interviewer/facilitator – Lammons and Moss
2. Credentials – Lammons, MA; Moss, PhD
3. Occupation: Lammons, PPI Research Lead; Moss, PPI Research Lead
4. Gender – Lammons, male; Moss, female
5. Experience and training – Lammons, Imperial College London PPI Training; Moss, original PPI research on improving outcomes for aphasia patients

Relationship with participants

6. Relationship established – No relationship was established between Lammons, Moss and participants prior to this research. Participants were recruited through the neoWONDER network of interested participants who had given consent to contact, which is managed by Battersby.
7. Participant knowledge of the researchers – Lammons and Moss clearly stated the research goals, vision, and purposes at the start of every focus group and interview. They asserted that their goals were to understand parent and former patient experiences, then use these to improve the trial's success in terms of recruitment, retention, relevance, and efficacy.
8. Interviewer characteristics – interviewers clearly stated their motivations and interests in the research topic throughout each focus group and interview. Interviewers shared personal experiences, such as parenthood or lack thereof which impacted their vision and understanding of these phenomena. Most importantly, researchers situated themselves as intermediaries who could receive critiques of the research design, then transmit these to improve the research's inclusivity and engagement with participants.

Domain 2: study design

Theoretical framework

9. Methodological orientation – Qualitative research, qualitative analysis, and patient and public involvement

Participant selection

10. Sampling – Participants were selected from the neoWONDER research participant network, managed by Battersby, which is a network of parents of premature babies and adults born

1
2
3 premature who have consented to contact for neonatal medicine related research studies.
4 Given time constraints the research team faced, we opted for this as the most efficient,
5 effective, convenient, and purposeful means for getting feedback on the COLLABORATE trial
6 prior in tandem with its protocol development.
7
8

9 11. Method of approach – email invitation through neoWONDER research participant network,
10 led by Battersby. Interested individuals who responded were offered participation times and
11 dates.
12

13 12. Sample size – 9
14

15 13. Non-participation 4 showed interest in participating but did not attend due to various
16 reasons, including illness or lack of clear confirmation; follow-up contact and rescheduling was
17 attempted with all four of these individuals twice via email, but no responses were received to
18 schedule additional meeting dates.
19
20

21 **Setting**

22 14. Setting of data collection – virtual focus groups and interviews held via Zoom and Microsoft
23 Teams. Participants joined the sessions from their personal computers/devices at their homes.
24

25 15. Presence of non-participants – only research participants and researchers (Moss and
26 Lammons) were present during sessions
27

28 16. Description of sample – participants were all female between the ages of 22 and 55; 7 were
29 mothers of neonatal patients, 1 was a former neonatal patient, and 1 was a mother and former
30 neonatal patient.
31
32

33 **Data collection**

34 17. Interview guide – a topic guide was created by Lammons and Moss which was shared with
35 the broader research team. The guide was not pilot tested, nor did participants request a copy
36 of the guide, though it was available upon request.
37

38 18. Repeat interviews – none were conducted
39

40 19. Audio/visual recording – sessions were video recorded using in-app recording functions of
41 Zoom and/or Teams. Audio recordings were extracted from the videos and used to create
42 transcriptions with Descript software. These transcriptions were edited for correctness and
43 understanding, then video recordings were deleted. Audio recordings were saved. One session
44 encountered extensive technical difficulties and was correspondingly conducted by Moss via
45 phone. As a result of technical issues, this session was not recorded.
46
47

48 20. Field notes – Lammons and Moss took field notes during and after interview/focus group
49 sessions. These were included in the NVivo workflow and theming process along with raw data.
50

51 21. Duration – Each session lasted roughly 90 minutes.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 22. Data saturation – Moss and Lammons used Malterud et al.'s concept of "information
4 power", or the theory that validity resides in data's strength and quality 23 to emphasize the
5 depth and relevance of the data collected and presented.
6
7

8 23. Transcripts returned – transcripts were not returned to participants for comment and/or
9 correction, though quotations used throughout the manuscript have been reviewed and
10 verified by participants.
11

12 **Domain 3: analysis and findings**

13 **Data analysis**

14 24. Number of data coders – 2, Moss and Lammons
15

16 25. Description of the coding tree – The coding tree has not been included in the manuscript
17 but is available on request.
18

19 26. Derivation of themes – Moss and Lammons used a "hybrid approach" of deductive themes
20 identified prior to the data collection and inductive themes derived from the data itself.
21

22 27. Software – NVivo 1.3 (QSR Technologies)
23

24 28. Participant checking – Participants have been included in the writing process as co-authors
25 and reviewers of findings. Their feedback has contributed to the extant draft.
26
27

28 **Reporting**

29 29. Quotations presented – Eleven quotations are presented in the results section in brief, with
30 their corresponding long-form versions and identifying participant numbers in Table 2.
31

32 30. Data and findings consistent – Data has been used to guide findings, discussion, and
33 analysis. Copies of transcripts and coding are available upon request.
34

35 31. Clarity of major themes – Quotes were clearly paired with theme headings and discussions
36 for optimum clarification.
37

38 32. Clarity of minor themes – Quotes were clearly paired with theme headings and discussions
39 for optimum clarification.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

BMJ Paediatrics Open

Incorporating parent, former patient, and clinician perspectives in the design of a national UK double-cluster, randomised controlled trial addressing uncertainties in preterm nutrition

Journal:	<i>BMJ Paediatrics Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjpo-2021-001112.R2
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-May-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Lammons, William; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine Moss, Becky; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine Battersby, Cheryl; Imperial College London, Neonatal Medicine Cornelius, Victoria; Imperial College London, Imperial Clinical Trials Unit Babalís, Daphne; Imperial College London, Imperial Clinical Trials Unit Modi, Neena; Imperial College London, Section of Neonatal Medicine
Keywords:	Neonatology, Qualitative research, Health services research

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



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 [licence](#).

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 [Creative Commons](#) 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.

1
2
3 **Incorporating parent, former patient, and clinician perspectives in the design of a national UK**
4 **double-cluster, randomised controlled trial addressing uncertainties in preterm nutrition**
5

6 Word count: 2981/2500; excluding title page, abstract, tables, figures, and references;
7

8 Structured abstract: 261/300
9

10 **Authors**
11

12 William Lammons, MA 1; Becky Moss, PhD 1; Cheryl Battersby, PhD BMBS BMedSci FRCPCH 1;
13 Victoria R Cornelius, PhD 2; Daphne Babalis, PhD 2; Prof Neena Modi MB ChB MD FRCP FRCPCH
14 FFPM FMedSci 1
15

16
17 1 Section of Neonatal Medicine, Chelsea and Westminster NHS Foundation Trust campus,
18 School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College London, London, UK
19

20 2 Imperial Clinical Trials Unit, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, Imperial College
21 London, London, UK
22

23 **Corresponding Author**
24

25 William Lammons; Imperial College London; Chelsea and Westminster Hospital Campus
26 369 Fulham Road, Chelsea, London SW10 9NH; w.lammons@imperial.ac.uk
27
28

29 **Keywords**
30

31 Patient and public involvement, PPI, parent involvement, neonatal medicine, qualitative
32 methodology, patient information leaflet, patient information sheet, opt-out consent
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Background

Comparative effectiveness randomised controlled trials are powerful tools to resolve uncertainties in existing treatments and care processes. We sought parent and patient perspectives on the design of a planned national, double-cluster randomised controlled trial (COLLABORATE) to resolve two longstanding uncertainties in preterm nutrition.

Methods

We used qualitative focus groups and interviews with parents, former patients and clinicians. We followed the COREQ checklist (Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research) and conducted Framework Analysis, a specific methodology within Thematic Analysis.

Results

We identified support for the trial's methodology and vision, and elicited themes illustrating parents' emotional needs in relation to clinical research. These were: relieving the pressure on mothers to breastfeed; opt-out consent as reducing parent stress; the desire for research to be a partnership between clinicians, parents, and researchers; the value of presenting trial information in a collaborative tone; and in a format that allows assimilation by parents at their own pace. We identified anxiety and cognitive dissonance among some clinicians in which they recognised the uncertainties that justify the trial but felt unable to participate because of their strongly held views.

Conclusions

The early involvement of parents and former patients identified the centrality of parents' emotional needs in the design of comparative effectiveness research. These insights have been incorporated into trial enrolment processes and information provided to participants. Specific outputs were a two-sided leaflet providing very brief as well as more detailed information, and use of language that parents perceive as inclusive and participatory. Further work is warranted to support clinicians to address personal biases that inhibit trial participation.

KEY MESSAGES

What is known about the subject?

- Comparative effectiveness randomised controlled trials are powerful means of resolving uncertainties in existing treatments and care processes.
- Many areas of neonatal practice lack an adequate evidence base, hence treatments often vary, within and between centres.
- The uncertainty around optimal practice creates risks for patients, anxiety for parents, and confusion among staff.

What this study adds?

- In addition to resolving practice uncertainties, comparative effectiveness research can help alleviate parent anxieties through metered study information, and partnership to improve newborn care.
- Early involvement of parents and former patients in trial development also enables researchers to support parents emotional needs through appropriate recruitment materials and methods.
- Incorporating clinicians as stakeholders has potential to understand and address their personal biases that inhibit trial participation.

INTRODUCTION

Many areas of neonatal practice lack an adequate evidence base, hence treatments often vary, within and between centres. Comparative effectiveness research refers to approaches to try and resolve uncertainties in established treatments.

COLLABORATE is a planned national, UK, double-cluster randomised controlled trial aiming to recruit at least 4700 babies to resolve two longstanding global uncertainties in preterm nutrition, the benefits of i) pasteurised human donor milk in comparison with preterm formula to supplement a baby's own mother's milk when more milk is needed and ii) routine versus no routine protein-carbohydrate fortification of human milk.[1, 2] The co-primary outcomes are survival to 36 weeks postmenstrual age without surgery for necrotising enterocolitis (NEC) and survival to age two-years without moderate-severe neurodevelopment impairment.

Currently in the UK less than twenty percent of very preterm babies receive any pasteurised donor milk and less than forty percent receive any fortifier.[3] The uncertainty around optimal practice creates risks for patients, anxiety for parents, and confusion among staff.

COLLABORATE offers a pragmatic response to these uncertainties. COLLABORATE will use data from the National Neonatal Research Database to minimise clinical burden,[4-6] and evaluate two-year language and cognitive outcomes with a parent-completed questionnaire, the Parent Report of Children's Abilities-Revised (PARCA-R).[7]

These clinical uncertainties, which affect the care provided to babies as well as the information provided to families, present an opportunity to understand how parents of very preterm babies can improve the recruitment materials for the COLLABORATE trial and clarify the acceptability of consent methods, as well as compare their views and reactions with those of clinicians. PPI consultations are enriching mechanisms to improve design, making studies more successful and relevant to their stakeholders [8-12]. In paediatric research they have identified important guiding themes for future research, largely through centring the narratives and experiences of survivors and families [13, 14]. Our aim at this preliminary stage was to involve parents, former patients, and clinicians in trial development.

METHODS

We recruited former neonatal intensive care patients and parents of patients from across the UK through a network of individuals with experience of preterm birth who had consented to be invited to participate in neonatal research activities.[15] We invited the participation of healthcare professionals through a national webinar. In total, twenty volunteers; ten clinicians, seven parents, two former patients, and one parent/former patient; participated in virtual focus groups or semi-structured interviews [16, 17]. Sessions with single participants utilised the same topic guide. No clinicians attended the parent-patient groups to avoid inhibiting or influencing the discussions.[16, 17] Participants gave verbal consent for participation and recording at the start of every discussion session.

1
2
3 We followed the COREQ checklist (Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research) for
4 qualitative studies and created a topic guide to probe parent-patient and clinician experiences
5 and understanding of the trial, based upon a hybrid blend of deductive and inductive
6 approaches to facilitate discussion and allow themes to emerge.[18, 19] We provided a draft
7 Parent Information Leaflet (Supplementary Materials). Each session lasted approximately 90
8 minutes, and all were recorded with participant consent. WL and BM, non-clinical qualitative
9 researchers led the discussions and conducted interviews. They transcribed recordings and
10 conducted interviews.
11
12

13 WL and BM analysed all qualitative data using Framework Analysis, a specific methodology
14 within Thematic Analysis.[20] Initial themes and concepts were identified through iterative
15 review of the data, then used to construct a thematic index, or “framework”, and assign an
16 index label to each phrase or passage of the transcripts.[20] The indexed and labeled raw data
17 was then summarised and synthesised into thematic charts to preserve the data’s context while
18 facilitating systematic exploration. These thematic charts produced salient themes, which serve
19 as descriptive and explanatory accounts of the data.[20] Data were organised and analysed
20 using NVivo, version 1.0(QSR International)[21]. Participants were provided contact information
21 for psychological support services in the event that discussions elicited strong emotions.
22
23
24

25 **Patient and Public Involvement**

26
27 At this preliminary stage of the development of COLLABORATE, we have utilised patient-public
28 involvement to assist in developing the consent process and trial information leaflet. We have
29 also involved clinicians to understand and address concerns related to their perspectives on
30 opt-out consent, cluster randomisation, and clinical uncertainties. This paper embodies the first
31 phase of the study’s public involvement strategy which includes parents, adults born preterm,
32 and clinicians as research collaborators throughout the research cycle.[22]
33
34

35 **RESULTS**

36
37 Nine volunteers, all women (seven parents, one former patient, and one parent who is also a
38 former patient) participated in parent-patient focus groups (Table 1). Eleven volunteers for
39 clinician focus groups included eight neonatologists, a dietician and an infant feeding specialist
40 midwife. One non-clinician adult born preterm also chose to attend a clinician focus group.
41 Seven of the eleven participants were men. No participant required the psychological support
42 services that were offered.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Participant	Gestational Age of Child or Patient	Reason for Interest in Participating	Feeding Method	Single/Multiple Birth	Incidence of necrotising enterocolitis [NEC]?	Survival of Baby(ies)	Support for Trial
Parent 1	33+3 weeks	Pharmacist w/RCT experience	Mum's milk	Single	N	Y	Y
Parent 2	n/a	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	Y	Y	N
Parent 3	n/a	Breastfeeding peer supporter	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	N	Y	Y
Parent 4	22 weeks	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Mum's milk & Donor milk	Twins	N/N	Y/N	Y
Parent 5	33 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Fortifier	Single	Y	N	Unsure
Parent 6	29+5 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Formula	Twins	Suspected NEC/N	Y/Y	Y
Parent 7	28 weeks	n/a	Mum's milk & Formula	Single	Y	Y	Y
Patient/Parent 12	29 weeks	NEC/preterm charity volunteer	Formula & Donor Milk/Formula & Donor Milk	Single/Single	Y/Y	Y/Y	Y
Patient 1	28+4weeks	Paediatric nurse	Mum's milk & Formula	Twin	N/suspected NEC	Y/N3	Y

We identified three parent-patient themes; “pressure to breastfeed”, “consent process”, and “emotional trauma”; one clinician theme, “equipoise and personal beliefs”; and one theme combining parent-patient and clinician discussions, “collaboration and inclusivity.”

Theme 1 Pressure to breastfeed

Participants almost universally cited the refrain, “breast is best,” but mothers’ experiences of expressing milk and breastfeeding provoked stress and feelings of inadequacy. One former patient articulated the challenges of breastfeeding with an anecdote from her own mother:

1
2
3 *"...my mum will share with me that she cried with her breasts bleeding, trying to express*
4 *because she was told it was the best... And she had a woman sitting next to her in the*
5 *expressing room who had, you know, 500 mls of milk sitting there...and this woman was*
6 *saying, 'Oh, it's not enough.' My mum was like, 'you're kidding me. I've got five ml from*
7 *the last four hours. And I'm bleeding into it."* (NICU patient born at 28+4 weeks, now a
8 *paediatric nurse)*
9
10

11 Parents showed understanding of the trial's aim of resolving feeding uncertainties. The
12 discussion identified confusion around feeding options that were brought to the fore by the
13 challenges of expressing sufficient milk.
14
15

16 *"I remember when they talked about putting him onto formula, I said to the consultant,*
17 *'I'm really, really worried about him getting NEC [necrotising enterocolitis]. I'm really*
18 *worried.' Cause I had it and...I know how bad it is...they assured me that the risk with*
19 *formula was just as high as it was with donor milk. So I was like...if they need to gain*
20 *weight and it's such a balancing act, isn't it?...I suppose it's the same for the doctors.*
21 *They're just trying to balance the best options."* (Mother who had NEC as a preterm
22 *baby, whose baby was born at 29 weeks)*
23
24
25

26 Participants emphasised sensitivity was needed to support mothers when discussing feeding.
27

28 *"... And at the end of the day, it has to be what's best...for your circumstances and what's*
29 *best for your baby because your mum's milk is best, but if mum's milk is not available...*
30 *you shouldn't make mums feel as if they're kind of a failure."* (Mother of twins born at
31 *29+5 weeks)*
32
33

34 **Theme 2 Consent process**

35

36 Parent-patient participants and most clinicians supported opt-out as minimising the added
37 stress of trial consent in an already stressful environment. One parent stated
38

39 *"...I appreciate the opt-out allows a much larger number of people, and often families*
40 *don't go there. Not because they don't necessarily want to do it, but for whatever reason*
41 *they have...they're not thinking about it or they read [the consent form]...and forget to*
42 *fill out..."* (Mother of a preterm baby who had NEC)
43
44

45 Other participants echoed this sentiment noting that usual trial consent and information
46 processes are often cumbersome and confusing. Some clinicians went further, suggesting that
47 cluster randomisation meant that opt-out consent was required only from a neonatal unit
48 rather than from parents themselves.
49

50
51 However, worries around transparency led some clinicians to feel uncomfortable with opt-out
52 consent. For example, one told us they felt opt-out was only appropriate when a rapid decision
53 was needed for a time-critical intervention.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Theme 3 Collaboration and inclusivity

Parent-patient participants emphasised the confusion and anxiety that results from lack of clarity or consistency in medical information communicated to them. They felt researchers can help alleviate these anxieties through the tone they adopt as well as the clarity of their communications.

“They need to be able to sometimes slightly dumb it down so we can understand it really well... I'm focusing on ‘add extra protein and carbohydrate’ [in the parent information leaflet.] I've never heard of that before...” (Mother of twin boys born at 22 weeks, one of whom did not survive)

They recommended we remove phrases in the draft parent information leaflet such as “if a mother has insufficient milk” (Supplementary Materials). They encouraged general use of words and phrases that expressed empathy for mothers’ difficulties as opposed to ones that provoked feelings of guilt or inadequacy, supportive of an “inclusive” tone.

“The document, as it reads, is looking to me like dumbed down ‘science-y’ stuff. Whereas I think it needs to come from a person to person, like where you have concerns and fears, and this is what we are trying to do together as a community of NICU [neonatal intensive care unit] survivors and clinicians...” (Mother of twin boys born at 22 weeks, one of whom did not survive)

This parent’s reference to a “community of survivors” illustrates their need for empathy.

Clinician participants recognized the importance of fostering a collaborative relationship with parents:

“I think this whole thing about us having to approach parents in a really collaborative way around the importance of...feeding...managing their expectations and their understanding of what is happening with that baby's gut, and that we're trying to help promote a healthy gut, not just for the time when they're in their unit, but beyond that time as a healthy gut for life – here is the one of the fundamental things that's going to influence their feeding for not just weeks, but months and years to come.” (Neonatal clinician)

They perceived a tension between ensuring information was shared transparently and managing parental anxiety. Offering clear and consistent explanations was seen as paramount, but this was sometimes difficult because of clinical uncertainties and professional differences of opinion.

Theme 4 Trauma, powerlessness, and parental learning in the neonatal unit

Mothers experience trauma and feelings of powerlessness, when their babies were “taken away” for intensive care almost immediately following birth.

1
2
3 *"...I had this baby ripped from me...I didn't see her after birth. It was horrific...her first*
4 *nappy was changed by somebody else... All her cares were done by somebody else. The*
5 *first person she saw was somebody else"* (Mother of a preterm baby with NEC)
6
7

8 A lack of knowledge of neonatal care typically amplified these emotional experiences and
9 participants described feelings of urgency to obtain more information.
10

11 *... when you're in hospital and you've just had a new baby, especially if the baby's*
12 *premature and you just have...so little time..."* (Mother of a baby born at 33+3 weeks,
13 *pharmacist*)
14

15 *At the same time, often, you do have a lot of time to kill in the neonatal unit ... you will*
16 *read every leaflet front to back"* (Mother of a preterm baby)
17
18

19 Pursuing knowledge helped remedy feelings of powerlessness for some mothers, though a
20 broader awareness of dangers facing babies often increased anxiety for others.
21

22 *"I'm the sort of person that likes to know everything, so I would want to read every tiny*
23 *little detail of everything...but I know from speaking to other parents in the neonatal unit*
24 *that a lot of parents...don't want to be involved as much and they don't want to know*
25 *things. (Mother of a preterm baby who had NEC)"*
26
27

28 In summary, parents reported varying degrees of desire for knowledge, from those who wanted
29 to know "everything" and those who wanted a more general understanding.
30
31

32 **Theme 5: Equipose and personal beliefs**

33 Clinicians described the difficulty of managing their own anxieties about treatments in
34 discussions with parents to minimise parent feelings of emotional distress and ensure
35 equipose across the unit.
36
37

38 *"On a ward round, one negative sentence, a loose comment about something ...*
39 *just spoils everything. We try to police that to some extent [and] share all our*
40 *anxieties and disagreement beforehandwe have our own personal agendas or*
41 *personal biases but keep them to ourselves when we are ... in front of other people.*
42 *that's where I see the issue about [a] unit that's sort of consenting to participate,*
43 *but not then sticking to the protocol...and then bringing some of their own ideas*
44 *into the consenting ... [and] recruitment process."* (Neonatal clinician)
45
46
47

48 Clinicians identified that the anxieties, disagreements, and biases that are common to care
49 could amount to complications in trial procedures for some units. Despite broad acceptance of
50 the need for a trial, many clinicians predicted neonatal units with a standardised feeding
51 regimen would not agree to change them and would therefore decline to participate. Clinical
52 focus group participants accepted the existence of clinical uncertainties and understood the
53 need for a definitive trial. For example, one said:
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *'We've been asking these questions for so long and we still haven't got the*
4 *answer" (Neonatal clinician)*
5

6 **DISCUSSION**

7
8
9 This PPI consultation with parent, former patient and clinician views about a planned national
10 double-cluster randomised controlled trial involved participants with intimate knowledge of
11 neonatal care, and the corresponding relevance and depth of their contributions provide novel
12 insights. We identified support for the rationale and proposed methodology, and themes within
13 and across groups. Particularly powerful themes related to the emotional needs of parents and
14 the personal beliefs of clinicians. Parents experience stress and anxiety because of their baby's
15 admission to intensive care. A novel insight provided by this consultation is that comparative
16 effectiveness research might help alleviate parent anxieties in several ways. Clinician
17 participants identified anxieties arising from the tension between their personal views and their
18 acknowledgement of the need for evidence to guide practice. The methodology around PPI
19 consultations continues to evolve [23]. Utilising PPI consultations in a study's early stages can
20 assure relevance for patients and parents in the study's recruitment methods, ethics
21 application, research protocol, and outcomes.[8] Our group illustrated an example of PPI
22 consultations to identify a core outcome set for neonatology through consensus meetings
23 around stakeholder viewpoints.[4] Others have called for "integration" of parents in research
24 by frequently inviting their feedback.[14]

25
26
27
28
29
30 Participants voiced support for the use of opt-out consent, noting it reduced the anxiety of
31 decision making. Some authors have criticised opt-out consent as not supporting informed
32 consent.[24] However, the stress of neonatal intensive care complicates parent understanding
33 of studies.[25] Our group has previously shown opt-out taps "into parents' desire for normality
34 in an abnormal situation." [26] We have also shown that opt-out, as with opt-in consent, can be
35 viewed as an ongoing consent process, leaving parents able to withdraw participation at any
36 time, and that this approach is acceptable to the UK National Research Ethics Service.[27] Opt-
37 out also allows parents to understand the trial and decline to participate without imposing a
38 burden of additional information processing.[26]

39
40
41
42 The insights provided by consultation participants indicated the Parent Information Leaflet
43 could be structured to provide emotional assistance by minimising the anxiety provoked by
44 varying desires for information. This could be achieved by presenting information in a
45 collaborative tone that situates the research as a partnership between clinicians, parents, and
46 researchers, and employing a format that allows parents to assimilate information at their own
47 pace. The language used can also help avoid making mothers feel inadequate by recognising
48 the challenges of providing milk for their babies and alleviating the pressure to breastfeed. Our
49 participants advised metering trial information to accommodate the needs of parents who
50 want only a small amount of information as well as those who want to know more. The
51 rationale for comparative effectiveness research is the relevance to patient safety of resolving
52 uncertainties in care. However, "uncertain" does not necessarily describe how parents
53 experience the moment of selecting a nutritional option. What is "uncertain" in terms of
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 clinical practice is experienced as “worry”, guilt, and even trauma by parents. This stems from a
4 mixture of a shortfall in knowledge and the requirement to process substantial new
5 information. The information provided through research participation enables parents to
6 understand the issues facing their babies, providing direct benefit and a safe space to learn
7 about neonatal treatments. As a consequence of these insights we undertook a redesign of the
8 information leaflet to allow parents to adjust how much information they would receive by
9 converting it into a two-sided format with a very brief explanation of the study on the front and
10 a more detailed explanation on the back (Supplementary Materials).
11
12
13

14 We identified anxiety among clinicians that manifest as a strong tendency to focus on the detail
15 of the trial rather than the bigger picture even though the trial compares standard clinical
16 practices. The main driver of anxiety was difficulty in managing uncertainty, both in terms of
17 explaining this to parents and in accommodating it in their own practice. We found a cognitive
18 dissonance at play, whereby the rationale for the trial is acceptable, yet involvement and being
19 forced to confront their own personal views and biases led many to reject participation. In
20 contrast, parents and patients felt that the proposed trial helped allay the anxieties invoked by
21 the very uncertainties that justified the trial.
22
23
24

25 Our research has identified important areas for incorporation into the design of COLLABORATE
26 and other comparative-effectiveness studies. Participating in research provides parents with a
27 forum in which to learn about neonatal treatments, participate in knowledge production, and
28 shape future care. Furthermore, in addition to the baby’s medical care needs, this consultation,
29 along with others, has identified that the provision of information to participants and
30 enrolment to trials should consider the emotional needs of the parents as affected by study
31 decision making, information processing, and language in study materials.[28, 29] This
32 consultation illustrates the need for further work to address the anxieties described and
33 experienced by healthcare professionals. We hope this will help spearhead a truly collaborative
34 research culture between parents, clinicians, and researchers.
35
36
37
38

39 **Acknowledgements**

40
41 We would like to thank Saulius Satas, Juliette Lee, Sara Clarke, Nadia Leake, Shalabh Garg,
42 Nicola Pritchard, Ganka Taneva and also the other parents, adults born preterm, and clinicians
43 who participated in this PPI consultation for the COLLABORATE trial.
44
45

46 **Funding Statement**

47
48 There was no specific funding for this work.
49

50 **Competing Interests Statement**

51
52 All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure at www.icmje.org/coi_disclosure.pdf
53 and declare: no financial support for the submitted work; CB reports grants and personal awards
54 funded by the NIHR, NM reports grants from Medical Research Council, grants from National
55 Institute for Health Research, grants from Prolacta Life Sciences, grants from Chiesi International,
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 grants from Westminster Children's Research Trust, grants from European Health Data and
4 Evidence Network, grants from HCA International, grants from Health Data Research UK, grants
5 from Shire Pharmaceuticals, grants from March of Dimes, outside the submitted work; CB is
6 deputy chair of the NIHR Health Technology Assessment Prioritisation Committee for Hospital
7 based care, NM is a member of the Nestle International Scientific Advisory Board (accepts no
8 personal remuneration for this role).
9
10

11 **Contributors**

12
13 All authors contributed to the research design of the parent, patient, and public involvement,
14 qualitative methods, the revision of this manuscript, approval of the final draft for publication,
15 and responsibility for the intellectual content within. Specific specialisations are described
16 below.
17
18

19
20 WL – Writing, draft editing, thematic analysis, qualitative design, public involvement design,
21 and data collection
22

23
24 BM – Writing, draft editing, thematic analysis, qualitative design, public involvement design,
25 and data collection
26

27
28 CB – Writing, draft editing, qualitative participant recruitment
29

30
31 VC – Writing, Draft editing, randomised controlled trial (RCT) design
32

33
34 DB – Writing, Draft editing, RCT design
35

36
37 NM – Writing, draft editing, qualitative design, public involvement design, RCT Design
38

39 **Patient Consent for Publication**

40
41 This manuscript was shared with all participants to receive feedback and improve the paper's
42 integrity. Participant names have been included only if participants have given explicit
43 permission for their names to be published under our acknowledgements section.
44
45

46 **Research Ethics Approval**

47
48 Research ethics approval for PPI consultations is not required [9]. However, we approached
49 parents and former patients through the neoWONDER group that has agreed to be invited to
50 participate in consultations (REC reference: 20/yh/0330).
51

52 **Data Availability Statement**

53
54 Anonymised data are available upon request from the corresponding author.
55

56 **References**

57
58 1 McGuire, W., Quigley, M., & Embleton, N. Formula versus donor breast milk for feeding preterm or low birth
59 weight infants. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2019;7:1-65. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002972.pub3
60

- 1
2
3 2 Brown, J., Lin, L., Embleton, N., et al. Multi-nutrient fortification of human milk for preterm infants. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2013;6:1-64. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000343.pub4.
4
5
6 3 Greenbury SF, Ougham K, Wu J, Battersby C, Gale C, Modi N, Angelini ED Identification of variation in nutritional
7 practice in neonatal units in England and association with clinical outcomes using agnostic machine learning.
8 *Scientific Reports*. In press.
- 9
10 4 Webbe, J. W. H., Duffy, J. M. N., Afonso, E., et al. Core outcomes in neonatology: Development of a core outcome
11 set for neonatal research. *Archives of Disease in Childhood: Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2020;105(4):425-431.
12 doi:10.1136/archdischild-2019-317501
- 13
14 5 Modi, N., Ashby, D., Battersby, C., et al. Developing routinely recorded clinical data from electronic patient
15 records as a national resource to improve neonatal health care: the Medicines for Neonates research programme.
16 *Programme Grants for Applied Research* 2019;7(6):1-396. doi:10.3310/pgfar07060
- 17
18 6 Modi N Information technology infrastructure, quality improvement and research: the UK National Neonatal
19 Research Database. *Translational Pediatrics* 2019; 8:193-8. doi: dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp.2019.07.08
- 20
21 7 Johnson S, Bountziouka V, Brocklehurst P, et al. Standardisation of the Parent Report of Children's Abilities-
22 Revised (PARCA-R): a norm-referenced assessment of cognitive and language development at age 2 years. *Lancet
23 Child Adolesc Health*. 2019 Oct;3(10):705-712. doi: 10.1016/S2352-4642(19)30189-0.
- 24
25 8 Fiori, M., Endacott, R., & Latour, J. M. Public involvement in designing a study on patient-witnessed
26 cardiopulmonary resuscitation in hospital. *Nursing in Critical Care*, 2020;25:313-320.
27 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nicc.12429>;
- 28
29 9 INVOLVE, NIHR. Patient and public involvement in research and research ethics committee review. NIHR. Version
30 1. 2009. <https://www.invo.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/INVOLVENRESfinalStatement310309.pdf>.
31 Accessed 5/2021.
- 32
33 10 INVOLVE, NIHR (National Institute of Health Research). Public involvement in research: impact on ethical
34 aspects of research. 2014. www.involve.nihr.ac.uk. Accessed 05/2021.
- 35
36 11 Bliss: For babies born premature or sick. Our approach to research. [https://www.bliss.org.uk/research-](https://www.bliss.org.uk/research-campaigns/research)
37 [campaigns/research](https://www.bliss.org.uk/research-campaigns/research). Accessed 05/2021.
- 38
39 12 National Institute for Health Research. Patient and public involvement in health and social care research: A
40 handbook for researchers by Research Design Service London. 2014:1-40. [http://www.rds.nihr.ac.uk/wp-](http://www.rds.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/RDS-PPI-Handbook-2014-v8-FINAL.pdf)
41 [content/uploads/RDS-PPI-Handbook-2014-v8-FINAL.pdf](http://www.rds.nihr.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/RDS-PPI-Handbook-2014-v8-FINAL.pdf);
- 42
43 13 Manning, J. C., Hemingway, P., & Redsell, S. A. Survived so what? Identifying priorities for research with children
44 and families post-paediatric intensive care unit. *Nursing in Critical Care*, 2017;23(2):68-74.
45 <https://doi.org/10.1111/nicc.12298>).
- 46
47 14 Janvier, A., Bourque, C. J., Dahan, S., Robson, K., & Barrington, K. J. Integrating Parents in Neonatal and Pediatric
48 Research. *Neonatology*, 2019;115:283-291. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000492502>
- 49
50 15 NeoWONDER: Neonatal Whole Population Data linkage to improve lifelong health and wellbeing of preterm
51 babies 2020 <https://www.neowonder.org.uk/> Accessed 2/2021.
- 52
53 16 Finch, Helen and Lewis, Jane "Focus Groups" In: Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J., eds. *Qualitative Research Practice: A
54 Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2003:170-198.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 17 Barbour, Rosaline S. and Schostak, John "Interviewing and Focus Groups" In: Somekh, B., & Lewin, C., eds.
4 Research Methods in the Social Sciences. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications 2005:41-48.
5
6 18 Tong, A., Sainsbury, P., & Craig, J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): A 32-item
7 checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care* 2007;19(6):349–357. doi:
8 10.1093/intqhc/mzm042
9
10 19 Fereday, J., & Muir-Cochrane, E. (2006). Demonstrating Rigor Using Thematic Analysis: A Hybrid Approach of
11 Inductive and Deductive Coding and Theme Development. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*,
12 2006;5(1):80–92. doi:10.1177/160940690600500107
13
14 20 Ritchie, Jane; Spencer, Liz; and O'Connor, William. "Carrying out Qualitative Analysis" In: Ritchie, J., & Lewis, J.,
15 eds. *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
16 Publications 2003:170-198.
17
18 21 QSR International Pty Ltd. NVivo 2020;3. [https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-](https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home)
19 [software/home](https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home)
20
21 22 Greenhalgh, T., Hinton, L., Finlay, T., et al. Frameworks for supporting patient and public involvement in
22 research: Systematic review and co-design pilot. *Health Expectations* 2019;22(4):785–801. doi:10.1111/hex.12888
23
24 23 Ocloo, J., & Matthews, R. From tokenism to empowerment: Progressing patient and public involvement in
25 healthcare improvement. *BMJ Quality and Safety*, 2016;25:26–632. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004839> "
26
27 24 Berry, J. G., Ryan, P., Duszynski, K. M., et al. Parent perspectives on consent for the linkage of data to evaluate
28 vaccine safety: A randomised trial of opt-in and opt-out consent. *Clinical Trials* 2013;10(3):483–494.
29 doi:10.1177/1740774513480568
30
31 25 Mason S, Allmark P for the Euricon Study Group (Allmark P, Megone C, Bratlid D, et al.) Obtaining informed
32 consent to neonatal randomised controlled trials: interviews with parents and clinicians in the Euricon Study.
33 *Lancet* 2000; 356:2045-51 doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(00)03401-2.
34
35 26 McLeish, J., Alderdice, F., Robberts, H., et al. Challenges of a simplified opt- out consent process in a neonatal
36 randomised controlled trial: qualitative study of parents' and health professionals' views and experiences. *Archives*
37 *of Disease in Childhood - Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2020;0:F1–F7. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2020-319545
38
39 27 Gale, C., Hyde, M. J., & Modi, N. Research ethics committee decision-making in relation to an efficient neonatal
40 trial. *Archives of Disease in Childhood: Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2017;102:F291–F298. doi:10.1136/archdischild-
41 2016-310935
42
43 28 Neu, M., Klawetter, S., Greenfield, J. C., et al. Mothers' Experiences in the NICU before Family-Centered Care
44 and in NICUs Where It Is the Standard of Care. *Advances in Neonatal Care* 2020;20(1):68–79.
45 doi:10.1097/ANC.0000000000000671
46
47 29 Mörelius, E., Kling, K., Eva, R. N., et al. You can't flight, you need to fight — A qualitative study of mothers'
48 experiences of feeding extremely preterm infants. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 2020;29:2420–2428.
49 doi:10.1111/jocn.15254
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplementary Materials

Draft Parent Information Leaflet

This information sheet provides details of a landmark approach to improve the care of very preterm babies. Please read it carefully and ask us if anything is unclear.

Background: This neonatal unit is taking part in a large, national study to find out the best way to feed very preterm babies. This will involve using data that doctors and nurses record routinely for all babies admitted to neonatal units. This leaflet is to provide you with information. You do not need to do anything unless you do not wish us to use your baby's data.

You can "opt-out" at any time by telling [NAME OF STAFF MEMBER]. If you opt-out, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected. However, your baby's data will not be included in the analysis of the results.

What we are trying to find out: We ask all mothers who have a very preterm baby to express milk. However, if a mother has insufficient milk we do not know whether it is beneficial for a baby to receive pasteurised donated milk or formula specially made for preterm babies. We also do not know whether it is beneficial to very preterm babies to add extra protein and carbohydrate routinely to human milk. These are important questions affecting the care of all very preterm babies.

Why there is uncertainty: Preterm formula is made from cow's milk in a factory to strict regulatory standards. It has a consistent amount of nutrition and is used very widely. However, some clinicians believe cow's milk may increase the risks in very preterm babies of a gut inflammation called necrotising enterocolitis that can be very serious. About 3 in 100 very preterm babies in the UK develop severe necrotising enterocolitis.

Human milk provides more than just nutrition, for example, it has factors that strengthen immunity. However, human milk from a donor must be pasteurised to reduce the risk of transmitting infection. Pasteurisation reduces or destroys some beneficial properties of human milk; therefore, donor milk is not the same as milk from a baby's own mother. Pasteurised human donor milk is expensive and has very variable nutrition. This means that doctors may need to add extra protein and carbohydrate from cow's milk which some feel may also be a risk for necrotising enterocolitis.

What happens at present: Because we do not know which options are better for babies, some neonatal units use preterm formula and some use pasteurised human donor milk; some routinely add extra protein and carbohydrate to human milk feeds for very preterm babies and some do not. Overall, in the UK, the majority of babies receive their own mother's milk with some formula; less than 20% receive any donor milk, and about 40% receive some extra protein and carbohydrate.

How to resolve these uncertainties: The most reliable way to resolve uncertainties is by fairly allocating neonatal units to a feeding strategy, using a computer programme that makes the choice without influence so that half will use one approach and half will use the other, for each of the two uncertainties. This is ethical because it gives patients an equal, fair chance of receiving any of the alternative treatments. We will need to compare information from about 4700 babies to find out which options are more beneficial. In this neonatal unit we will be using [X] and [Y].

Other information: There are no risks to your baby from participation in this study because all feeding options are already widely used. Standard NHS indemnity operates in relation to the clinical treatment your baby receives. The UK Health Research Authority has approved the study. Imperial College London is coordinating the study and [x] is funding it. We will keep all details about your baby private. The only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
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
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

people allowed to look at your baby’s data are the team running the study and the regulatory authorities responsible for checking it is carried out correctly.

Thank you for reading this.

Confidential: For Review Only

Supplementary Materials (Continued)

Revised Parent Information Leaflet

SIDE ONE

This information sheet provides details of a landmark approach to improve the care of very preterm babies.

This neonatal unit is taking part in a large, national study to find out the best way to feed very preterm babies (born at less than 29 weeks gestation).

This will involve using data that doctors and nurses record routinely for all babies admitted to neonatal units.

This sheet is to provide you with information. You do not need to do anything unless you do not wish us to use your baby's data.

You can "opt-out" at any time by telling [NAME OF STAFF MEMBER].

If you opt-out, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected. However, your baby's data will not be included in the analysis of the results.

If you are interested in learning more about why the study is taking place, please turn overleaf.

SIDE TWO

What we are trying to find out: We ask all mothers who have a very preterm baby to express milk, as we know this is the optimum way to feed neonates. However, breast-feeding a premature baby can often present challenges, despite their mother's effort and commitment. This means that sometimes a baby will need an additional source of nutrition. At present, we do not know whether it is beneficial for a baby to receive pasteurised donated milk or formula specially made for preterm babies. We also do not know whether it is beneficial to very preterm babies to add extra protein and carbohydrate routinely to human milk. These are important questions affecting the care of all very preterm babies.

Why there is uncertainty: Preterm formula is made from cow's milk in a factory to strict regulatory standards. It has a consistent amount of nutrition and is used very widely. However, some clinicians believe cow's milk may increase the risks in very preterm babies of a gut inflammation called necrotising enterocolitis that can be very serious. About 3 in 100 very preterm babies in the UK develop severe necrotising enterocolitis.

Human milk provides more than just nutrition, for example, it has factors that strengthen immunity. However, human milk from a donor must be pasteurised to reduce the risk of transmitting infection. Pasteurisation reduces or destroys some beneficial properties of human milk and for these and other reasons, donor milk is not the same as milk from a baby's own mother. Pasteurised human donor milk is expensive and has very variable nutrition. This means that doctors may need to add extra protein and carbohydrate from cow's milk which some feel may also be a risk for necrotising enterocolitis.

What happens at present: Because we do not know which options are better for babies, some neonatal units use preterm formula and some use pasteurised human donor milk; some routinely add extra protein and carbohydrate to human milk feeds for very preterm babies and some do not. Overall, in the UK, the majority of babies receive their own mother's milk with some formula; less than 20% receive any donor milk, and about 40% receive some extra protein and carbohydrate.

How to resolve these uncertainties: The most reliable way to resolve uncertainties is by fairly allocating neonatal units to a feeding strategy, using a computer programme that makes the choice without influence so that half will use one approach and half will use the other, for each of the two uncertainties. This is ethical because it gives patients an equal, fair chance of receiving any of the alternative treatments. We will need to compare information from about 4700 babies to find out which options are more beneficial. In this neonatal unit we will be using [X] and [Y].

Other information: There are no risks to your baby from participation in this study because all feeding options are already widely used. Standard NHS indemnity operates in relation to the clinical treatment your baby receives. The UK Health Research Authority has approved the study. Imperial College London is coordinating the study and [x] is funding it. We will keep all details about your baby private. The only people allowed to look at your baby's data are the team running the study and the regulatory authorities responsible for checking it is carried out correctly.

Once again, if you opt-out of the research study, your baby will continue to receive the same treatment and his or her care will not be affected.

Thank you for reading this. Please ask us if anything is unclear.

Supplementary Materials (Continued)

Completed Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ)

Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity

Personal Characteristics

1. Interviewer/facilitator – Lammons and Moss
2. Credentials – Lammons, MA; Moss, PhD
3. Occupation: Lammons, PPI Research Lead; Moss, PPI Research Lead
4. Gender – Lammons, male; Moss, female
5. Experience and training – Lammons, Imperial College London PPI Training; Moss, original PPI research on improving outcomes for aphasia patients

Relationship with participants

6. Relationship established – No relationship was established between Lammons, Moss and participants prior to this research. Participants were recruited through the neoWONDER network of interested participants who had given consent to contact, which is managed by Battersby.
7. Participant knowledge of the researchers – Lammons and Moss clearly stated the research goals, vision, and purposes at the start of every focus group and interview. They asserted that their goals were to understand parent and former patient experiences, then use these to improve the trial's success in terms of recruitment, retention, relevance, and efficacy.
8. Interviewer characteristics – interviewers clearly stated their motivations and interests in the research topic throughout each focus group and interview. Interviewers shared personal experiences, such as parenthood or lack thereof which impacted their vision and understanding of these phenomena. Most importantly, researchers situated themselves as intermediaries who could receive critiques of the research design, then transmit these to improve the research's inclusivity and engagement with participants.

Domain 2: study design

Theoretical framework

9. Methodological orientation – Qualitative research, qualitative analysis, and patient and public involvement

Participant selection

10. Sampling – Participants were selected from the neoWONDER research participant network, managed by Battersby, which is a network of parents of premature babies and adults born

1
2
3 premature who have consented to contact for neonatal medicine related research studies.
4 Given time constraints the research team faced, we opted for this as the most efficient,
5 effective, convenient, and purposeful means for getting feedback on the COLLABORATE trial
6 prior in tandem with its protocol development.
7
8

9 11. Method of approach – email invitation through neoWONDER research participant network,
10 led by Battersby. Interested individuals who responded were offered participation times and
11 dates.
12

13 12. Sample size – 9
14

15 13. Non-participation 4 showed interest in participating but did not attend due to various
16 reasons, including illness or lack of clear confirmation; follow-up contact and rescheduling was
17 attempted with all four of these individuals twice via email, but no responses were received to
18 schedule additional meeting dates.
19
20

21 **Setting**

22 14. Setting of data collection – virtual focus groups and interviews held via Zoom and Microsoft
23 Teams. Participants joined the sessions from their personal computers/devices at their homes.
24

25 15. Presence of non-participants – only research participants and researchers (Moss and
26 Lammons) were present during sessions
27

28 16. Description of sample – participants were all female between the ages of 22 and 55; 7 were
29 mothers of neonatal patients, 1 was a former neonatal patient, and 1 was a mother and former
30 neonatal patient.
31
32

33 **Data collection**

34 17. Interview guide – a topic guide was created by Lammons and Moss which was shared with
35 the broader research team. The guide was not pilot tested, nor did participants request a copy
36 of the guide, though it was available upon request.
37

38 18. Repeat interviews – none were conducted
39

40 19. Audio/visual recording – sessions were video recorded using in-app recording functions of
41 Zoom and/or Teams. Audio recordings were extracted from the videos and used to create
42 transcriptions with Descript software. These transcriptions were edited for correctness and
43 understanding, then video recordings were deleted. Audio recordings were saved. One session
44 encountered extensive technical difficulties and was correspondingly conducted by Moss via
45 phone. As a result of technical issues, this session was not recorded.
46
47

48 20. Field notes – Lammons and Moss took field notes during and after interview/focus group
49 sessions. These were included in the NVivo workflow and theming process along with raw data.
50

51 21. Duration – Each session lasted roughly 90 minutes.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 22. Data saturation – Moss and Lammons used Malterud et al.'s concept of "information
4 power", or the theory that validity resides in data's strength and quality 23 to emphasize the
5 depth and relevance of the data collected and presented.
6

7
8 23. Transcripts returned – transcripts were not returned to participants for comment and/or
9 correction, though quotations used throughout the manuscript have been reviewed and
10 verified by participants.
11

12 **Domain 3: analysis and findings**

13 **Data analysis**

14
15 24. Number of data coders – 2, Moss and Lammons
16

17
18 25. Description of the coding tree – The coding tree has not been included in the manuscript
19 but is available on request.
20

21
22 26. Derivation of themes – Moss and Lammons used a "hybrid approach" of deductive themes
23 identified prior to the data collection and inductive themes derived from the data itself.
24

25 27. Software – NVivo 1.3 (QSR Technologies)
26

27 28. Participant checking – Participants have been included in the writing process as co-authors
28 and reviewers of findings. Their feedback has contributed to the extant draft.
29

30 **Reporting**

31
32 29. Quotations presented – Eleven quotations are presented in the results section in brief, with
33 their corresponding long-form versions and identifying participant numbers in Table 2.
34

35
36 30. Data and findings consistent – Data has been used to guide findings, discussion, and
37 analysis. Copies of transcripts and coding are available upon request.
38

39 31. Clarity of major themes – Quotes were clearly paired with theme headings and discussions
40 for optimum clarification.
41

42 32. Clarity of minor themes – Quotes were clearly paired with theme headings and discussions
43 for optimum clarification.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60