

# BMJ Open

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

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

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

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

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## School-based screening for childhood anxiety problems and intervention delivery: A co-design approach

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-058089
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Oct-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Williamson, Victoria; King's College London, Larkin, Michael; Aston University Reardon, Tessa; University of Oxford Medical Sciences Division, Experimental Psychology and Psychiatry Pearcey, Samantha; Oxford University Button, Roberta; University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology Green, Iheoma; University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology Hill, Claire; University of Reading Stallard, Paul; University of Bath, Department for Health Spence, Susan; Griffith University, Breen, Maria; University of Reading, School of Psychology & Clinical Language Sciences NIHR ARC South West Peninsula, University of Reading, Reading, RG6 6ALExeter, Exeter, EX1 2LU Mcdonald, Ian; Charlie Waller Institute Ukoumunne, Obioha; University of Exeter Medical School, NIHR CLAHRC South West Peninsula (PenCLAHRC) Ford, Tamsin; University of Cambridge, Department of Psychiatry Violato, Mara; University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology Sniehotta, Falko; Newcastle University Stainer, Jason; Stanley Primary School, Stanley Primary School, Strathmore Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 8UH Gray, Alastair; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Population Health Brown, Paul; Bransgore C Of E Primary School, Ringwood Rd, Bransgore, Christchurch BH23 8JH Sancho, Michelle; West Berkshire Council, Council Offices, Market St, Newbury RG14 5LD Morgan, Fan; PACT Jasper, Bec; Square peg Creswell, Cathy; University of Oxford
Keywords:	EDUCATION & TRAINING (see Medical Education & Training), MENTAL HEALTH, PAEDIATRICS



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



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  
4 School-based screening for childhood anxiety problems and intervention delivery: A co-  
5  
6  
7 design approach  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Williamson, V.<sup>a,b,m</sup>, Larkin, M.<sup>d \*</sup>, Tessa Reardon<sup>am</sup>, Samantha Pearcey<sup>a</sup>, Roberta Button<sup>a,m</sup>,  
18  
19  
20 Iheoma Green<sup>a,m</sup>, Claire Hill<sup>d</sup>, Paul Stallard<sup>c</sup>, Susan H. Spence<sup>f</sup>, Maria Breen<sup>d</sup>, Ian  
21  
22  
23 McDonald<sup>g</sup>, Obioha C Ukoumunne<sup>n</sup>, Tamsin Ford<sup>h</sup>, Mara Violato<sup>i</sup>, Falko F Sniehotta<sup>j</sup>, Jason  
24  
25  
26 Stainer<sup>k</sup>, Alastair Gray<sup>i</sup>, Paul Brown<sup>l</sup>, Michelle Sancho<sup>m</sup>, Fan Morgan<sup>q</sup>, Bec Jasper<sup>p</sup>,  
27  
28  
29  
30 Creswell, C. <sup>a,m</sup>  
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

<sup>a</sup> Department of Experimental Psychology, Anna Watts Building, University of Oxford,  
Oxford, OX2 6 GG

<sup>b</sup> Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, SE5  
9RJ

<sup>c</sup> Institute for Neurodevelopment and Health, Department of Psychology, Aston University,  
Birmingham, B4 7ET

1  
2  
3  
4 <sup>d</sup> School of Psychology & Clinical Language Sciences, University of Reading, Reading, RG6

5  
6  
7 6AL

8  
9  
10 <sup>e</sup> University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY

11  
12  
13 <sup>f</sup> Australian Institute of Suicide Research and Prevention and School of Applied Psychology,

14  
15  
16 Griffith University, Mount Gravatt, QLD 4121, AU

17  
18  
19  
20  
21 <sup>g</sup> Charlie Waller Memorial Trust, First Floor, Rear Office, 32 High Street, Thatcham RG19

22  
23  
24  
25 3JD

26  
27  
28 <sup>h</sup> Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

29  
30  
31 <sup>i</sup> Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Richard Doll Building,

32  
33  
34 Old Road Campus, Oxford OX3 7LF | UK

35  
36  
37  
38 <sup>j</sup> Population Health Science Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University,

39  
40  
41 Baddiley-Clark Building, Richardson Road, NE2 4AX

42  
43  
44  
45 <sup>k</sup> Stanley Primary School, Strathmore Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 8UH

46  
47  
48 <sup>l</sup> Bransgore C Of E Primary School, Ringwood Rd, Bransgore, Christchurch BH23 8JH

49  
50  
51 <sup>m</sup> West Berkshire Council, Council Offices, Market St, Newbury RG14 5LD

52  
53  
54 <sup>n</sup> NIHR ARC South West Peninsula, University of Exeter, Heavitree Rd, Exeter EX1 2LU

55  
56  
57  
58 <sup>o</sup> Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

59  
60

<sup>P</sup> PACT Parents and Carers Together CIC, UK

<sup>Q</sup> Square Peg (Team Square Peg CIC), UK

**\*Correspondence:** Dr Michael Larkin, Department of Psychology, Aston University,

Birmingham, B4 7ET, m.larkin@aston.ac.uk

**Funding:** This paper represents independent research funded by the National Institute for

Health Research (NIHR) (CC) and hosted by Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust. CC and

MV acknowledge support from the Oxford and Thames Valley NIHR Applied Research

Collaboration. MV was partly supported by the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre.

OU was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research

Collaboration (ARC) for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRC) for the

South West Peninsula at the Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust. The views

expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the

Department of Health and Social Care. AWARD/GRANT NUMBER IS NOT

APPLICABLE.

**Competing interests:** Authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

**Data sharing statement:** No additional data are available.

1  
2  
3  
4 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank those who participated in our patient and public  
5  
6  
7 involvement (PPI) activities for their contribution to this research.  
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

For peer review only



## Abstract

**Objectives:** A very small proportion of children with anxiety problems receive evidence-based treatment. Barriers to access include difficulties with problem identification, concerns about stigma, a lack of clarity about how to access specialist services, and their limited availability. A school-based programme that integrates screening to identify those children who are most likely to be experiencing anxiety problems, with the offer of intervention, has the potential to overcome many of these barriers. This article is a process-based account of how we used co-design to develop a primary school-based screening and intervention programme for child anxiety problems.

**Design:** Co-design.

**Setting:** UK primary schools.

**Participants:** Data were collected from Year Four children, parents, school staff and mental health practitioners.

1  
2  
3  
4 **Results:** We report how the developed programme was experienced and perceived by a range  
5  
6  
7 of users, including parents, children, school staff and mental health practitioners, as well as  
8  
9  
10 how the programme was adapted following user feedback.  
11  
12

13 **Conclusions:** We reflect on the mitigation techniques we employed, the lessons learnt from  
14  
15  
16 the co-design process, and give recommendations that may inform the development and  
17  
18  
19 implementation of future school-based screening and intervention programmes.  
20  
21  
22

23 **Keywords:** co-design, mental health, primary school, screening  
24  
25  
26

27 **Strengths and limitations of this study:**  
28  
29

- 30 • The co-design methodology used allowed for the collection of data from a broad  
31  
32  
33 range of users (parents, children, teachers, practitioners) at various stages of the study,  
34  
35  
36 providing in-depth insight into their experiences and concerns at each research stage.  
37  
38
- 39 • Our use of co-design also yielded a number of transferrable learning points that may  
40  
41  
42 be applicable to other studies aiming to implement universal mental health screening  
43  
44  
45 and intervention in schools.  
46  
47
- 48 • The inclusion of a range of participant perspectives highlighted that some school staff  
49  
50  
51 and practitioners may have very different views from families about the potential  
52  
53  
54 risks and benefits to a school-based mental health screening/intervention pathway.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

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

For peer review only

## Introduction

Anxiety disorders are among the most prevalent mental health disorders experienced by children, with 6.5% of children globally meeting likely diagnostic criteria [1] and as many as half of lifetime anxiety disorders starting before a child leaves primary school [2]. Without intervention, anxiety disorders can persist into adulthood with deleterious implications for a child's social, educational, and familial functioning [3].

Effective treatments, such as cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) [4], have been developed for childhood anxiety disorders, yet only a small proportion of children with anxiety disorders actually access services at all, let alone evidence-based treatment [5,6]. Barriers include problems with identification and difficulties in accessing treatment, including: parental concerns about children being labelled or families blamed for child difficulties; a lack of confidence or ability to identify likely child anxiety problems among primary care providers, school staff, or other professionals that children interact with; parental uncertainty about how to find reliable sources of support; and restricted access to specialist services due to narrow inclusion criteria or long waiting lists [3,5,7,8]. A school-based screening programme to identify children who are most likely to be experiencing anxiety problems and offer intervention seamlessly without families having to negotiate

1  
2  
3 routes to services has the potential to overcome many of these barriers. However, if carried  
4  
5  
6  
7 out poorly school-based screening programmes may also have poor uptake or inadvertent  
8  
9  
10 unintended consequences , such as increasing stigma or misidentification [9,10]. Designing  
11  
12  
13 engaging, acceptable, and well received procedures is therefore essential.  
14  
15  
16

17 For such a programme to be implemented, it must function efficiently, be safe and  
18  
19 reliable, and have the experiences of service users and stakeholders at the heart of programme  
20  
21 design and delivery [11]. This final criterion is best met by co-design - a method which aims  
22  
23  
24 to develop a thorough understanding of how stakeholders and service users perceive and  
25  
26  
27 experience the look, feel, and procedures of a service which is then used to inform the design  
28  
29  
30 and delivery of, and adaptations to, services [12]. This approach brings advantages over  
31  
32  
33 surveys or questionnaires of patient/stakeholder experiences of a service as it allows for an  
34  
35  
36 in-depth understanding of a service's potential shortcoming and/or the development of  
37  
38  
39 solutions. A co-design approach allows for both participant views as well as patient and  
40  
41  
42 public involvement (PPI) perspectives to be incorporated, ensuring services are designed *for*  
43  
44  
45 users *with* users [13]. Co-design has been widely used in health contexts to make services  
46  
47  
48 more acceptable and, thus, ultimately improve patient wellbeing (e.g. [14–16]). In relation to  
49  
50  
51 designing and delivering mental health services for children, previous qualitative co-design  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 studies have yielded promising findings when the views of children, family members,  
4  
5  
6  
7 clinicians, and other stakeholders were incorporated [17–19]. Designing and implementing a  
8  
9  
10 successful school-based screening and intervention programme for childhood anxiety  
11  
12  
13 disorders requires equally thorough triangulation.  
14

15  
16  
17 Our aim was to co-design an engaging and accessible primary school-based pathway  
18  
19  
20 to screen and offer an intervention for child anxiety problems. As potential screening tools  
21  
22  
23 [20] and low intensity interventions [21,22] already exist, the purpose of this study was to  
24  
25  
26 develop an in-depth understanding of the challenges that may arise when delivering screening  
27  
28  
29 and intervention for child anxiety problems in primary schools and to respond to such  
30  
31  
32 concerns by co-creating, implementing, and evaluating solutions. In this article, we will  
33  
34  
35 provide a process-based account of how our school-based screening and intervention pathway  
36  
37  
38 was co-designed, how the pathway procedures were experienced by users, and how pathway  
39  
40  
41 development was influenced by user feedback. We will also report qualitative findings from  
42  
43  
44 interviews with parents, children, school staff and other stakeholders to show how their  
45  
46  
47 perspectives were incorporated in order to help ensure that the developed pathway would be  
48  
49  
50 well-received and sustainably implemented.  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 56 57 **Method** 58 59 60

## Ethics approval

This study was approved by the Central University Research Ethics Committee at the University of Oxford (REF R64620/RE001). All adult participants gave written informed consent and children assented to participate in the project.

## Approach and focus

We set out to co-design, produce, and deliver a series of procedures – a ‘pathway’ - to improve access to an evidence-based intervention for child anxiety problems through primary schools in England. As described in detail in our study protocol [23], several of the pathway features were specified in advance of the co-design work with input and guidance from stakeholder members of the research team (see next section). In particular, we pre-specified that children’s anxiety problems would be screened using validated questionnaire measures [20], parents would receive feedback on the outcome, and, where indicated, a brief online treatment for child anxiety problems would be offered. The treatment offered was an online version of a brief therapist-guided parent-delivered CBT approach for child anxiety problems (OSI; Online Support and Intervention for child anxiety) which involves seven online modules for parents, supported by a weekly 20-minute telephone call with a Children’s Wellbeing Practitioner (CWP, NHS Band 5), with a follow-up telephone session 4-weeks

1  
2  
3 later. A face-to-face version of this brief parent-led treatment has been found to be both  
4  
5  
6 clinically effective [24] and more cost-effective than an alternative brief psychological  
7  
8  
9 intervention [25]  
10  
11  
12

13  
14 As described in our protocol [23], the co-design process to establish *how* the pre-  
15  
16 specified features of the pathway should be presented consisted of four stages. The first stage  
17  
18 involved initial interviews and focus groups with parents, children, school staff, and other  
19  
20 stakeholders to inform the development of a set of procedures that would comprise the  
21  
22 pathway (Stage 1) (see Figure 1). These procedures were subsequently applied in three  
23  
24 primary schools (Stage 2) with participating children, parents, and school staff providing  
25  
26 feedback on their experience (Stage 3 & 4), including cued-recall interviews which examined  
27  
28 parents' experiences of receiving feedback on whether their child experiences difficulties  
29  
30 with anxiety (see Table 2).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 [INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **PPI and Stakeholder involvement** 51

52  
53 Parents, school staff and other stakeholders were involved in this co-design study in a  
54  
55 number of ways. First, this project actively involved a dedicated patient and public  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 involvement (PPI) and stakeholder group from protocol development stage to ensure that the  
4  
5  
6 developed pathway would be acceptable to both parents and school staff. This group  
7  
8  
9  
10 included two parents with relevant lived experience, two school leaders, and one school  
11  
12  
13 mental health lead for a national charity. The PPI/stakeholder group provided guidance  
14  
15  
16 during the initial project plans and funding application and later informed the development of  
17  
18  
19 the study protocol and reviewed research data collected throughout the study to aid in  
20  
21  
22 decision making. Examples of decisions that were made on the basis of consultation with this  
23  
24  
25 group included providing the option for children to complete screening measures at home  
26  
27  
28 (Stage 2), as well as guiding the researcher team on what information had to be securely  
29  
30  
31 shared about participating families with school staff for safeguarding purposes. Researchers  
32  
33  
34 met with the PPI/stakeholder group at regular intervals and the group were compensated for  
35  
36  
37 their time and expertise. This dedicated PPI/stakeholder group, while providing guidance,  
38  
39  
40 were not research participants. The dedicated PPI/stakeholder group were not directly  
41  
42  
43 involved in the recruitment of participants. Second, a distinct online PPI group, made up  
44  
45  
46 primarily of parents, was established for this project. Regular updates about the study as well  
47  
48  
49 as polls and questions were posed to the online PPI group in order to access wider parental  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 views about study procedures and gain insight about key concerns. Results will be  
4  
5  
6  
7 disseminated to participants via social media and lay summaries.  
8  
9

## 10 Participants

11  
12  
13 *Sampling rationale for the co-design activities.* For Stages 1-4, participants included  
14  
15  
16 children in Year 4 of primary school (Y4; aged 8-9 years), parents of Y4 children, primary  
17  
18 school staff and other stakeholders (see Table 2). Y4 children (age 8-9 years) were the focus  
19  
20 of the intervention as consultations with parents and school-staff advised that this would be a  
21  
22 manageable time for primary schools. The delivery of the procedures in Y4 was thought to  
23  
24 allow primary schools to see the benefit of the pathway, and would enable children to thrive  
25  
26 when managing subsequent key transitions (e.g. to secondary school).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

## 37 Setting

38  
39  
40 Participants for Stage 1 were recruited from two local mainstream primary schools as  
41  
42 well as through adverts online on social media and national mailing lists for the initial  
43  
44 procedure development phase (see Figure; Stage 1). Three local primary schools participated  
45  
46 in Stages 2-4 to iteratively try out and adapt the pathway procedures (one school from Stage  
47  
48 1, and two new schools). These schools varied in their demographic characteristics (see Table  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 1)  
58  
59  
60

Table 1. Stages 2-4 School demographic characteristics

School	Total number of pupils on roll	Percentage of pupils with SEN support	Percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals	Percentage of pupils with English as an additional language
School 1	200	9.5%	12.6%	41.5%
School 2	364	18.0%	9.1%	23.9%
School 3	415	7.6%	2.7%	26.2%
National average	N/A	12.2%	20.8%	19.2%

*Note.* National average = refers to official UK Gov statistics for the 2020/2021 school year [26].

***Recruitment to the co-design activities.***

***Parents and children.*** To recruit participants with a broad range of perspectives to Stage 1, we circulated study invitations to families of all Y4 children in two primary schools

1  
2  
3  
4 in the local area, as well as circulating study adverts online on social media, and national  
5  
6  
7 mailing lists. In Stages 2-4, study information was circulated to all Y4 parents and children in  
8  
9  
10 three participating schools, including invitations to take part in the screening/intervention  
11  
12  
13 pathway and the opportunity to participate in study-related interviews.  
14  
15

16  
17 Notably, in Stage 4, we also specifically recruited a number of parents facing  
18  
19  
20 challenging circumstances that could influence their views of the acceptability of and likely  
21  
22  
23 engagement with a school-based screening and intervention programme. These were parents  
24  
25  
26 who care for a foster child or a child with chronic physical health problems, where the parent  
27  
28  
29 has past/present mental health problem(s), or where the parent is a member of the UK Armed  
30  
31  
32 Forces community. This sub-group of parents (n=10, see Table 2) was recruited via  
33  
34  
35 circulation of study advertisements online and via mailing lists. Its inclusion aimed to ensure  
36  
37  
38 that the co-designed school-based programme would be inclusive and appropriate to the  
39  
40  
41 needs of a greater number of families (see Williamson et al., under review).  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 ***School staff and other stakeholder participants.*** To recruit school staff and  
48  
49  
50 practitioners that provide mental health support in schools to Stage 1 and 4, we circulated  
51  
52  
53 invitations for study interviews/focus groups within local primary schools and shared study  
54  
55  
56 adverts online and via mailing lists. School staff were included in study interviews if they  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 were employed in a participating mainstream primary/junior school in England (e.g. class  
5  
6  
7 teacher, headteacher). The inclusion criteria for staff that provide mental health support in  
8  
9  
10 schools were that they must be a practitioner providing mental health support in primary  
11  
12  
13 schools in England, such as educational psychologists, Special Educational Needs  
14  
15  
16 Coordinator (SENCOs), and Emotional Literacy Support Assistants (ELSAs) (Stages 1 and 4,  
17  
18 see Figure 1 and Figure 2). For clarity, they are referred to throughout this manuscript as  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 'practitioners'.  
25  
26

### 27 **Procedure and description of co-design process**

28  
29  
30 Our co-design consultations were conducted throughout all four stages (see Figure 1),  
31  
32  
33 to allow us to get feedback on a preliminary pathway prototype, refine it, implement it, and  
34  
35  
36 then get feedback on people's experiences and perceptions of that to inform a further  
37  
38  
39  
40 refinement.  
41  
42

43  
44 ***Stage 1.*** We carried out in-depth one-to-one interviews and focus groups with  
45  
46  
47 practitioners, school staff, children, and parents (see Table 2). Participants were asked for  
48  
49  
50 their views on features of the draft pathway which the research team had outlined in  
51  
52  
53 collaboration with the dedicated PPI/stakeholder group's input. Participants were shown  
54  
55  
56 visual materials of the proposed stages of the pathway (when possible, if the interview was  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 conducted in person or via video conference with the visuals representing the general journey  
5  
6  
7 through screening to intervention. The visuals were intended as a generic prototype of the  
8  
9  
10 pathway stages (i.e. a generic image of a school was shown during questions about the  
11  
12  
13 potential impact screening may have on a school community) and participants were  
14  
15  
16 encouraged to write down further thoughts, comment on concerns, and highlight possible  
17  
18  
19 solutions. When shown the pathway visuals, participants were asked about their beliefs about  
20  
21  
22 using screening questionnaires to identify child anxiety problems in schools, perceptions of  
23  
24  
25 how families should be informed of the outcomes of the screening questionnaires, families  
26  
27  
28 experiences of the online intervention, and views of whether there might be any secondary  
29  
30  
31 effects of a school-based screening and intervention on a family or school community (see  
32  
33  
34 Figure 2).  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 **Stage 2.** The detailed prototype set of procedures refined after Stage 1 were  
41  
42  
43 administered in three primary schools, including screening, feedback to parents, and the offer  
44  
45  
46 of treatment where indicated.  
47  
48  
49

50 **Stage 3.** Parents were invited to discuss their experience of receiving feedback on  
51  
52  
53 their child's screening outcomes via cued-recall interviews. The cued-recall interviews were  
54  
55  
56 audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The aim of the cued-recall interviews was to  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 capture the acceptability of the feedback procedures used here to inform a further iteration of  
5  
6  
7 the procedures ahead of a larger scale future trial. Participating parents received feedback on  
8  
9  
10 their children's screening outcomes in writing and via telephone call from the study CWP.  
11  
12  
13 Recordings of the parent-CWP telephone call were reviewed by parents with a study  
14  
15  
16 researcher, with the parent encouraged to comment at points that were relevant, for example,  
17  
18  
19 points in the call where the parent felt more information from the CWP would have been  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 useful.

25  
26  
27 **Stage 4.** Following the administration of all the pathway procedures, interviews were  
28  
29  
30 carried out with Y4 children, their parents and school staff. We carried out interviews with a  
31  
32  
33 sub-sample of participating parents and children who completed the screening questionnaires  
34  
35  
36 and engaged with the treatment modules, and of parents and children who withdrew. All  
37  
38  
39 parents who engaged with or withdrew from treatment were invited to interview. School staff  
40  
41  
42 in participating schools were interviewed about their experience of facilitating the pathway  
43  
44  
45 procedures. Practitioners who provide mental health treatment in primary school settings  
46  
47  
48 were also interviewed about their views of the pathway procedures that had been  
49  
50  
51 administered. Views about the proposed pathway were also sought from parents in especially  
52  
53  
54 challenging circumstances (e.g. foster families, military families) (Williamson et al., under  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 review). The interviews were used to gain an in-depth understanding of participants'  
4  
5  
6  
7 experiences and perceptions of the pathway procedures. Participants' feedback and  
8  
9  
10 recommendations at this stage will inform any further revisions that are needed.  
11  
12

### 13 **Study context.**

14  
15  
16  
17 Data collection took place between December 2019 and December 2020. From March  
18  
19  
20 2020, the UK enacted a number of restrictions in an effort to slow the spread of the COVID-  
21  
22  
23 19 (CV-19) virus. These ongoing measures included school closures, remote working where  
24  
25  
26 possible, and social distancing restrictions, and had a number of implications for our study.  
27  
28

29  
30 With much of the country moving towards remote learning and working during this time,  
31  
32  
33 many people became more familiar with using online technology [27,28] which likely  
34  
35  
36 facilitated engagement with our online screening questionnaires and intervention.  
37  
38

39  
40 Nonetheless, families and school staff had increasing and frequently changing demands on  
41  
42  
43 their time during this period, with parents being required to support their child's learning  
44  
45  
46 from home, often alongside working from home or managing other disruptions to their lives;  
47  
48  
49 and teachers having to adapt and deliver lessons and support online as well as offering in-  
50  
51  
52 school teaching for some children. Schools had to respond to fluctuating school CV-19  
53  
54  
55 regulations, while many staff were juggling their own caregiving responsibilities.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4        ***Procedure modifications.*** The timing of the study, coinciding with UK CV-19  
5  
6  
7 restrictions (March 2020-December 2020), meant that some of our planned recruitment  
8  
9  
10 approaches and data collection strategies were altered; for example, face-to-face interviews  
11  
12  
13 had to be conducted via telephone/video call from March 2020. We had originally aimed to  
14  
15  
16 include interviews with parents who chose not to participate or dropped out of the study, as  
17  
18  
19 well as cued recall interviews with 12 parents and four teachers about the experience of  
20  
21  
22 delivering or receiving feedback on screening questionnaire outcomes [23]. Because of the  
23  
24  
25 move to remote contact and because of the demands on teachers' time, we changed the  
26  
27  
28 procedure so that the study CWP provided feedback on screening outcomes to parents, rather  
29  
30  
31 than teachers. As such we did not interview teachers about their experience of delivering this  
32  
33  
34 feedback. Furthermore, we were unsuccessful in recruiting any non-participating parents and  
35  
36  
37 were only able to recruit a small number of parents who dropped out (n=2) and parents to  
38  
39  
40 cued-recall interviews (n=2). It is likely that CV-19 related demands on parent/school staff  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 time and societal disruptions were contributing factors.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 2***Overview of co-design input sources and data contributions*

Input	Participants	Study stage	Time frame	Demographic information		Mode of contribution to co-design	Output generated
PPI/Stakeholder group (Headteachers x 2; parents x 2; Voluntary/community sector mental health in schools expert)	N=5	Stage 1-4	Pre-study – Month 12	Age M (SD)	49.3 (7.4)	Regular meetings to share findings and discussion of study progress.	The dedicated PPI/stakeholder group are members of the research team and provided guidance and recommendations on study findings and developments.
				Females (n)	2		
Practitioners that provide mental health support in schools	N=2	Stage 1	Months 1-2	Age M (SD)	54.5 (12.0)	Focus group interview conducted face to face [qualitative].	Perceptions of how the screening/intervention procedures should be introduced in schools, delivered, concerns and possible
				Females (n)	2		

	N=15	Stage 4	Months 6-8	Age M (SD)	38 (10.5)	Semi-structured interviews conducted remotely [qualitative].	solutions.
				Females (n)	14		
Y4 Children	N=8	Stage 1	Months 1-2	Age range years	8-9	Focus group interview conducted face to face [qualitative].	Perceptions of how the screening/intervention procedures should be introduced to the class, carried out, concerns and possible solutions.
				Females (n)	6		
	N=29	Stage 2	Months 2-6	N/A		Completed screening questionnaires for likely anxiety problems [quantitative].	Identification of children who are likely to have problems with anxiety.
Y4 Parents	N=7	Stage 1	Month 1-2	Age M (SD)	43.7 (3.6)	Focus group interview conducted face to face	Perceptions of how the screening/intervention procedures
				Females (n)	2		

				Females (n)	6	[qualitative].	should be introduced to families, delivered in schools, concerns and possible solutions.
	N=29	Stage 2	Months 2-6	N/A		Completed screening questionnaires for likely anxiety problems [quantitative].	Identification of children who are likely to have problems with anxiety
	N=2	Stage 3	Months 5-6	Age M (SD)	46.5 (0.7)	Cued-recall interviews conducted via telephone [qualitative].	Experience of the screening pathway and receiving feedback on scores.
				Females (n)	2		
	N=7	Stage 4	Months 6-8	Age M (SD)	43.6 (2.2)	Semi-structured interviews conducted remotely [qualitative].	Experience of the screening pathway and intervention. Includes parents who dropped out (n=2).
				Females (n)	6		
Parents in challenging circumstances	N=10	Stage 4	Months 5- 12	Age M (SD)	47.1 (7.6)	Semi-structured interview conducted remotely [qualitative].	Perceptions of how a school screening/intervention pathway could be delivered in schools and possible barriers/facilitators to taking part.
				Females (n)	7		

School staff	N=6	Stage 1	Month 1-2	Age M (SD)	48.0 (7.4)	Focus group interview conducted face to face [qualitative].	Perceptions of how the screening/intervention procedures should be introduced, delivered, concerns and possible solutions.	
				Females (n)	6			
	N=4	Stage 2	Months 2-6	Age M (SD)	41.8 (8.3)	Screening questionnaires for likely anxiety problems [quantitative].		Identification of children who are likely to have problems with anxiety
				Females (n)	2			
	N=5	Stage 4	Months 6-9	Age M (SD)	41.6 (7.2)	Semi-structured interview conducted remotely [qualitative].		Experience of the screening pathway, perceptions of the intervention offered to families and perceived barriers/facilitators to uptake in schools.
				Females (n)	3			

*Note.* Y4 = Year four.

## Data analysis

During the co-design process, we made audio recordings of interviews and focus group discussions, and photographed tabletop activities. Recordings were transcribed in full. Two approaches were taken for analysing the data: 'fast and direct' and 'slow and in-depth'. A description of the 'fast and direct' and 'slow and in-depth' analyses is provided below and in subsequent articles that drew on the data collected for transparency (Williamson et al., under review)

The 'fast and direct' approach involved the researchers making notes of the key findings during interviews, focus groups, and from participants' comments on the generic pathway visual images in Stage 1. The key findings were collated and shared with the research team and dedicated stakeholder group and, where necessary, used to rapidly alter the research study procedures. For the 'slow and in-depth' approach, NVivo 12 software was used to facilitate data analysis of interviews and focus groups. A Template Analysis approach was used [29]. This first required researchers to become familiar with the data by re-reading transcripts several times. The primary author (VW) then created a template of initial codes guided by the open-ended interview schedule questions, the empirical literature of child

1  
2  
3  
4 mental health and school-based interventions as well as the study's research questions. Once  
5  
6  
7 the template was developed, transcripts were analysed in a 'top down' manner following the  
8  
9  
10 provisional structure of the template. Data collection and analysis took place simultaneously  
11  
12  
13 to allow emerging topics of interest to be investigated further in subsequent interviews. Peer  
14  
15  
16 debriefing was carried out midway through data analysis and the template was modified to  
17  
18  
19 include additional codes based on discoveries in the dataset that had not yet been captured by  
20  
21  
22 the initial coding template. Once all the data had been initially analysed, the populated  
23  
24  
25 templates were then shared, discussed and refined within the authorship team (CC, ML, TF,  
26  
27  
28 IM, VW, SS, FM). Themes relating to the research question were identified in the coded data  
29  
30  
31 set through analysis of patterns found between codes and among coded segments as well as  
32  
33  
34 through code use frequencies. Each theme was identified and verified through team  
35  
36  
37 consensus. Given that in this article we aim to provide a reflective and pragmatic account of  
38  
39  
40 the data, rather than providing an account organised by themes, we will focus on describing  
41  
42  
43 the challenges we faced throughout the co-design process at distinct research phases, the  
44  
45  
46 strategies we used to overcome these issues and reflections on the lessons we learnt, drawing  
47  
48  
49 on examples of previous co-design studies (e.g. [18,30,31]).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

### 57 **Reporting and reflecting on experiences of co-design process findings**

58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Based on the insights and outcomes from the co-design process, we present a  
5  
6  
7 snapshot of our findings related to the co-design and delivery of our school screening and  
8  
9  
10 intervention pathway for child anxiety problems (see Table 3). We highlight the challenges  
11  
12  
13 faced by participants both prior to and during data collection structured by the patterns of  
14  
15  
16 participants' shared concerns in each research phase, and steps taken to mitigate these  
17  
18  
19 difficulties. Our findings are organised by insights from the co-design process, are reported  
20  
21  
22 by distinct research phases, and include data about how the pathway was experienced and  
23  
24  
25 perceived by users and influenced and adapted following their feedback. We present a  
26  
27  
28 simplified representation of the challenges, mitigations, and lessons learned in each research  
29  
30  
31 phase in Table 3. Anonymised excerpts are provided to illustrate key points. The findings  
32  
33  
34 from the qualitative interviews and in-depth data analysis with practitioners and parents are  
35  
36  
37 reported in detail elsewhere (Williamson et al., under review).  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

## 44 Results

45  
46  
47 **Research phase: appraising the existing need for support and context.** To successfully  
48  
49  
50 identify children with anxiety problems and facilitate access to early intervention, the  
51  
52  
53 pathway would need to overcome uncertainty about whether particular children are likely to  
54  
55  
56 benefit from intervention and create a clear route to access it. Previous studies (e.g. [5,9,32])  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 have shown that parents and teachers often struggle to identify whether the difficulties a child  
5  
6  
7 is exhibiting reflect a clinically significant problem. This was supported by data from our  
8  
9  
10 participating mental health practitioners who described that many families as well as school  
11  
12  
13 staff may not consider a child's emotional or behavioural difficulties as indicative of a likely  
14  
15  
16 problem, rather it may be seen as a 'phase' or attention seeking. As one practitioner  
17  
18  
19 describes:  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 *Practitioner: "You are aiming to reach out to parents that have never given a thought*  
25 *maybe that there [are] maybe anxiety issues in [their] children... I think some parents*  
26 *aren't aware at all and maybe quite oblivious to little tell-tale signs that might be*  
27 *going on and just to recognise it."*  
28  
29  
30

31  
32 If this obstacle of identification was overcome and a child was recognised as having a  
33  
34  
35 likely anxiety problem, previous studies have found families may nonetheless be hesitant to  
36  
37  
38 engage in school screening due to concerns about the accessibility of formal support [9].  
39

40  
41  
42 Participating practitioners and parents in the present study described the often extensive  
43  
44  
45 waiting lists for child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS). Practitioners reported  
46  
47  
48 being overwhelmed by the demand for their psychological services, and many families  
49  
50  
51 equally described being unable to promptly access appropriate formal support for their child.  
52  
53

54  
55 Readily accessible support was thus a key requirement of any developed  
56  
57  
58 screening/intervention pathway for participating parents, practitioners, and school staff. This  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 practitioner describes that a pathway would be well received given the significant challenges  
5  
6  
7 parents can face accessing care:  
8  
9  
10

11  
12 *Practitioner: "First and foremost I'd say that parents will be crying out for help. The*  
13 *children that I've worked with and our team...are crying out for help. It's one of the*  
14 *hardest things I've seen is when a parent wants their child to thrive, and they can't*  
15 *[get them help] ...I'd say parents will bite your hands off."*  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22 **Research phase: engaging schools.** Participating teachers and school staff in Stage 1  
23  
24  
25 described that schools are often bombarded with offers for their school to receive mental  
26  
27  
28 health programmes. Such programmes were often described as costly with unclear efficacy.  
29  
30  
31 Moreover, particularly in light of the CV-19 pandemic, schools were described as being  
32  
33  
34 under increasing pressure to provide psychological support to children. To build school trust  
35  
36  
37 and confidence in a screening/intervention pathway, teaching staff described the need for a  
38  
39  
40 pathway to be seen as credible and evidence based, with recognisable logos on materials,  
41  
42  
43 clear information provided to staff about pathway procedures, with further information  
44  
45  
46 readily available on request. One teacher describes the challenges faced by schools and the  
47  
48  
49 importance of demonstrating credibility below:  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 *Teacher: "I literally get ten emails a day offering us some sort of mental health*  
56 *intervention... saying 'sign up for our pack, it's only £X thousand.'... That's the*  
57 *question isn't it, it's like how are you going to prove to schools...that actually this*  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *[pathway] is better than X, Y or Z?... I think credibility is really key with this.... Just*  
5 *because there's so much out there now. It's really hard as a teacher I think to make a*  
6 *value judgement"*  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 **Research phase: engaging families.** Once schools had agreed to be involved in the  
13  
14  
15 delivery of the pathway, Y4 children and their parents were invited to consent/assent to  
16  
17  
18 screening. Practitioners and teachers described that stigma-related concerns may prevent  
19  
20  
21 families from participating in this key step of the pathway, preventing them from benefitting  
22  
23  
24 from early identification. This is consistent with the broader literature on barriers to help-  
25  
26  
27 seeking and illustrated by the following excerpts:  
28  
29

30  
31  
32 *Practitioner: "Yes, it's convincing every parent that this [pathway] is good because*  
33 *some parents don't want a label or don't want to admit things. But the majority want*  
34 *to embrace it. Some parents will go 'no way!' and it could be that they are the ones*  
35 *that are flagged up."*  
36  
37

38 *Teacher: "Parents should be talking to us about if they're concerned. It shouldn't*  
39 *have to wait for this sort of intervention but often it does because families aren't*  
40 *always very good at that. Some families like to cover [up] these things and that's*  
41 *what you are aiming to unpick isn't it is where families like to downplay or deflect*  
42 *when there really are problems."*  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 On the other hand, parents who had faced challenges previously in accessing formal  
50  
51 help for their child reported that, as a result, their relationship with their child's school had  
52  
53  
54 sometimes become strained or they lacked confidence in formal psychological  
55  
56  
57 services/interventions. Concerns about the steps of the pathway, such as what data would be  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 collected, from whom, and whether they would be shared outside the research team were  
5  
6  
7 frequently described by parents. The excerpt below illustrates the potential stigma-related  
8  
9  
10 concerns parents may have and how this could be mitigated by clear guidance:

11  
12  
13 *Parent: "I guess the issue that some parents might have is where that information is*  
14 *going to be shared, there might be parents thinking 'oh I don't want a secondary*  
15 *school to know about, I don't want this to go on their records. I don't want them to be*  
16 *labelled in some way through this' .... I guess just [being] really explicit in the*  
17 *communication [to families] that this is just for your benefit, your child's benefit. It's*  
18 *not something that will label you or be recorded by school."*  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 To overcome these participation concerns, several information sessions (e.g. Y4  
25  
26  
27 assembly, parents evenings, teacher briefings) were delivered to provide clear guidance about  
28  
29  
30 the pathway (including data sharing procedures), answer questions and allay concerns. As  
31  
32  
33  
34 parents and staff had many demands on their time and some sessions were poorly attended,  
35  
36  
37 we made brief information videos, and these were circulated amongst school staff and Y4  
38  
39  
40  
41 parents. Researchers also provided their contact details and encouraged staff/parents to get in  
42  
43  
44 touch with any further questions or concerns. Going forwards, it was also felt by  
45  
46  
47  
48 practitioners, teaching staff, and parents that an opt-out approach to screening (where all Y4  
49  
50  
51 children are included unless parents request for them not to be), rather than the opt-in  
52  
53  
54 approach used, would make the pathway feel more inclusive and help overcome stigma-  
55  
56  
57 related barriers to participation. One parent described how opt-out would still allow parents  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 who were concerned to withdraw their children whilst providing most children the chance to  
5  
6  
7 participate:

8  
9  
10 *Parent: "I think our daughter would have liked the opportunity to do [the*  
11 *questionnaire] and for someone to say 'that's OK, there isn't a right or wrong it's*  
12 *just about how you feel' ... I think it should be part of the curriculum long term but...*  
13 *opt-out is the better option of what you have at the moment....Because if you feel*  
14 *really strongly, you still have that opportunity to pull your child out of it, but why*  
15 *you'd want to I just don't know."*  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 **Research phase: screening.** Once schools and parents had agreed to the delivery of the  
22  
23  
24 pathway, concerns were then encountered regarding the feasibility of delivering screening  
25  
26  
27 questionnaires for child anxiety problems in classroom settings. Parents in Stage 1 were  
28  
29  
30 concerned about the validity and content of the child screening questionnaires and whether  
31  
32  
33 child report was reliable. Whereas children participating in Stage 1 focus groups expressed  
34  
35  
36 concerns about whether there would be adequate privacy to fill in paper questionnaires in the  
37  
38  
39 classroom. Children were also concerned that sharing one's fears and worries may lead to  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 negative outcomes, as one child describes:

46  
47  
48 *Child: "Sometimes your worries can either be small worries which sometimes you*  
49 *can tell them but sometimes if they're big worries, like I've had some big worries*  
50 *before, I think you should probably just keep it to yourself....I would normally keep*  
51 *all my worries to myself because... if you keep it private then no one else is going to*  
52 *fiddle around with it and make it even worse."*  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 In response to privacy concerns, the research team made it possible for the Stage 2  
5  
6  
7 parent/child/teacher report screening questionnaires to be completed online using a secure  
8  
9  
10 platform (Qualtrics). Participating children and teachers in Stage 4 interviews ultimately did  
11  
12  
13 not describe experiencing concerns about classroom privacy. This early amendment was also  
14  
15  
16 especially opportune as it allowed families/staff to continue to participate from their homes  
17  
18  
19 when CV-19 restrictions and school closures later came into effect. Nonetheless, practitioners  
20  
21  
22 highlighted that some families may lack access to or confidence using online technology, and  
23  
24  
25 this may exclude some from participating.  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 To address parental concerns about the screening questionnaire content, we provided  
31  
32  
33 clear information about the content and purpose of the self-report questionnaires prior to  
34  
35  
36 consent. Parents were not routinely provided with a copy of their child's questionnaire  
37  
38  
39 responses, but researchers made a blank copy of the child-report questionnaire available on  
40  
41  
42 the study website so that there was transparency about questionnaire content. The  
43  
44  
45 triangulation of teacher, child, and parent report was considered by many participants to be a  
46  
47  
48 strength of the pathway as this thorough approach was seen as more reliable and  
49  
50  
51 comprehensive than a single point of view. One parent described the benefits of multiple  
52  
53  
54 reports below:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *Parent: As a teacher [myself], I used to feel very much that I knew things about my*  
5 *students that their parents didn't know because...I spent more waking hours with them*  
6 *than their parents did. And so I know your child, I can give you my observations*  
7 *confidently....I suppose an accurate picture of a child's disposition can't come from just*  
8 *one person because of the differences between being at home and school. So... I suppose*  
9 *I think that it's right that [the teacher] did [the teacher-report questionnaire] because*  
10 *anyone trying to help my daughter, if she needs help, needs to have as holistic a picture*  
11 *as possible.*  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Nonetheless, teachers stressed the many demands on their time and were concerned that  
18  
19 they would not have capacity to deliver information about the screening and pathway to the  
20  
21 class, support children in filling in their screening questionnaires, as well as complete  
22  
23 screening questionnaires on behalf of each participating child. In response to these concerns,  
24  
25 the research team attended the school to deliver the information session, screening  
26  
27 questionnaire administration, and answer any questions. However, due to CV-19 restrictions,  
28  
29 it was not possible for the research team to visit the third school in person. Where families  
30  
31 completed the questionnaires remotely and had queries, teaching staff were encouraged to  
32  
33 contact the research team who helped staff to draft replies. In Stage 4, teachers reported  
34  
35 feeling that the questionnaires were easy to access, were not time consuming, and research  
36  
37 team presence for questionnaire administration was efficient and reassuring. As one teacher  
38  
39 notes:  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 *Teacher: "Yes, I think [taking part] didn't feel onerous in any way. I think is the upshot*  
58 *because so often again when you get embroiled in these things you realise that the paper*  
59 *filling and the time it takes is the thing that you hadn't anticipated. But [the pathway]*  
60

1  
2  
3 *didn't seem to take up any time at all in that sense...I didn't notice any issues with*  
4 *feedback, with admin or anything at all. So very positive from our perspective in that*  
5 *sense."*  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **Research phase: feeding back screening outcomes.** Receiving feedback about the  
11  
12 likelihood of a child meeting criteria for anxiety problems based on the screening scores was  
13  
14 a key issue for many participants. Participating parents described that for some the news that  
15  
16 their child had a likely anxiety problem was expected and feedback confirming this was  
17  
18 reassuring. Other parents felt this feedback may be unexpected and distressing and may lead  
19  
20 to feelings of self-blame or guilt. Practitioners highlighted the need for this feedback to be  
21  
22 delivered sensitively and reassuringly to parents, with an emphasis on the availability of an  
23  
24 evidence-based intervention. In response to these concerns, the research team sought input  
25  
26 from the dedicated stakeholder group into the contents of the feedback letter and a follow up  
27  
28 phone call with parents was also carried out to discuss any additional concerns or questions  
29  
30 parents may have. This parent describes how they found receiving feedback to be a helpful,  
31  
32 validating experience:  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 *Parent: I think we found the feedback really helpful. It was particularly helpful just*  
51 *because it felt like it validated some of the concerns that we have had... I think we just*  
52 *thought well...like no one is asking us how bad this is and so it must just not be that bad.*  
53 *So, to get the numbers back and to see oh our concerns are right, there are some numbers*  
54 *here that are quite alarming. I think we found that quite helpful.*  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 Due to CV-19 school closures, the research team provided feedback to families directly  
5  
6  
7 via letter followed up with a telephone call. Stage 3 and 4 interviews with parents described  
8  
9  
10 feedback from the research team to be acceptable as researchers were seen as knowledgeable  
11  
12  
13 about child mental health and were also a neutral party, independent from the school – a  
14  
15  
16 feature that was particularly important if the family had had difficulties accessing support  
17  
18  
19 from the school in the past. This feeling is illustrated in the following excerpt:  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 *Parent: I think [the feedback is] better coming from you than from the school because you*  
25 *are not involved. I mean, I know you are involved, but you are not the teacher, you are*  
26 *not the headteacher, you are not the school cook, you are not to do with school....Not one*  
27 *of the pupil's neighbours parents or something so you are neutral. I think it's better*  
28 *coming from you.*  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Research team feedback to parents directly, rather than school staff delivery, was also felt  
34  
35  
36 to protect families' privacy. On the other hand, school staff reported concerns that they had a  
37  
38  
39 duty of care to fulfil and should be informed which children met criteria for likely anxiety  
40  
41  
42 problems. To address both parties' concerns, where the parent consented, the research team  
43  
44  
45 provided schools with a copy of the feedback letter sent to each family, but staff were  
46  
47  
48 otherwise not informed whether a family chose to take up the intervention. Parents were also  
49  
50  
51 fully informed prior to participation about confidentiality and its limits, including what  
52  
53  
54 information would and would not be shared with the school by the research team.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 In a similar vein, practitioners and school staff expressed concerns that some parents of  
5  
6  
7 children with likely anxiety problems may refuse the intervention or drop-out. These children  
8  
9  
10 were considered to be most vulnerable as well as most likely to benefit from the intervention.  
11  
12  
13 These parents were seen by some school staff and practitioners as uncaring or ‘bad’ parents,  
14  
15  
16 rather than as parents who were simply too overwhelmed to engage with the intervention or  
17  
18  
19 had had poor experiences of engaging with services in the past. This pattern of concern  
20  
21  
22 highlights the balance that must be struck in a co-designed pathway between recognising and  
23  
24  
25 responding to varying stakeholder concerns while accepting that all participants have a right  
26  
27  
28 to refuse an intervention. Nonetheless, practitioners highlighted that sensitive delivery of  
29  
30  
31 screening feedback, and a positively framed offer of optional formal support, may increase  
32  
33  
34 future help-seeking even amongst parents who refuse the pathway intervention.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39  
40 *Practitioner: “I think there’s something about the message of help isn’t it and being able*  
41 *to provide a nice experience of accepting help or not accepting help so that when the*  
42 *family is ready or maybe when the child is old enough to opt-in on their own that they’ll*  
43 *still have that positive memory.”*  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 **Research phase: delivery of online intervention.** Participating parents highlighted that the  
50  
51  
52 CV-19 context influenced their experience of the online intervention that was offered as part  
53  
54  
55 of the pathway. For example, many parents reported being more comfortable working  
56  
57  
58 remotely and the online intervention was, therefore, seen as more acceptable and accessible.  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 The weekly phone calls from the CWP were also felt by parents to be an essential part of the  
5  
6  
7 intervention process, personalising their experience of the online modules, and maintaining  
8  
9  
10 their family's engagement with the modules. Nonetheless, the CV-19 social distancing  
11  
12  
13 restrictions meant many parents reported not having the opportunity to speak with friends or  
14  
15  
16 school staff informally about their experience of the pathway. The adjunct of social support,  
17  
18  
19 such as via a closed peer support group for parents, was considered to be a valuable  
20  
21  
22 component to consider in future studies, as this parent describes:  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 *Parent: "I think the creation of a group would definitely help some people...I think*  
28 *there are people that would like to have those conversations within a safe space...*  
29 *and you know that other families are having...experiences that aren't too dissimilar*  
30 *to you and having that just makes it a bit more relaxing and it gives you the*  
31 *opportunity to open up about certain things. I think it's helpful to relax the worries*  
32 *that perhaps parents can have and it's not always your fault and it's not always what*  
33 *you are doing it's sometimes just having that openness just makes it easier."*  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 Consistent with previous studies (e.g. [9]), parents described concerns about the  
40  
41  
42 availability of follow-on support and how they would manage any residual anxiety problems  
43  
44  
45 their child may have once they completed the intervention. Similarly, several professionals  
46  
47  
48 expressed concerns about how families who were still struggling despite completing the  
49  
50  
51 pathway would be adequately supported. Nonetheless, this finding underscores the  
52  
53  
54 importance of having steps in place to support families beyond the intervention stage for the  
55  
56  
57 screening/intervention pathway to be considered acceptable. A core component of the present  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 intervention pathway was to teach parents skills and strategies to support their child beyond  
5  
6  
7 the intervention. Moreover, a pre-planned component of the intervention was for the study  
8  
9  
10 CWP to contact families one month post-intervention to check in, and the content of the  
11  
12  
13 check in call was amended to ensure troubleshooting could be carried out as well as making  
14  
15  
16  
17 referrals to further formal support where necessary.

18  
19  
20 *Parent: "I think the fact is that even though you are discharging [families] if you identify*  
21 *that they need more help then you are going to point them in the right direction, aren't*  
22 *you? So, they aren't just being left in limbo which is important."*  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 **Research phase: identifying and addressing potential secondary impacts of pathway.** The  
28  
29  
30 pathway was generally perceived and experienced as a positive and helpful opportunity for  
31  
32  
33 families to support their child with anxiety problems. However, concerns were expressed that  
34  
35  
36 the delivery of a screening/intervention pathway in schools could cause some children to be  
37  
38  
39 labelled or bullied. Some practitioners felt this could be due to poor mental health literacy  
40  
41  
42 within schools, while parents described that bullying or labelling could arise if their data,  
43  
44  
45 such as whether their family were involved in the intervention, were shared across school  
46  
47  
48 staff. Nonetheless, the introduction of the pathway to a school was considered by parents,  
49  
50  
51 teachers, and practitioners to be an opportunity to improve a school community's  
52  
53  
54 understanding of mental health. The research team acted on these insights by providing clear  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 information about confidentiality as well as psychoeducation at several stages throughout the  
5  
6  
7 pathway, including during parent and teacher briefings and within the information sheets.  
8  
9

10 The research team also delivered an in-class lesson focusing on psychoeducation about  
11  
12  
13 anxiety problems and problem solving to Y4 children following the screening session. A  
14  
15  
16 reduction in mental health-related stigma in schools is a frequently cited benefit of school  
17  
18  
19 screening/interventions [33]. Whether stigma is reduced in primary school settings following  
20  
21  
22 the implementation of such a pathway has yet to be evaluated but is an important direction  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 for future research.  
28  
29

30 *Professional: "I would hope that it would reduce the stigma around it and I would hope*  
31 *that it would be something that other parents would be interested in finding out more*  
32 *about and that as those children progress through school they can take what they've*  
33 *learnt with their parents and use it so that when they get to secondary school... to prevent*  
34 *it from being such an issue then."*  
35  
36  
37

38 In Table 3 below, we present each research phase and detail the challenges, mitigations,  
39  
40  
41 and lessons learned in each phase informed by the co-design process.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 3.** Challenges, mitigations and lessons learned from qualitative data collections

Challenges encountered	How we mitigated these	Lessons learned
<b>Research phase: appraising the existing need for support and context</b>		
Parents/teachers may not recognise anxiety as a problem	Offering universal screening for the Y4 class	Universal screening offered a way to identify children who may be struggling with anxiety, but difficulties were not previously recognised as such
Parents may not know how to access help for their child	Integrated pathway for screening and intervention so families are offered help if potential difficulties were identified.	Schools and families were receptive to a screening programme if an intervention to problems found was also being offered
Formal support may not be easily accessible	Integrated pathway included screening and intervention so families would not need to be referred elsewhere to access support for anxiety problems. Rapid contact with a mental health professional was available to support further signposting to resources and further services if required. Intervention was made available to all families interested in taking it up, not solely those who screened positive for a likely anxiety problem.	An inclusive offer for access to a low level intervention was of interest to families, even those who did not have a child who screened positive for a likely problem. Low level or early mental health interventions may not be sufficient for complex needs cases and team must be prepared to provide resources and make referrals as part of the intervention.
<b>Research phase: engaging schools</b>		
School staff are bombarded with offers for mental health interventions	Used university logos on materials, refer to previous evidence, and offer face-to-face meetings with staff to answer questions	Future studies should take steps to ensure school-based screening/intervention studies are seen as credible and trustworthy to schools

bmjopen-2021-058088 on 21 June 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on December 1, 2022 by guest. Protected by copyright.

<p>Schools are under considerable and changing CV-19 pressures to provide children with mental health care</p>	<p>Pathway incorporates an efficient intervention to be offered to families in cases where children met criteria for likely anxiety problems, and which can be delivered remotely.</p>	<p>There is an increasing demand for schools to offer accessible mental health support to children and young people due to CV-19 and a screening/intervention pathway may be especially welcome as a consequence.</p>
<p><b>Research phase: participant recruitment</b></p>		
<p>There may be stigma around mental health problems and help seeking. There may be a lack of trust in formal services and interventions where families have had negative previous experiences.</p>	<p>Universal screening was offered to Y4 within a supported information session at school. Information was shared with parents and school staff explaining all procedures, including guidance to address data sharing concerns.</p>	<p>‘Opt out’ (rather than ‘opt in’) was considered to be a more inclusive approach for engaging families - i.e. all children are included unless parents/carers request for them not to be. Parents/carers are given clear information and opportunities to ‘opt out’.</p>
<p>Schools and families may not have a good understanding of mental health</p>	<p>Training materials were provided to staff about the project which included psychoeducation. Staff training briefing, including in-person meetings, telephone calls, and a short information video was offered. Assembly, an in-class lesson and parent evenings were offered to provide psychoeducation to children and parents/carers.</p>	<p>Brief video about the pathway and the steps involved was considered more accessible and engaging than an information sheet. School staff reported not being approached by families to ask questions about the pathway but nonetheless staff appreciated being informed about how the pathway operated. Being able to contact the research team and receive personalised feedback was valued and allayed parents’ concerns.</p>
<p>Parents did not attend information sessions or reported not hearing about the project</p>	<p>Brief information video about the project made and posted online and circulated via school mailing lists</p>	<p>Delivery of information in a varied and accessible format (e.g. information video) is preferred by parents who often have many competing demands on their time</p>
<p><b>Research phase: screening</b></p>		

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

<p>Concerns about the accuracy and content of screening questionnaires</p>	<p>Underpinning work to improve accuracy and content of screening measures (with stakeholder involvement). Clear information was provided to parents and teachers about the content and purpose of the questionnaires in advance. Parents had the option for their child to complete the questionnaire at home with them instead of in class. Screening for likely case criteria was done by encouraging parent, child, and teacher completion of the screening questionnaires to provide a more complete picture of the child's difficulties. Language for communicating about screening developed with stakeholders to ensure sensitivity.</p>	<p>Researchers must be transparent and clear when giving information to families and school to ensure school-based screening/intervention studies are understood and are credible and trustworthy. It is important to stakeholders that multiple views about a child's anxiety are heard to reflect the different experiences in different contexts.</p>
<p>Schools feel unable to offer a screening session in classrooms</p>	<p>Dedicated team facilitate administration of screening questionnaire session in small groups outside the classroom. Information assembly and in-class lesson provided by research team to explain what the questionnaires were for in context of wider psychoeducation.</p>	<p>Having a dedicated team presence can feel reassuring to teachers who may lack confidence in having mental health related discussions. This approach may also reduce burden for staff.</p>
<p>Concerns about adequate privacy during screening questionnaire completion</p>	<p>The option of completion of screening questionnaire at home via online/paper was also offered to children. Option to complete in classroom on a tablet offered.</p>	<p>Participating children ultimately did not report privacy concerns if they completed the questionnaires at school (pre-CV-19). Children enjoyed taking part in the study and feeling 'part of the pathway'. Having the option for their child to complete at home was felt to be reassuring for parents. Tablet option was considered more engaging as well as ensuring privacy</p>



<p>Concerns about the ability of families to take part when schools moved to remote learning due to CV-19</p>	<p>Schools were provided with information sheets and envelopes to mail home to families as schools reported that families were inundated with emails and postal communication was preferred (although this was not taken up by families). Online questionnaires were delivered via a user-friendly and secure platform. The dedicated team were available and responded quickly to teacher/ parent questions about the study and accessing the questionnaires.</p>	<p>Responding to parental needs, such as being overwhelmed by emails, and delivering information via other channels, helped to disseminate accessible information about the study. Responding quickly to concerns helped to continue families' and staff interest and trust in the project. Families found that due to increased remote working and school work, completion of online questionnaires for the study was not challenging and they did not have concerns about data being stored online. Postal response rate was low (during CV-19 restrictions).</p>
<p><b>Research phase: feedback of screening outcomes</b></p>		
<p>School staff have considerable pre-existing demands on their time</p>	<p>Dedicated team delivers feedback to families about screening questionnaires directly</p>	<p>Families found feedback from the CWP directly to be acceptable as the practitioner was seen as a neutral party, independent of the school, and could answer their queries</p>
<p>Parents may find the feedback surprising or may be distressed to hear that their child has possible anxiety problems</p>	<p>Stakeholders gave input into the content of the feedback letter to families. This letter was followed up by a phone call to discuss any concerns and answer questions</p>	<p>Feedback of screening questionnaire scores may be a shocking (or validating) moment for families and research teams should be prepared to approach the subject sensitively.</p>
<p>Parents of children who screen positive for likely anxiety problems may choose not to take up the intervention</p>	<p>Future help seeking is encouraged by making it clear that treatment is potentially accessible. Resources are provided which could be useful in future. A psychoeducation lesson is provided to all children including simple guidance on managing anxiety.</p>	<p>Future studies should consider what appropriate steps can be taken to support child anxiety problems where parents are not able to participate in the intervention for any reason.</p>

<p>Parents of children who screen positive for a likely problem may feel they are being forced to take up the intervention</p>	<p>Important to highlight that the intervention is optional and that the school/other services will not be informed whether or not they choose to be involved in the intervention</p>	<p>It is essential that clear information is given about confidentiality (and its limits) and data sharing to reassure families. Researchers should be conscious and sensitive that not all families may have positive supportive relationships with their child's school/services</p>
<p>School staff feel they should be informed about the children meeting criteria for potential anxiety problems to fulfil their duty of care</p>	<p>School staff are copied in to feedback letters that are sent to families where parents consented</p>	<p>School will have procedures in place to fulfil their duty of care to children that must be considered when identifying potential child anxiety problems</p>
<p><b>Research phase: delivery of online intervention</b></p>		
<p>Parents feel they would benefit from peer support</p>	<p>This potential add on was explored with parents and what format this would be preferred given CV-19 social distancing restrictions (e.g. WhatsApp, Facebook group)</p>	<p>Future studies should bear in mind the context in which parents engage with mental health interventions and that they may find informal peer support valuable for themselves as well</p>
<p>Lack of school attendance due to CV-19 removed many sources of children's anxieties</p>	<p>Information highlighted that skills learnt in the parent intervention will be applicable for the future. Responses to routine parent questionnaires needed to be interpreted in the context of CV-19 circumstances (e.g. children not attending school)</p>	<p>It is essential to be prepared to adapt or respond when measures are not applicable to the context</p>
<p>Parents may not feel an online intervention is acceptable as opposed to more traditional face-to-face support</p>	<p>Families were informed that the intervention that was being delivered online was based on a widely used treatment</p>	<p>Parents found the online intervention to be acceptable and it often fitted better around their schedules than face-to-face support. Weekly phone calls from the CWP were felt to be essential to personalise the experience and maintain momentum</p>

<p>Parents are concerned about next steps to support their child once the intervention modules are completed</p>	<p>CWP highlighted that referrals would be made for further support if needed after the intervention. A phone call from wellbeing practitioner was delivered at four week follow up to embed learning and offer guidance.</p>	<p>It will be important to be prepared to support making referrals on to other local services if the intervention offered does not entirely resolve child's difficulties</p>
<p><b>Research phase: assessing secondary impacts of pathway</b></p>		
<p>Concern that involvement in the study may lead to children being labelled or bullied</p>	<p>Clear information provided to teachers, children, and families via school assembly, in-class lesson and information sheets which includes psychoeducation about mental health. Confidentiality is explained to families, including what data will and will not be shared with the school</p>	<p>It is important to be mindful that mental health stigma is an endemic issue but providing psychoeducation as part of the school-based screening/intervention represents an opportunity to improve language around and understanding of mental health</p>
<p>Ensuring that the pathway maximises potential for wide and long-term benefits, e.g. through increased mental health literacy in school context</p>	<p>Psychoeducation provided about mental health in several stages, including during teacher training about the project, parent information sheets and feedback, as well as during the assembly and class lesson for children</p>	<p>There is the potential for school communities to have improved emotional and mental health literacy via the dissemination of linked psychoeducation. Future evaluations should aim to track changes over time in mental health stigma in schools - such as before and after study implementation - and tailor their psychoeducation and information sheets accordingly.</p>

Note. Y4 = Year four.

## Discussion

Using co-design and data collection from multiple sources, we identified several key barriers and facilitators to participation for both schools and families, including difficulties accessing (or delivering) reliable mental health support for children; concerns about mental health-related stigma; concerns about the trustworthiness and effectiveness of the pathway; and the adverse impact of CV-19 restrictions on participation. Our iterative co-design approach allowed for the research team to actively respond to users' concerns which may have ultimately improved how the pathway procedures were experienced. As described in Table 3, the developed pathway ultimately consisted of: (i) the circulation of credible and transparent study information and psychoeducation in a variety of formats to school staff, children, and parents; (ii) screening for anxiety problems using child, teacher, and parent report online and paper questionnaires; (iii) the sensitive delivery of written and verbal feedback to parents directly regarding screening questionnaire outcomes; and (iv) the offer and delivery of a brief parent-led intervention.

Our findings offer key lessons for future studies aiming to deliver engaging and sustainable school-based screening and intervention procedures. For example, our study

1  
2  
3 demonstrated that despite recent studies which have found that parents are the most effective  
4  
5  
6  
7 reporters to identify anxiety diagnoses among pre-adolescent children [20,34], our  
8  
9  
10 participants considered that the inclusion and triangulation of parents/child/teacher report on  
11  
12  
13 screening questionnaires was valuable. This highlights that future studies may need to strike a  
14  
15  
16 balance between what is psychometrically reliable and what procedures feel valid and  
17  
18  
19 meaningful to participants themselves to bolster engagement. Moreover, we found that  
20  
21  
22 parents were especially concerned about data privacy and sharing – particularly if they had  
23  
24  
25 previously had negative experiences with their child’s school or formal services. The need to  
26  
27  
28 share participant data with school staff in order to meet their duty of care had to be carefully  
29  
30  
31 weighed against parents’ concerns about them or their child being labelled or judged and a  
32  
33  
34 desire for privacy. In response, the research team opted for transparency, providing parents  
35  
36  
37 with clear information about what data would (and would not) be shared with whom, with  
38  
39  
40 consent obtained for this at the outset. CV-19 restrictions meant that the research team  
41  
42  
43 provided screening feedback to parents directly about the screening outcomes and this  
44  
45  
46 improvised solution was found to be preferable to families to feedback being given by school  
47  
48  
49 staff. Future screening/intervention efforts may benefit from using an independent source  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 (e.g. not connected to the school) who is knowledgeable about child mental health to deliver  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 feedback to parents. Furthermore, receiving feedback on screening outcomes was found to  
5  
6  
7 be a crucial part of the pathway which if done well, could facilitate engagement with the  
8  
9  
10 intervention and/or encourage future help-seeking. Knowledge of which research phase(s)  
11  
12  
13 and elements of the screening/intervention pathway may be especially critical – and produce  
14  
15  
16 potential long term positive outcomes - for participants may help to guide future studies.  
17  
18  
19  
20 Taken together, these points underscore the need for evaluations to include consideration of  
21  
22  
23 the implications of procedures, involving stakeholders and users in actively considering what  
24  
25  
26 broader (and perhaps unexpected) outcome the steps taken may have.  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 In the present study, our use of co-design presented a number of benefits and  
32  
33  
34 challenges, as well as transferrable learning points that may be applicable to other studies. A  
35  
36  
37 core strength of using a co-design approach is that it allows for the recognition that users may  
38  
39  
40 have a variety of pre-existing and conflicting beliefs and concerns about mental health and  
41  
42  
43 help-seeking and ensures that these concerns are heard and can be effectively responded to  
44  
45  
46 [12]. In the present study, we were able to gain an in-depth understanding about what barriers  
47  
48  
49 and facilitators for pathway engagement exist and to co-create solutions with our participants.  
50  
51  
52  
53 For example, stigma-related concerns were expressed regarding the screening process which  
54  
55  
56  
57 led to the recommendation that an ‘opt out’ approach may be more inclusive. Our ‘fast and  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 direct' analytic approach meant the pathway procedures could be quickly and meaningfully  
4  
5  
6 adapted in response to feedback to help ensure optimal user engagement. The co-design  
7  
8  
9 methodology used also allowed for the collection of data from a broad range of users  
10  
11  
12 (parents, children, teachers, practitioners) at various stages of the pathway, providing in-  
13  
14  
15 depth insight into their experiences and concerns at each research stage. The inclusion of a  
16  
17  
18 range of perspectives highlighted that some school staff and practitioners may have very  
19  
20  
21 different views from families about the potential risks and benefits to a screening/intervention  
22  
23  
24 pathway. For example, a number of school staff and practitioners expressed beliefs that a  
25  
26  
27 screening process was beneficial as some parents may downplay or deflect child anxiety  
28  
29  
30 difficulties, while parents described school staff dismissing their concerns. Incorporating  
31  
32  
33 multiple views via co-design paints a fuller picture of the context in which a  
34  
35  
36 screening/intervention pathway is being introduced and can allow for key contextual factors  
37  
38  
39 to be recognised and considered. The inclusion of stakeholders as members of the research  
40  
41  
42 team also provided valuable guidance in shaping the initial 'blueprint' of the  
43  
44  
45 screening/intervention procedures which were further refined in subsequent focus groups and  
46  
47  
48 interviews. However, this inclusive approach to data collection did yield a considerable  
49  
50  
51 amount of data which could be challenging to manage and meaningfully report. Given the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 amount of research data that goes unpublished (or ‘research waste’ [35]), this is a  
4  
5  
6  
7 consideration for future studies.  
8  
9

10           This study has several strengths and limitations. Amongst the strengths is the  
11  
12 inclusion of key stakeholders in the research team who not only provided guidance on  
13  
14 procedures but also supported the development of sensitive participant-facing documents and  
15  
16 procedures but also supported the development of sensitive participant-facing documents and  
17  
18 interpretation of data. A second strength is the range of participant views included using  
19  
20 multiple eliciting techniques and different time points, allowing concerns to be well captured  
21  
22 and responded to. Third, the research team were able to adapt to the unforeseen social  
23  
24 distancing restrictions imposed following CV-19 – for example, by carrying out data  
25  
26 collection remotely – and our findings and adaptations may be useful to future studies that are  
27  
28 likely face similar difficulties for the foreseeable future. However, given the changes that  
29  
30 were made, it is unclear how our adapted pathway procedures would be received by schools  
31  
32 and families in ‘normal’ circumstances. That said, CV-19 has led to an increased demand for  
33  
34 child mental health services [36] and the screening/intervention pathway procedures that have  
35  
36 been developed here may ultimately have a beneficial impact in improving child mental  
37  
38 health and delivering support to families through schools.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 Another strength of this study was the inclusion of schools in Stages 2-4 that had  
5  
6  
7 varying numbers of children with Special Educational Needs and relatively high numbers of  
8  
9  
10 children with English as an additional language (who may generally be underrepresented in  
11  
12  
13 research); however, schools with high numbers of pupils eligible for free school meals due to  
14  
15  
16 low family incomes were underrepresented [26]. Despite the targeted recruitment of parents  
17  
18  
19 in challenging circumstances (e.g. foster parents, military connected parents), our sample  
20  
21  
22 may not capture the diverse views of families with different backgrounds and who are living  
23  
24  
25 in different circumstances. Moreover, possibly due to families being overwhelmed or difficult  
26  
27  
28 to contact due to CV-19 restrictions, we were unable to meet some of our recruitment targets  
29  
30  
31 (e.g. for parents who chose not to participate in the pathway). Thus, comparatively little is  
32  
33  
34 known about why some families may chose not to take participate in the pathway and, as  
35  
36  
37 many of these families are likely to be those who could benefit the most, it is important that  
38  
39  
40 researchers establish how best to capture their perspectives in future research.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Despite these limitations, this study adds to the literature in several ways. First, it  
48  
49  
50 illustrates that a screening/intervention pathway for child mental health problems in schools  
51  
52  
53 *can* be inclusively co-designed in partnership with parents, children, school staff and mental  
54  
55  
56 health practitioners. Given the sensitive and often stigmatised nature of mental health  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 screening and treatment, this study highlights that a methodological approach such as co-  
5  
6  
7 design can lead to an in-depth understanding of users concerns and the co-creation of  
8  
9  
10 solutions, optimising study procedures and improving the chances of successful  
11  
12  
13 implementation. A well-designed screening/intervention pathway may bridge the gap  
14  
15  
16 between children and families' needs for and access to early mental health treatment which is  
17  
18  
19 pressingly required given the extensive waiting lists and high thresholds for accepting  
20  
21  
22 referrals for many specialist services [37]. Finally, the findings from this study underscore  
23  
24  
25 that there may be tangible potential secondary benefits to offering a well-designed school-  
26  
27  
28 based screening/intervention pathway. An effective and acceptable pathway could not only  
29  
30  
31 foster child wellbeing but also promote future help-seeking, highlighting that school-based  
32  
33  
34 screening/intervention efforts for child mental health are both promising and worthwhile.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Future studies should systematically evaluate the co-designed pathway to examine whether  
41  
42  
43  
44 reductions in child mental health problems are achieved and if wider benefits are found.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- 1 Polanczyk G V., Salum GA, Sugaya LS, *et al.* Annual research review: A meta-analysis of the worldwide prevalence of mental disorders in children and adolescents. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry Allied Discip* 2015;**56**:345–65. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12381
- 2 Kessler RC, Amminger GP, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, *et al.* Age of onset of mental disorders: A review of recent literature. *Curr. Opin. Psychiatry.* 2007;**20**:359–64. doi:10.1097/YCO.0b013e32816ebc8c
- 3 Schwartz C, Barican J Lou, Yung D, *et al.* Systematic review Six decades of preventing and treating childhood anxiety disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis to inform policy and practice. *Based Ment Heal* 2019;**22**:103–10. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2019-300096
- 4 James AC, Reardon T, Soler A, *et al.* Cognitive behavioural therapy for anxiety disorders in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2020;**2020**. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013162.PUB2
- 5 Reardon T, Harvey K, Baranowska M, *et al.* What do parents perceive are the barriers and facilitators to accessing psychological treatment for mental health problems in children and adolescents? A systematic review of qualitative and quantitative studies.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Eur. Child Adolesc. Psychiatry. 2017;**26**. doi:10.1007/s00787-016-0930-6  
5  
6  
7 6 Costello EJ, He J, Sampson NA, *et al*. Services for Adolescents With Psychiatric  
8  
9  
10 Disorders: 12-Month Data From the National Comorbidity Survey–Adolescent.  
11  
12  
13 <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps201100518> 2014;**65**:359–66.  
14  
15  
16 doi:10.1176/APPI.PS.201100518  
17  
18  
19  
20 7 Levitt JM, Saka N, Hunter Romanelli L, *et al*. Early identification of mental health  
21  
22  
23 problems in schools: The status of instrumentation. *J Sch Psychol* 2007;**45**:163–91.  
24  
25  
26 doi:10.1016/J.JSP.2006.11.005  
27  
28  
29  
30 8 O’Brien D, Harvey K, Howse J, *et al*. Barriers to managing child and adolescent  
31  
32  
33 mental health problems: A systematic review of primary care practitioners’  
34  
35  
36 perceptions. *Br J Gen Pract* 2016;**66**:e693–707. doi:10.3399/bjgp16X687061  
37  
38  
39  
40 9 Sonesson E, Childs-Fegredo J, Anderson JK, *et al*. Acceptability of screening for  
41  
42  
43 mental health difficulties in primary schools: A survey of UK parents. *BMC Public*  
44  
45  
46 *Health*. 2018;**18**:1–12. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-6279-7  
47  
48  
49  
50 10 Kelleher KJ, Campo J V., Gardner WP. Management of pediatric mental disorders in  
51  
52  
53 primary care: Where are we now and where are we going? *Curr Opin Pediatr*  
54  
55  
56 2006;**18**:649–53. doi:10.1097/MOP.0B013E3280106A76  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 11 Bate P, Robert G. Toward More User-Centric OD: Lessons From the Field of  
5  
6  
7 Experience-Based Design and a Case Study.  
8  
9  
10 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306297014> 2016;**43**:41–66.  
11  
12  
13 doi:10.1177/0021886306297014  
14  
15  
16  
17 12 Palmer VJ, Chondros P, Piper D, *et al.* The CORE study protocol: A stepped wedge  
18  
19 cluster randomised controlled trial to test a co-design technique to optimise  
20  
21 psychosocial recovery outcomes for people affected by mental illness in the  
22  
23 community mental health setting. *BMJ Open* 2015;**5**:e006688. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-  
24  
25 2014-006688  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34 13 National Institute for Health Research. PPI (Patient and Public Involvement) resources  
35  
36 for applicants to NIHR research programmes. London: 2019.  
37  
38  
39  
40 [https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/ppi-patient-and-public-involvement-resources-for-](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/ppi-patient-and-public-involvement-resources-for-applicants-to-nihr-research-programmes/23437)  
41  
42  
43  
44 [applicants-to-nihr-research-programmes/23437](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/documents/ppi-patient-and-public-involvement-resources-for-applicants-to-nihr-research-programmes/23437) (accessed 2 Aug 2021).  
45  
46  
47  
48 14 Larkin M, Boden ZVR, Newton E. On the Brink of Genuinely Collaborative Care:  
49  
50 Experience-Based Co-Design in Mental Health.  
51  
52  
53 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049732315576494> 2015;**25**:1463–76.  
54  
55  
56  
57 doi:10.1177/1049732315576494  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 15 Gustavsson SM, Andersson T. Patient involvement 2.0: Experience-based co-design  
5  
6 supported by action research: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476750317723965>  
7  
8  
9  
10 2017;**17**:469–91. doi:10.1177/1476750317723965  
11  
12  
13  
14 16 Dewar B, Mackay R, Smith S, *et al.* Use of emotional touchpoints as a method of  
15  
16 tapping into the experience of receiving compassionate care in a hospital setting:  
17  
18 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1744987109352932> 2009;**15**:29–41.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23 doi:10.1177/1744987109352932  
24  
25  
26  
27 17 Dewa LH, Lavelle M, Pickles K, *et al.* Young adults' perceptions of using wearables,  
28  
29 social media and other technologies to detect worsening mental health: A qualitative  
30  
31 study. *PLoS One* 2019;**14**:e0222655. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0222655  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 18 Mulvale G, Moll S, Miatello A, *et al.* Co-designing Services for Youth With Mental  
38  
39 Health Issues: Novel Elicitation Approaches. doi:10.1177/1609406918816244  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44 19 Mulvale G, Green J, Miatello A, *et al.* Finding harmony within dissonance: Engaging  
45  
46 patients, family/caregivers and service providers in research to fundamentally  
47  
48 restructure relationships through integrative dynamics. *Heal Expect* 2021;**24**:147–60.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 20 Reardon T, Spence SH, Hesse J, *et al.* Identifying children with anxiety disorders using  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4 brief versions of the Spence Children's Anxiety Scale for children, parents, and  
5  
6  
7 teachers. *Psychol Assess* 2018;**30**:1342–55. doi:10.1037/pas0000570  
8  
9
- 21 20 Creswell C, Willetts L, Murray L, *et al*. Treatment of child anxiety: an exploratory  
21 study of the role of maternal anxiety and behaviours in treatment outcome. *Clin*  
22  
23 *Psychol Psychother* 2008;**15**:38–44. doi:10.1002/cpp.559  
24  
25
- 22 21 Thirlwall K, Cooper PJ, Karalus J, *et al*. Treatment of child anxiety disorders via  
22 guided parent-delivered cognitive-behavioural therapy: Randomised controlled trial.  
23  
24 *Br J Psychiatry* 2013;**203**:436–44. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.126698  
25  
26
- 23 20 Williamson V, Larkin M, Reardon T, *et al*. Codesign and development of a primary  
21 school based pathway for child anxiety screening and intervention delivery: a protocol,  
22  
23 mixed-methods feasibility study. *BMJ Open* 2021;**11**:e044852.  
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
- 24 21 Thirlwall K, Cooper P, Creswell C. Guided parent-delivered cognitive behavioral  
22 therapy for childhood anxiety: Predictors of treatment response. *J Anxiety Disord*  
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
- 25 20 Creswell C, Violato M, Fairbanks H, *et al*. Clinical outcomes and cost-effectiveness of  
21 brief guided parent-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy and solution-focused brief

- 1  
2  
3  
4 therapy for treatment of childhood anxiety disorders: a randomised controlled trial.  
5  
6  
7 *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2017;**4**:529–39. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30149-9  
8  
9
- 10 26 GOV. Schools, pupils and their characteristics, Academic Year 2019/20. GOV.UK.  
11  
12  
13 2020.[https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/school-pupils-](https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/school-pupils-and-their-characteristics)  
14  
15  
16  
17 and-their-characteristics (accessed 21 Sep 2021).  
18  
19
- 20 27 Salzano G, Passanisi S, Pira F, *et al.* Quarantine due to the COVID-19 pandemic from  
21  
22  
23 the perspective of adolescents: the crucial role of technology. *Ital J Pediatr* 2021 **471**  
24  
25  
26  
27 2021;**47**:1–5. doi:10.1186/S13052-021-00997-7  
28  
29
- 30 28 Kenny RM, Galloghly E, Porter CM, *et al.* ‘Living in a Zoom world’: Survey mapping  
31  
32  
33 how COVID-19 is changing family therapy practice in the UK. *J Fam Ther*  
34  
35  
36  
37 2021;**43**:272–94. doi:10.1111/1467-6427.12332  
38  
39
- 40 29 King N. Template analysis. G. Symon C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qual. methods Anal. Organ.*  
41  
42  
43  
44 Res. A Pract. Guid. (pp. 118–134). 1998;:118–34.[https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-](https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-02931-006)  
45  
46  
47 02931-006 (accessed 16 Jul 2021).  
48  
49
- 50 30 Reñosa MDC, Mwamba C, Meghani A, *et al.* Selfie consents, remote rapport, and  
51  
52  
53 Zoom debriefings: collecting qualitative data amid a pandemic in four resource-  
54  
55  
56  
57 constrained settings. *BMJ Glob Heal* 2021;**6**:e004193. doi:10.1136/BMJGH-2020-  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3  
4 004193  
5  
6  
7 31 Hackett CL, Mulvale G, Miatello A. Co-designing for quality: Creating a user-driven  
8  
9  
10 tool to improve quality in youth mental health services. *Heal Expect* 2018;**21**:1013–23.  
11  
12  
13 doi:10.1111/HEX.12694  
14  
15  
16  
17 32 Newlove-Delgado T, McManus S, Sadler K, *et al.* Child mental health in England  
18  
19  
20 before and during the COVID-19 lockdown. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2021;**8**:353–4.  
21  
22  
23 doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30570-8  
24  
25  
26  
27 33 Lindow JC, Hughes JL, South C, *et al.* The Youth Aware of Mental Health  
28  
29  
30 Intervention: Impact on Help Seeking, Mental Health Knowledge, and Stigma in U.S.  
31  
32  
33 Adolescents. *J Adolesc Heal* 2020;**67**:101–7. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.01.006  
34  
35  
36  
37 34 Nauta MH, Scholing A, Rapee RM, *et al.* A parent-report measure of children's  
38  
39  
40 anxiety: Psychometric properties and comparison with child-report in a clinic and  
41  
42  
43 normal sample. *Behav Res Ther* 2004;**42**:813–39. doi:10.1016/S0005-7967(03)00200-  
44  
45  
46  
47 6  
48  
49  
50  
51 35 Chen Y long, Yang K hu. Avoidable waste in the production and reporting of  
52  
53  
54 evidence. *Lancet*. 2009;**374**:786. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61591-9  
55  
56  
57  
58 36 Adegboye D, Williams F, Collishaw S, *et al.* Understanding why the COVID-19  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 pandemic-related lockdown increases mental health difficulties in vulnerable young  
5  
6  
7 children. *JCPP Adv* 2021;1:e12005. doi:10.1111/JCV2.12005  
8  
9

- 10  
11 37 Wise J. Progress on children's mental health services is too slow, says commissioner  
12  
13 for England. *BMJ* 2018;363:k4953. doi:10.1136/BMJ.K4953  
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

For peer review only





Figure 1. Overview of the co-design process for developing the school-based screening and intervention pathway

Note. Y4 = Year four.



**Figure 2**

Levels of investigation in co-design process

bmjopen-2021-058089 on 21 June 2022. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on December 3, 2022 by guest. Protected by copyright.

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

For peer review only

# BMJ Open

## School-based screening for childhood anxiety problems and intervention delivery: A co-design approach

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-058089.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Apr-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Williamson, Victoria; King's College London, Larkin, Michael; Aston University Reardon, Tessa; University of Oxford Medical Sciences Division, Experimental Psychology and Psychiatry Pearcey, Samantha; Oxford University Button, Roberta; University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology Green, Iheoma; University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology Hill, Claire; University of Reading Stallard, Paul; University of Bath, Department for Health Spence, Susan; Griffith University, Breen, Maria; University of Reading, School of Psychology & Clinical Language Sciences NIHR ARC South West Peninsula, University of Reading, Reading, RG6 6ALExeter, Exeter, EX1 2LU Mcdonald, Ian; Charlie Waller Institute Ukoumunne, Obioha; University of Exeter Medical School, NIHR CLAHRC South West Peninsula (PenCLAHRC) Ford, Tamsin; University of Cambridge, Department of Psychiatry Violato, Mara; University of Oxford, Department of Experimental Psychology Sniehotta, Falko; Newcastle University Stainer, Jason; Stanley Primary School, Stanley Primary School, Strathmore Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 8UH Gray, Alastair; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Population Health Brown, Paul; Bransgore C Of E Primary School, Ringwood Rd, Bransgore, Christchurch BH23 8JH Sancho, Michelle; West Berkshire Council, Council Offices, Market St, Newbury RG14 5LD Morgan, Fan; PACT Jasper, Bec; Square peg Creswell, Cathy; University of Oxford
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Paediatrics
Keywords:	EDUCATION & TRAINING (see Medical Education & Training), MENTAL HEALTH, PAEDIATRICS

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



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  
4 School-based screening for childhood anxiety problems and intervention delivery: A co-  
5  
6  
7 design approach  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

17 Williamson, V.<sup>a,b,m</sup>, Larkin, M.<sup>d \*</sup>, Tessa Reardon<sup>am</sup>, Samantha Pearcey<sup>a</sup>, Roberta Button<sup>a,m</sup>,  
18  
19  
20 Iheoma Green<sup>a,m</sup>, Claire Hill<sup>d</sup>, Paul Stallard<sup>c</sup>, Susan H. Spence<sup>f</sup>, Maria Breen<sup>d</sup>, Ian  
21  
22  
23 McDonald<sup>g</sup>, Obioha C Ukoumunne<sup>n</sup>, Tamsin Ford<sup>h</sup>, Mara Violato<sup>i</sup>, Falko F Sniehotta<sup>j</sup>, Jason  
24  
25  
26 Stainer<sup>k</sup>, Alastair Gray<sup>i</sup>, Paul Brown<sup>l</sup>, Michelle Sancho<sup>m</sup>, Fan Morgan<sup>q</sup>, Bec Jasper<sup>p</sup>,  
27  
28  
29  
30 Creswell, C. <sup>a,m</sup>  
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

<sup>a</sup> Department of Experimental Psychology, Anna Watts Building, University of Oxford,  
Oxford, OX2 6 GG

<sup>b</sup> Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, SE5  
9RJ

<sup>c</sup> Institute for Neurodevelopment and Health, Department of Psychology, Aston University,  
Birmingham, B4 7ET

1  
2  
3  
4 <sup>d</sup> School of Psychology & Clinical Language Sciences, University of Reading, Reading, RG6

5  
6  
7 6AL

8  
9  
10 <sup>e</sup> University of Bath, Claverton Down, Bath BA2 7AY

11  
12  
13 <sup>f</sup> Australian Institute of Suicide Research and Prevention and School of Applied Psychology,

14  
15  
16 Griffith University, Mount Gravatt, QLD 4121, AU

17  
18  
19  
20  
21 <sup>g</sup> Charlie Waller Memorial Trust, First Floor, Rear Office, 32 High Street, Thatcham RG19

22  
23  
24  
25 3JD

26  
27  
28 <sup>h</sup> Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

29  
30  
31 <sup>i</sup> Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Richard Doll Building,

32  
33  
34  
35 Old Road Campus, Oxford OX3 7LF | UK

36  
37  
38 <sup>j</sup> Population Health Science Institute, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University,

39  
40  
41  
42 Baddiley-Clark Building, Richardson Road, NE2 4AX

43  
44  
45 <sup>k</sup> Stanley Primary School, Strathmore Road, Teddington, Middlesex, TW11 8UH

46  
47  
48 <sup>l</sup> Bransgore C Of E Primary School, Ringwood Rd, Bransgore, Christchurch BH23 8JH

49  
50  
51  
52 <sup>m</sup> West Berkshire Council, Council Offices, Market St, Newbury RG14 5LD

53  
54  
55 <sup>n</sup> NIHR ARC South West Peninsula, University of Exeter, Heavitree Rd, Exeter EX1 2LU

56  
57  
58  
59 <sup>o</sup> Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, United Kingdom

1  
2  
3  
4 <sup>P</sup> PACT Parents and Carers Together CIC, UK  
5  
6

7 <sup>Q</sup> Square Peg (Team Square Peg CIC), UK  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13 **\*Correspondence:** Dr Michael Larkin, Department of Psychology, Aston University,  
14

15  
16  
17 Birmingham, B4 7ET, m.larkin@aston.ac.uk  
18  
19

20 **Funding:** This paper represents independent research funded by the National Institute for  
21  
22  
23 Health Research (NIHR) (CC) and hosted by Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust. CC and  
24  
25  
26 MV acknowledge support from the Oxford and Thames Valley NIHR Applied Research  
27  
28  
29 Collaboration. MV was partly supported by the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre.  
30  
31  
32 OU was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research  
33  
34  
35 Collaboration (ARC) for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care (CLAHRC) for the  
36  
37  
38 South West Peninsula at the Royal Devon and Exeter NHS Foundation Trust. The views  
39  
40  
41 expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the  
42  
43  
44 Department of Health and Social Care. AWARD/GRANT NUMBER IS NOT  
45  
46  
47

48 APPLICABLE.  
49  
50

51 **Competing interests:** Authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.  
52  
53

54  
55 **Data sharing statement:** No additional data are available.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 **Acknowledgements:** We would like to thank those who participated in our patient and public  
5  
6  
7 involvement (PPI) activities for their contribution to this research.  
8  
9

10 **Contributor statement:** All authors (VW, ML, TR, SP, RB, IG, CH, PS, SHS, MB, IM, OCU,  
11  
12  
13 TF, MV, FS, JS, AG, PB, MS, FM, JP, CC ) contributed to the study design. Authors (VW,  
14  
15  
16 ML, TR, CC, RB, IG, SP) contributed towards data collection & data analysis. All authors  
17  
18  
19 (VW, ML, TR, SP, RB, IG, CH, PS, SHS, MB, IM, OCU, TF, MV, FS, JS, AG, PB, MS,  
20  
21  
22 FM, JP, BJ, CC ) contributed towards the write up of the manuscript. All authors (VW, ML,  
23  
24  
25 TR, SP, RB, IG, CH, PS, SHS, MB, IM, OCU, TF, MV, FS, JS, AG, PB, MS, FM, JP, BJ,  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30 CC ) read and approved the manuscript prior to submission.  
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

## Abstract

**Objectives:** A very small proportion of children with anxiety problems receive evidence-based treatment. Barriers to access include difficulties with problem identification, concerns about stigma, a lack of clarity about how to access specialist services, and their limited availability. A school-based programme that integrates screening to identify those children who are most likely to be experiencing anxiety problems, with the offer of intervention, has the potential to overcome many of these barriers. This article is a process-based account of how we used co-design to develop a primary school-based screening and intervention programme for child anxiety problems.

**Design:** Co-design.

**Setting:** UK primary schools.

**Participants:** Data were collected from Year Four children (ages 8-9 years), parents, school staff and mental health practitioners.

1  
2  
3  
4 **Results:** We report how the developed programme was experienced and perceived by a range  
5  
6  
7 of users, including parents, children, school staff and mental health practitioners, as well as  
8  
9  
10 how the programme was adapted following user feedback.  
11  
12

13 **Conclusions:** We reflect on the mitigation techniques we employed, the lessons learnt from  
14  
15  
16 the co-design process, and give recommendations that may inform the development and  
17  
18  
19 implementation of future school-based screening and intervention programmes.  
20  
21  
22

23 **Keywords:** co-design, mental health, primary school, screening  
24  
25  
26

27 **Strengths and limitations of this study:**  
28  
29

- 30 • The co-design methodology used allowed for the collection of data from a broad  
31  
32  
33 range of users (parents, children, teachers, practitioners) at various stages of the study,  
34  
35  
36 providing in-depth insight into their experiences and concerns at each research stage.  
37  
38  
39
- 40 • Our use of co-design also yielded a number of transferrable learning points that may  
41  
42  
43 be applicable to other studies aiming to implement universal mental health screening  
44  
45  
46 and intervention in schools.  
47  
48  
49
- 50 • The inclusion of a range of participant perspectives highlighted that some school staff  
51  
52  
53 and practitioners may have very different views from families about the potential  
54  
55  
56 risks and benefits to a school-based mental health screening/intervention pathway.  
57  
58  
59  
60

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

For peer review only

## Introduction

Anxiety disorders are among the most prevalent mental health disorders experienced by children, with 6.5% of children globally meeting likely diagnostic criteria [1] and as many as half of lifetime anxiety disorders starting before a child leaves primary school [2]. Without intervention, anxiety disorders can persist into adulthood with deleterious implications for a child's social, educational, and familial functioning [3].

Effective treatments, such as cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT) [4], have been developed for childhood anxiety disorders, yet only a small proportion of children with anxiety disorders actually access services at all, let alone evidence-based treatment [5,6]. Barriers include problems with identification and difficulties in accessing treatment, including: parental concerns about children being labelled or families blamed for child difficulties; a lack of confidence or ability to identify likely child anxiety problems among primary care providers, school staff, or other professionals that children interact with; parental uncertainty about how to find reliable sources of support; and restricted access to specialist services due to narrow inclusion criteria or long waiting lists [3,5,7,8]. A school-based screening programme to identify children who are most likely to be experiencing anxiety problems and offer intervention seamlessly without families having to negotiate



1  
2  
3 routes to services has the potential to overcome many of these barriers. However, if carried  
4  
5  
6  
7 out poorly school-based screening programmes may also have poor uptake or inadvertent  
8  
9  
10 unintended consequences , such as increasing stigma or misidentification [9,10]. Designing  
11  
12  
13 engaging, acceptable, and well received procedures is therefore essential.  
14  
15  
16

17 For such a programme to be implemented, it must function efficiently, be safe and  
18  
19 reliable, and have the experiences of service users and stakeholders at the heart of programme  
20  
21 design and delivery [11]. This final criterion is best met by co-design - a method which aims  
22  
23  
24 to develop a thorough understanding of how stakeholders and service users perceive and  
25  
26  
27 experience the look, feel, and procedures of a service which is then used to inform the design  
28  
29  
30 and delivery of, and adaptations to, services [12]. This approach brings advantages over  
31  
32  
33 surveys or questionnaires of patient/stakeholder experiences of a service as it allows for an  
34  
35  
36 in-depth understanding of a service's potential shortcoming and/or the development of  
37  
38  
39 solutions. A co-design approach allows for both participant views as well as patient and  
40  
41  
42 public involvement (PPI) perspectives to be incorporated, ensuring services are designed *for*  
43  
44  
45 users *with* users [13]. Co-design has been widely used in health contexts to make services  
46  
47  
48 more acceptable and, thus, ultimately improve patient wellbeing (e.g. [14–16]). In relation to  
49  
50  
51 designing and delivering mental health services for children, previous qualitative co-design  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 studies have yielded promising findings when the views of children, family members,  
4  
5  
6  
7 clinicians, and other stakeholders were incorporated [17–19]. Designing and implementing a  
8  
9  
10 successful school-based screening and intervention programme for childhood anxiety  
11  
12  
13 disorders requires equally thorough triangulation.  
14

15  
16  
17 Our aim was to co-design an engaging and accessible primary school-based pathway  
18  
19  
20 to screen and offer an intervention for child anxiety problems. As potential screening tools  
21  
22  
23 [20] and low intensity interventions [21,22] already exist, the purpose of this study was to  
24  
25  
26 develop an in-depth understanding of the challenges that may arise when delivering screening  
27  
28  
29 and intervention for child anxiety problems in primary schools and to respond to such  
30  
31  
32 concerns by co-creating, implementing, and evaluating solutions. In this article, we will  
33  
34  
35 provide a process-based account of how our school-based screening and intervention pathway  
36  
37  
38 was co-designed, how the pathway procedures were experienced by users, and how pathway  
39  
40  
41 development was influenced by user feedback. We will also report qualitative findings from  
42  
43  
44 interviews with parents, children, school staff and other stakeholders to show how their  
45  
46  
47 perspectives were incorporated in order to help ensure that the developed pathway would be  
48  
49  
50 well-received and sustainably implemented.  
51  
52  
53  
54

## 55 56 57 **Method** 58 59 60

## Ethics approval

This study was approved by the Central University Research Ethics Committee at the University of Oxford (REF R64620/RE001). All adult participants gave written informed consent and children assented to participate in the project.

## Approach and focus

We set out to co-design, produce, and deliver a series of procedures – a ‘pathway’ - to improve access to an evidence-based intervention for child anxiety problems through primary schools in England. As described in detail in our study protocol [23], several of the pathway features were specified in advance of the co-design work with input and guidance from stakeholder members of the research team (see next section). In particular, we pre-specified that children’s anxiety problems would be screened using validated questionnaire measures [20], parents would receive feedback on the outcome, and, where indicated, a brief online treatment for child anxiety problems would be offered. The treatment offered was an online version of a brief therapist-guided parent-delivered CBT approach for child anxiety problems (OSI; Online Support and Intervention for child anxiety) which involves seven online modules for parents, supported by a weekly 20-minute telephone call with a Children’s Wellbeing Practitioner (CWP (psychological therapists with a 1 year postgraduate training),

1  
2  
3  
4 NHS Band 5 [24]), with a follow-up telephone session 4-weeks later. A face-to-face version  
5  
6  
7 of this brief parent-led treatment has been found to be both clinically effective [25] and more  
8  
9  
10 cost-effective than an alternative brief psychological intervention [26]  
11  
12

13  
14 As described in our protocol [23], the co-design process to establish *how* the pre-  
15  
16  
17 specified features of the pathway should be presented consisted of four stages. The first stage  
18  
19  
20 involved initial interviews and focus groups with parents, children, school staff, and other  
21  
22  
23 stakeholders to inform the development of a set of procedures that would comprise the  
24  
25  
26 pathway (Stage 1) (see Figure 1 & Table 1). These procedures were subsequently applied in  
27  
28  
29 three primary schools (Stage 2) with participating children, parents, and school staff  
30  
31  
32 providing feedback on their experience (Stage 3 & 4), including cued-recall interviews which  
33  
34  
35 examined parents' experiences of receiving feedback on whether their child experiences  
36  
37  
38 difficulties with anxiety (see Table 2).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 [INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE]  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 **PPI and Stakeholder involvement**

51  
52  
53  
54 Parents, school staff and other stakeholders were involved in this co-design study in a  
55  
56  
57 number of ways. First, this project actively involved a dedicated patient and public  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 involvement (PPI) and stakeholder group from protocol development stage to ensure that the  
4  
5  
6 developed pathway would be acceptable to both parents and school staff. This group  
7  
8  
9  
10 included two parents with relevant lived experience as a parent of a child with anxiety  
11  
12  
13 problems, two school leaders, and one school mental health lead for a national charity. The  
14  
15  
16 PPI/stakeholder group provided guidance during the initial project plans and funding  
17  
18  
19 application and later informed the development of the study protocol and reviewed research  
20  
21  
22 data collected throughout the study to aid in decision making. Examples of decisions that  
23  
24  
25 were made on the basis of consultation with this group included providing the option for  
26  
27  
28 children to complete screening measures at home (Stage 2), as well as guiding the researcher  
29  
30  
31 team on what information had to be securely shared about participating families with school  
32  
33  
34 staff for safeguarding purposes. Researchers met with the PPI/stakeholder group at regular  
35  
36  
37 intervals and the group were compensated for their time and expertise. This dedicated  
38  
39  
40 PPI/stakeholder group, while providing guidance, were not research participants. The  
41  
42  
43 dedicated PPI/stakeholder group were not directly involved in the recruitment of participants.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 Second, a distinct online PPI group, made up primarily of parents, was established for this  
51  
52  
53 project. Regular updates about the study as well as polls and questions were posed to the  
54  
55  
56  
57 online PPI group in order to access wider parental views about study procedures and gain  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 insight about key concerns. Results will be disseminated to participants via social media and  
4  
5  
6  
7 lay summaries.  
8  
9

## 10 Participants

11  
12  
13 *Sampling rationale for the co-design activities.* For Stages 1-4, participants included  
14  
15  
16 children in Year 4 of primary school (Y4; aged 8-9 years), parents of Y4 children, primary  
17  
18 school staff and other stakeholders (see Table 2). Y4 children (age 8-9 years) were the focus  
19  
20 of the intervention as consultations with parents and school-staff advised that this would be a  
21  
22 manageable time for primary schools. The delivery of the procedures in Y4 was thought to  
23  
24 allow primary schools to see the benefit of the pathway, and would enable children to thrive  
25  
26 when managing subsequent key transitions (e.g. to secondary school).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

## 36 *Setting*

37  
38  
39 Participants for Stage 1 were recruited from two local mainstream primary schools as  
40  
41 well as through adverts online on social media and national mailing lists for the initial  
42  
43 procedure development phase (see Figure; Stage 1). Three local primary schools participated  
44  
45 in Stages 2-4 to iteratively try out and adapt the pathway procedures (one school from Stage  
46  
47 1, and two new schools). These schools varied in their demographic characteristics (see Table  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 1)  
58  
59  
60

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

For peer review only

Table 1. Stages 2-4 School demographic characteristics

School	Total number of pupils on roll	Percentage of pupils with SEN support	Percentage of pupils eligible for free school meals	Percentage of pupils with English as an additional language
School 1	200	9.5%	12.6%	41.5%
School 2	364	18.0%	9.1%	23.9%
School 3	415	7.6%	2.7%	26.2%
National average	N/A	12.2%	20.8%	19.2%

*Note.* National average = refers to official UK Gov statistics for the 2020/2021 school year [27]. SEN= special educational needs.

***Recruitment to the co-design activities.***

***Parents and children.*** To recruit participants with a broad range of perspectives to Stage 1, we circulated study invitations to families of all Y4 children in two primary schools



1  
2  
3  
4 in the local area, as well as circulating study adverts online on social media, and national  
5  
6  
7 mailing lists. In Stages 2-4, study information was circulated to all Y4 parents and children in  
8  
9  
10 three participating schools, including invitations to take part in the screening/intervention  
11  
12  
13 pathway and the opportunity to participate in study-related interviews. All Y4 parents and  
14  
15  
16 children in participating schools were invited to participate and were included in the study if  
17  
18  
19 they provided informed consent/assent.  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 Notably, in Stage 4, we also specifically recruited a number of parents facing  
25  
26  
27 challenging circumstances that could influence their views of the acceptability of and likely  
28  
29  
30 engagement with a school-based screening and intervention programme. These were parents  
31  
32  
33 who care for a foster child or a child with chronic physical health problems, where the parent  
34  
35  
36 has past/present mental health problem(s), or where the parent is a member of the UK Armed  
37  
38  
39 Forces community. This sub-group of parents (n=10, see Table 2) was recruited via  
40  
41  
42 circulation of study advertisements online and via mailing lists. Parents who expressed an  
43  
44  
45 interest in taking part were approached by the research team, screened against study  
46  
47  
48 inclusion/exclusion criteria, and invited to take part following informed consent. The inclusion of this  
49  
50  
51 sub-group of parents aimed to ensure that the co-designed school-based programme would be  
52  
53  
54 inclusive and appropriate to the needs of a greater number of families (see Williamson et al.,  
55  
56  
57 under review).  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 ***School staff and other stakeholder participants.*** To recruit school staff and  
5  
6  
7 practitioners that provide mental health support in schools to Stage 1 and 4, we circulated  
8  
9  
10 invitations for study interviews/focus groups within local primary schools and shared study  
11  
12  
13 adverts online and via mailing lists. School staff and practitioners were encouraged to contact  
14  
15  
16 the research team if they were interested in taking part. School staff were included in study  
17  
18  
19 interviews if they were employed in a participating mainstream primary/junior school in  
20  
21  
22 England (e.g. class teacher, headteacher). The inclusion criteria for staff that provide mental  
23  
24  
25 health support in schools were that they must be a practitioner providing mental health  
26  
27  
28 support in primary schools in England, such as educational psychologists, Special  
29  
30  
31 Educational Needs Coordinator (SENCOs), and Emotional Literacy Support Assistants  
32  
33  
34 (ELSAs) (Stages 1 and 4, see Figure 1 and Figure 2). For clarity, they are referred to  
35  
36  
37 throughout this manuscript as ‘practitioners’. Practitioners were sampled to ensure a that a  
38  
39  
40 range of views were represented from a diverse group of professional backgrounds and  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

### **Procedure and description of co-design process**

Our co-design consultations were conducted throughout all four stages (see Figure 1),  
to allow us to get feedback on a preliminary pathway prototype, refine it, implement it, and

1  
2  
3 then get feedback on people's experiences and perceptions of that to inform a further  
4  
5  
6  
7 refinement.  
8  
9

10 *Stage 1.* We carried out in-depth one-to-one interviews and focus groups with  
11  
12 practitioners, school staff, children, and parents (see Table 2 and Supplementary Material 1).  
13  
14  
15 Participants were asked for their views on features of the draft pathway which the research  
16  
17 team had outlined in collaboration with the dedicated PPI/stakeholder group's input.  
18  
19  
20 Participants were shown visual materials of the proposed stages of the pathway (when  
21  
22 possible, if the interview was conducted in person or via video conference with the visuals  
23  
24 representing the general journey through screening to intervention. The visuals were intended  
25  
26 as a generic prototype of the pathway stages (i.e. a generic image of a school was shown  
27  
28 during questions about the potential impact screening may have on a school community) and  
29  
30 participants were encouraged to write down further thoughts, comment on concerns, and  
31  
32 highlight possible solutions. When shown the pathway visuals, participants were asked about  
33  
34 their beliefs about using screening questionnaires to identify child anxiety problems in  
35  
36 schools, perceptions of how families should be informed of the outcomes of the screening  
37  
38 questionnaires, families experiences of the online intervention, and views of whether there  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 might be any secondary effects of a school-based screening and intervention on a family or  
5  
6  
7 school community (see Figure 2).  
8  
9

10 **Stage 2.** The detailed prototype set of procedures refined after Stage 1 were  
11  
12  
13 administered in three primary schools, including screening, feedback to parents, and the offer  
14  
15  
16 of treatment where indicated.  
17  
18

19  
20 **Stage 3.** Parents were invited to discuss their experience of receiving feedback on  
21  
22  
23 their child's screening outcomes via cued-recall interviews. The cued-recall interviews were  
24  
25  
26 audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The aim of the cued-recall interviews was to  
27  
28  
29 capture the acceptability of the feedback procedures used here to inform a further iteration of  
30  
31  
32 the procedures ahead of a larger scale future trial. Participating parents received feedback on  
33  
34  
35 their children's screening outcomes in writing and via telephone call from the study CWP.  
36  
37  
38 Recordings of the parent-CWP telephone call were reviewed by parents with a study  
39  
40  
41 researcher, with the parent encouraged to comment at points that were relevant, for example,  
42  
43  
44 points in the call where the parent felt more information from the CWP would have been  
45  
46  
47 useful.  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 **Stage 4.** Following the administration of all the pathway procedures, interviews were  
54  
55  
56 carried out with Y4 children, their parents and school staff. We carried out interviews with a  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 sub-sample of participating parents and children who completed the screening questionnaires  
4  
5  
6  
7 and engaged with the treatment modules, and of parents and children who withdrew. All  
8  
9  
10 parents who engaged with or withdrew from treatment were invited to interview. Parent  
11  
12  
13 interviews differed from the cued-recall interviews (Stage 3) in that parents were asked about  
14  
15  
16 their overall experience of the screening/intervention.  
17  
18  
19

20 School staff in participating schools were interviewed about their experience of  
21  
22  
23 facilitating the pathway procedures. Practitioners who provide mental health treatment in  
24  
25  
26 primary school settings were also interviewed about their views of the pathway procedures  
27  
28  
29 that had been administered. Views about the proposed pathway were also sought from  
30  
31  
32 parents in especially challenging circumstances (e.g. foster families, military families)  
33  
34  
35 (Williamson et al., under review). The interviews were used to gain an in-depth  
36  
37  
38 understanding of participants' experiences and perceptions of the pathway procedures.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43 Participants' feedback and recommendations at this stage will inform any further revisions  
44  
45  
46  
47 that are needed.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 [INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE]  
55  
56

57 **Study context.**  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 Data collection took place between December 2019 and December 2020. From March  
5  
6  
7 2020, the UK enacted a number of restrictions in an effort to slow the spread of the COVID-  
8  
9  
10 19 (CV-19) virus. These ongoing measures included school closures, remote working where  
11  
12  
13 possible, and social distancing restrictions, and had a number of implications for our study.  
14  
15  
16 With much of the country moving towards remote learning and working during this time,  
17  
18  
19 many people became more familiar with using online technology [28,29] which likely  
20  
21  
22 facilitated engagement with our online screening questionnaires and intervention.  
23  
24  
25 Nonetheless, families and school staff had increasing and frequently changing demands on  
26  
27  
28 their time during this period, with parents being required to support their child's learning  
29  
30  
31 from home, often alongside working from home or managing other disruptions to their lives;  
32  
33  
34 and teachers having to adapt and deliver lessons and support online as well as offering in-  
35  
36  
37 school teaching for some children. Schools had to respond to fluctuating school CV-19  
38  
39  
40 regulations, while many staff were juggling their own caregiving responsibilities.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 ***Procedure modifications.*** The timing of the study, coinciding with UK CV-19  
48  
49  
50 restrictions (March 2020-December 2020), meant that some of our planned recruitment  
51  
52  
53 approaches and data collection strategies were altered; for example, face-to-face interviews  
54  
55  
56 had to be conducted via telephone/video call from March 2020. We had originally aimed to  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 include interviews with parents who chose not to participate or dropped out of the  
5  
6  
7 intervention, as well as cued recall interviews with 12 parents and four teachers about the  
8  
9  
10 experience of delivering or receiving feedback on screening questionnaire outcomes [23].  
11  
12

13 Because of the move to remote contact and because of the demands on teachers' time, we  
14  
15  
16 changed the procedure so that the study CWP provided feedback on screening outcomes to  
17  
18  
19 parents, rather than teachers. As such we did not interview teachers about their experience of  
20  
21  
22 delivering this feedback. Furthermore, we were unsuccessful in recruiting any non-  
23  
24  
25 participating parents and were only able to recruit a small number of parents who dropped out  
26  
27  
28 (n=2) and parents to cued-recall interviews (n=2). It is likely that CV-19 related demands on  
29  
30  
31 parent/school staff time and societal disruptions were contributing factors.  
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

**Table 2***Overview of co-design input sources and data contributions*

Input	Participants	Study stage	Time frame	Demographic information		Mode of contribution to co-design	Output generated
PPI/Stakeholder group (Headteachers x 2; parents x 2; Voluntary/community sector mental health in schools expert)	N=5	Stage 1-4	Pre-study – Month 12	Age M (SD)	49.3 (7.4)	Regular meetings to share findings and discussion of study progress.	The dedicated PPI/stakeholder group are members of the research team and provided guidance and recommendations on study findings and developments.
				Females (n)	2		
Practitioners that provide mental health support in schools	N=2	Stage 1	Months 1-2	Age M (SD)	54.5 (12.0)	Focus group interview conducted face to face [qualitative].	Perceptions of how the screening/intervention procedures should be introduced in schools, delivered, concerns and possible
				Females (n)	2		



	N=15	Stage 4	Months 6-8	Age M (SD)	38 (10.5)	Semi-structured interviews conducted remotely [qualitative].	solutions.
				Females (n)	14		
Y4 Children	N=8	Stage 1	Months 1-2	Age range years	8-9	Focus group interview conducted face to face [qualitative].	Perceptions of how the screening/intervention procedures should be introduced to the class, carried out, concerns and possible solutions.
				Females (n)	6		
	N=29	Stage 2	Months 2-6	Age M (SD)	8.5 (0.6)	Completed screening questionnaires for likely anxiety problems [quantitative].	Identification of children who are likely to have problems with anxiety.
				Females (n)	19		
Y4 Parents	N=7	Stage 1	Month 1-2	Age M (SD)	43.7 (3.6)	Focus group interview conducted face to face	Perceptions of how the screening/intervention procedures
				Females (n)	2		

				Females (n)	6	[qualitative].	should be introduced to families, delivered in schools, concerns and possible solutions.
	N=29	Stage 2	Months 2-6	Age M (SD)	42.0 (3.4)	Completed screening questionnaires for likely anxiety problems [quantitative].	Identification of children who are likely to have problems with anxiety
				Females (n)	24		
	N=2	Stage 3	Months 5-6	Age M (SD)	46.5 (0.7)	Cued-recall interviews conducted via telephone [qualitative].	Experience of the screening pathway and receiving feedback on scores.
				Females (n)	2		
	N=7	Stage 4	Months 6-8	Age M (SD)	43.6 (2.2)	Semi-structured interviews conducted remotely [qualitative].	Experience of the screening pathway and intervention. Includes parents who dropped out (n=2).
				Females (n)	6		
Parents in challenging circumstances	N=10	Stage 4	Months 5- 12	Age M (SD)	47.1 (7.6)	Semi-structured interviews conducted remotely [qualitative].	Perceptions of how a school screening/intervention pathway could be delivered in schools and possible barriers/facilitators to taking part.
				Females (n)	7		

School staff	N=6	Stage 1	Month 1-2	Age M (SD)	48.0 (7.4)	Focus group interview conducted face to face [qualitative].	Perceptions of how the screening/intervention procedures should be introduced, delivered, concerns and possible solutions.	
				Females (n)	6			
	N=4	Stage 2	Months 2-6	Age M (SD)	41.8 (8.3)	Screening questionnaires for likely anxiety problems [quantitative].		Identification of children who are likely to have problems with anxiety
				Females (n)	2			
	N=5	Stage 4	Months 6-9	Age M (SD)	41.6 (7.2)	Semi-structured interview conducted remotely [qualitative].		Experience of the screening pathway, perceptions of the intervention offered to families and perceived barriers/facilitators to uptake in schools.
				Females (n)	3			

*Note.* Y4 = Year four.

## Data analysis

During the co-design process, we made audio recordings of interviews and focus group discussions, and photographed tabletop activities. Recordings were transcribed in full.

Two approaches were taken for analysing the data: 'fast and direct' and 'slow and in-depth'.

A description of the 'fast and direct' and 'slow and in-depth' analyses is provided below and in subsequent articles that drew on the data collected for transparency (Williamson et al., under review)

The 'fast and direct' approach involved the researchers making notes of the key findings during interviews, focus groups, and from participants' comments on the generic pathway visual images in Stage 1. The key findings were collated and shared with the research team and dedicated stakeholder group and, where necessary, used to rapidly alter the research study procedures. For the 'slow and in-depth' approach, NVivo 12 software was used to facilitate data analysis of interviews and focus groups. A Template Analysis approach was used [30]. This first required researchers to become familiar with the data by re-reading transcripts several times. The primary author (VW) then created a template of initial codes

1  
2  
3  
4 guided by the open-ended interview schedule questions, the empirical literature of child  
5  
6  
7 mental health and school-based interventions as well as the study's research questions.  
8  
9

10 In Template Analysis, the templates are study specific and the first iteration of any template  
11  
12  
13 in a given study provides the basis for further iterative developments. Once the template was  
14  
15  
16 developed, transcripts were analysed in a 'top down' manner following the provisional  
17  
18  
19 structure of the template. Data collection and analysis took place simultaneously to allow  
20  
21  
22 emerging topics of interest to be investigated further in subsequent interviews. Peer  
23  
24  
25 debriefing was carried out midway through data analysis and the template was modified to  
26  
27  
28 include additional codes based on discoveries in the dataset that had not yet been captured by  
29  
30  
31 the initial coding template. Once all the data had been initially analysed, the populated  
32  
33  
34 templates were then shared, discussed and refined within the authorship team (CC, ML, TF,  
35  
36  
37 IM, VW, SS, FM). Themes relating to the research question were identified in the coded data  
38  
39  
40  
41 set through analysis of patterns found between codes and among coded segments as well as  
42  
43  
44 through code use frequencies. Each theme was identified and verified through team  
45  
46  
47  
48 consensus. Given that in this article we aim to provide a reflective and pragmatic account of  
49  
50  
51 the data, rather than providing an account organised by themes, we will focus on describing  
52  
53  
54  
55 the challenges we faced throughout the co-design process at distinct research phases, the  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 strategies we used to overcome these issues and reflections on the lessons we learnt, drawing  
4  
5  
6  
7 on examples of previous co-design studies (e.g. [18,31,32]) (see Table 3).  
8  
9

### 10 **Reporting and reflecting on experiences of co-design process findings**

11  
12  
13  
14 Based on the insights and outcomes from the co-design process, we present a  
15  
16  
17 snapshot of our findings related to the co-design and delivery of our school screening and  
18  
19  
20 intervention pathway for child anxiety problems (see Table 3). We highlight the challenges  
21  
22  
23 faced by participants both prior to and during data collection structured by the patterns of  
24  
25  
26 participants' shared concerns in each research phase, and steps taken to mitigate these  
27  
28  
29 difficulties. Our findings are organised by insights from the co-design process, are reported  
30  
31  
32 by distinct research phases, and include data about how the pathway was experienced and  
33  
34  
35 perceived by users and influenced and adapted following their feedback. We present a  
36  
37  
38 simplified representation of the challenges, mitigations, and lessons learned in each research  
39  
40  
41 phase in Table 3. Anonymised excerpts are provided to illustrate key points. The findings  
42  
43  
44 from the qualitative interviews and in-depth data analysis with practitioners and parents are  
45  
46  
47 reported in detail elsewhere (Williamson et al., under review).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

## 53 **Results**

54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4           **Research phase: appraising the existing need for support and context.** To successfully  
5  
6  
7 identify children with anxiety problems and facilitate access to early intervention, the  
8  
9  
10 pathway would need to overcome uncertainty about whether particular children are likely to  
11  
12  
13 benefit from intervention and create a clear route to access it. Previous studies (e.g. [5,9,33])  
14  
15  
16 have shown that parents and teachers often struggle to identify whether the difficulties a child  
17  
18  
19 is exhibiting reflect a clinically significant problem. This was supported by data from our  
20  
21  
22 participating mental health practitioners who described that many families as well as school  
23  
24  
25 staff may not consider a child's emotional or behavioural difficulties as indicative of a likely  
26  
27  
28 problem, rather it may be seen as a 'phase' or attention seeking. As one practitioner  
29  
30  
31 describes:  
32  
33  
34

35  
36  
37           *Practitioner: "You are aiming to reach out to parents that have never given a thought*  
38           *maybe that there [are] maybe anxiety issues in [their] children... I think some parents*  
39           *aren't aware at all and maybe quite oblivious to little tell-tale signs that might be*  
40           *going on and just to recognise it."*  
41  
42  
43  
44

45           If this obstacle of identification was overcome and a child was recognised as having a  
46  
47  
48 likely anxiety problem, previous studies have found families may nonetheless be hesitant to  
49  
50  
51 engage in school screening due to concerns about the accessibility of formal support [9].  
52  
53  
54 Participating practitioners and parents in the present study described the often extensive  
55  
56  
57 waiting lists for child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS). Practitioners reported  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 being overwhelmed by the demand for their psychological services, and many families  
5  
6  
7 equally described being unable to promptly access appropriate formal support for their child.  
8  
9

10 Readily accessible support was thus a key requirement of any developed  
11  
12  
13 screening/intervention pathway for participating parents, practitioners, and school staff. This  
14  
15  
16 practitioner describes that a pathway would be well received given the significant challenges  
17  
18  
19 parents can face accessing care:  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 *Practitioner: "First and foremost I'd say that parents will be crying out for help. The*  
26 *children that I've worked with and our team...are crying out for help. It's one of the*  
27 *hardest things I've seen is when a parent wants their child to thrive, and they can't*  
28 *[get them help] ...I'd say parents will bite your hands off."*  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 **Research phase: engaging schools.** Participating teachers and school staff in Stage 1  
36  
37  
38 described that schools are often bombarded with offers for their school to receive mental  
39  
40  
41 health programmes. Such programmes were often described as costly with unclear efficacy.  
42  
43  
44 Moreover, particularly in light of the CV-19 pandemic, schools were described as being  
45  
46  
47 under increasing pressure to provide psychological support to children. To build school trust  
48  
49  
50 and confidence in a screening/intervention pathway, teaching staff described the need for a  
51  
52  
53 pathway to be seen as credible and evidence based, with recognisable logos on materials,  
54  
55  
56 clear information provided to staff about pathway procedures, with further information  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 readily available on request. One teacher describes the challenges faced by schools and the  
4  
5  
6 importance of demonstrating credibility below:  
7  
8  
9

10 *Teacher: "I literally get ten emails a day offering us some sort of mental health*  
11 *intervention... saying 'sign up for our pack, it's only £X thousand.'... That's the*  
12 *question isn't it, it's like how are you going to prove to schools...that actually this*  
13 *[pathway] is better than X, Y or Z?... I think credibility is really key with this.... Just*  
14 *because there's so much out there now. It's really hard as a teacher I think to make a*  
15 *value judgement"*  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 **Research phase: engaging families.** Once schools had agreed to be involved in the  
24  
25 delivery of the pathway, Y4 children and their parents were invited to consent/assent to  
26  
27 screening. Practitioners and teachers described that stigma-related concerns may prevent  
28  
29 families from participating in this key step of the pathway, preventing them from benefitting  
30  
31 from early identification. This is consistent with the broader literature on barriers to help-  
32  
33 seeking and illustrated by the following excerpts:  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44 *Practitioner: "Yes, it's convincing every parent that this [pathway] is good because*  
45 *some parents don't want a label or don't want to admit things. But the majority want*  
46 *to embrace it. Some parents will go 'no way!' and it could be that they are the ones*  
47 *that are flagged up."*  
48

49  
50 *Teacher: "Parents should be talking to us about if they're concerned. It shouldn't*  
51 *have to wait for this sort of intervention but often it does because families aren't*  
52 *always very good at that. Some families like to cover [up] these things and that's*  
53 *what you are aiming to unpick isn't it is where families like to downplay or deflect*  
54 *when there really are problems."*  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 On the other hand, parents who had faced challenges previously in accessing formal  
5  
6  
7 help for their child reported that, as a result, their relationship with their child's school had  
8  
9  
10 sometimes become strained or they lacked confidence in formal psychological  
11  
12  
13 services/interventions. Concerns about the steps of the pathway, such as what data would be  
14  
15  
16 collected, from whom, and whether they would be shared outside the research team were  
17  
18  
19 frequently described by parents. The excerpt below illustrates the potential stigma-related  
20  
21  
22 concerns parents may have and how this could be mitigated by clear guidance:  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 *Parent: "I guess the issue that some parents might have is where that information is*  
28 *going to be shared, there might be parents thinking 'oh I don't want a secondary*  
29 *school to know about, I don't want this to go on their records. I don't want them to be*  
30 *labelled in some way through this' .... I guess just [being] really explicit in the*  
31 *communication [to families] that this is just for your benefit, your child's benefit. It's*  
32 *not something that will label you or be recorded by school."*  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 To overcome these participation concerns, several information sessions (e.g. Y4  
39  
40  
41 assembly, parents evenings, teacher briefings) were delivered to provide clear guidance about  
42  
43  
44 the pathway (including data sharing procedures), answer questions and allay concerns. As  
45  
46  
47 parents and staff had many demands on their time and some sessions were poorly attended,  
48  
49  
50 we made brief information videos, and these were circulated amongst school staff and Y4  
51  
52  
53 parents. Researchers also provided their contact details and encouraged staff/parents to get in  
54  
55  
56 touch with any further questions or concerns. Going forwards, it was also felt by  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 practitioners, teaching staff, and parents that an opt-out approach to screening (where all Y4  
5  
6  
7 children are included unless parents request for them not to be), rather than the opt-in  
8  
9  
10 approach used, would make the pathway feel more inclusive and help overcome stigma-  
11  
12  
13 related barriers to participation. One parent described how opt-out would still allow parents  
14  
15  
16 who were concerned to withdraw their children whilst providing most children the chance to  
17  
18  
19 participate:  
20  
21

22  
23  
24 *Parent: "I think our daughter would have liked the opportunity to do [the*  
25 *questionnaire] and for someone to say 'that's OK, there isn't a right or wrong it's*  
26 *just about how you feel' ... I think it should be part of the curriculum long term but...*  
27 *opt-out is the better option of what you have at the moment....Because if you feel*  
28 *really strongly, you still have that opportunity to pull your child out of it, but why*  
29 *you'd want to I just don't know."*  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 **Research phase: screening.** Once schools and parents had agreed to the delivery of the  
35  
36  
37 pathway, concerns were then encountered regarding the feasibility of delivering screening  
38  
39  
40 questionnaires for child anxiety problems in classroom settings. Parents in Stage 1 were  
41  
42  
43 concerned about the validity and content of the child screening questionnaires and whether  
44  
45  
46 child report was reliable. Whereas children participating in Stage 1 focus groups expressed  
47  
48  
49 concerns about whether there would be adequate privacy to fill in paper questionnaires in the  
50  
51  
52 classroom. Children were also concerned that sharing one's fears and worries may lead to  
53  
54  
55 negative outcomes, as one child describes:  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *Child: "Sometimes your worries can either be small worries which sometimes you*  
5 *can tell them but sometimes if they're big worries, like I've had some big worries*  
6 *before, I think you should probably just keep it to yourself....I would normally keep*  
7 *all my worries to myself because... if you keep it private then no one else is going to*  
8 *fiddle around with it and make it even worse."*  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 In response to privacy concerns, the research team made it possible for the Stage 2  
16 parent/child/teacher report screening questionnaires to be completed online using a secure  
17  
18 platform (Qualtrics). Participating children and teachers in Stage 4 interviews ultimately did  
19  
20  
21  
22 not describe experiencing concerns about classroom privacy. This early amendment was also  
23  
24  
25 especially opportune as it allowed families/staff to continue to participate from their homes  
26  
27  
28  
29 when CV-19 restrictions and school closures later came into effect. Nonetheless, practitioners  
30  
31  
32 highlighted that some families may lack access to or confidence using online technology, and  
33  
34  
35  
36 this may exclude some from participating.  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 To address parental concerns about the screening questionnaire content, we provided  
43  
44 clear information about the content and purpose of the self-report questionnaires prior to  
45  
46  
47 consent. Parents were not routinely provided with a copy of their child's questionnaire  
48  
49  
50 responses, but researchers made a blank copy of the child-report questionnaire available on  
51  
52  
53 the study website so that there was transparency about questionnaire content. The  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58 triangulation of teacher, child, and parent report was considered by many participants to be a  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 strength of the pathway as this thorough approach was seen as more reliable and  
5  
6  
7 comprehensive than a single point of view. One parent described the benefits of multiple  
8  
9  
10 reports below:

11  
12  
13 *Parent: As a teacher [myself], I used to feel very much that I knew things about my*  
14 *students that their parents didn't know because...I spent more waking hours with them*  
15 *than their parents did. And so I know your child, I can give you my observations*  
16 *confidently....I suppose an accurate picture of a child's disposition can't come from just*  
17 *one person because of the differences between being at home and school. So... I suppose*  
18 *I think that it's right that [the teacher] did [the teacher-report questionnaire] because*  
19 *anyone trying to help my daughter, if she needs help, needs to have as holistic a picture*  
20 *as possible.*  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Nonetheless, teachers stressed the many demands on their time and were concerned that  
28  
29 they would not have capacity to deliver information about the screening and pathway to the  
30  
31 class, support children in filling in their screening questionnaires, as well as complete  
32  
33 screening questionnaires on behalf of each participating child. In response to these concerns,  
34  
35 the research team attended the school to deliver the information session, screening  
36  
37 questionnaire administration, and answer any questions. However, due to CV-19 restrictions,  
38  
39  
40 it was not possible for the research team to visit the third school in person. Where families  
41  
42  
43 completed the questionnaires remotely and had queries, teaching staff were encouraged to  
44  
45  
46 contact the research team who helped staff to draft replies. In Stage 4, teachers reported  
47  
48  
49 feeling that the questionnaires were easy to access, were not time consuming, and research  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 team presence for questionnaire administration was efficient and reassuring. As one teacher  
5  
6  
7 notes:

8  
9  
10 *Teacher: "Yes, I think [taking part] didn't feel onerous in any way. I think is the upshot*  
11 *because so often again when you get embroiled in these things you realise that the paper*  
12 *filling and the time it takes is the thing that you hadn't anticipated. But [the pathway]*  
13 *didn't seem to take up any time at all in that sense...I didn't notice any issues with*  
14 *feedback, with admin or anything at all. So very positive from our perspective in that*  
15 *sense."*  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21 **Research phase: feeding back screening outcomes.** Receiving feedback about the  
22  
23  
24 likelihood of a child meeting criteria for anxiety problems based on the screening scores was  
25  
26  
27 a key issue for many participants. Participating parents described that for some the news that  
28  
29  
30 their child had a likely anxiety problem was expected and feedback confirming this was  
31  
32  
33 reassuring. Other parents felt this feedback may be unexpected and distressing and may lead  
34  
35  
36 to feelings of self-blame or guilt. Practitioners highlighted the need for this feedback to be  
37  
38  
39 delivered sensitively and reassuringly to parents, with an emphasis on the availability of an  
40  
41  
42 evidence-based intervention. In response to these concerns, the research team sought input  
43  
44  
45 from the dedicated stakeholder group into the contents of the feedback letter and a follow up  
46  
47  
48 phone call with parents was also carried out to discuss any additional concerns or questions  
49  
50  
51 parents may have. This parent describes how they found receiving feedback to be a helpful,  
52  
53  
54 validating experience:  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 *Parent: I think we found the feedback really helpful. It was particularly helpful just*  
5 *because it felt like it validated some of the concerns that we have had... I think we just*  
6 *thought well...like no one is asking us how bad this is and so it must just not be that bad.*  
7 *So, to get the numbers back and to see oh our concerns are right, there are some numbers*  
8 *here that are quite alarming. I think we found that quite helpful.*  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 Due to CV-19 school closures, the research team provided feedback to families directly  
14  
15  
16 via letter followed up with a telephone call. Stage 3 and 4 interviews with parents described  
17  
18  
19 feedback from the research team to be acceptable as researchers were seen as knowledgeable  
20  
21  
22 about child mental health and were also a neutral party, independent from the school – a  
23  
24  
25 feature that was particularly important if the family had had difficulties accessing support  
26  
27  
28 from the school in the past. This feeling is illustrated in the following excerpt:  
29  
30  
31

32  
33 *Parent: I think [the feedback is] better coming from you than from the school because you*  
34 *are not involved. I mean, I know you are involved, but you are not the teacher, you are*  
35 *not the headteacher, you are not the school cook, you are not to do with school....Not one*  
36 *of the pupil's neighbours parents or something so you are neutral. I think it's better*  
37 *coming from you.*  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Research team feedback to parents directly, rather than school staff delivery, was also felt  
44  
45  
46 to protect families' privacy. On the other hand, school staff reported concerns that they had a  
47  
48  
49 duty of care to fulfil and should be informed which children met criteria for likely anxiety  
50  
51  
52 problems. To address both parties' concerns, where the parent consented, the research team  
53  
54  
55 provided schools with a copy of the feedback letter sent to each family, but staff were  
56  
57  
58 otherwise not informed whether a family chose to take up the intervention. Parents were also  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 fully informed prior to participation about confidentiality and its limits, including what  
5  
6  
7 information would and would not be shared with the school by the research team.  
8  
9

10 In a similar vein, practitioners and school staff expressed concerns that some parents of  
11  
12  
13 children with likely anxiety problems may refuse the intervention or drop-out. These children  
14  
15  
16 were considered to be most vulnerable as well as most likely to benefit from the intervention.  
17  
18  
19 These parents were seen by some school staff and practitioners as uncaring or ‘bad’ parents,  
20  
21  
22 rather than as parents who were simply too overwhelmed to engage with the intervention or  
23  
24  
25 had had poor experiences of engaging with services in the past. This pattern of concern  
26  
27  
28 highlights the balance that must be struck in a co-designed pathway between recognising and  
29  
30  
31 responding to varying stakeholder concerns while accepting that all participants have a right  
32  
33  
34 to refuse an intervention. Nonetheless, practitioners highlighted that sensitive delivery of  
35  
36  
37 screening feedback, and a positively framed offer of optional formal support, may increase  
38  
39  
40 future help-seeking even amongst parents who refuse the pathway intervention.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 *Practitioner: “I think there’s something about the message of help isn’t it and being able*  
48 *to provide a nice experience of accepting help or not accepting help so that when the*  
49 *family is ready or maybe when the child is old enough to opt-in on their own that they’ll*  
50 *still have that positive memory.”*  
51

52  
53  
54  
55 **Research phase: delivery of online intervention.** Participating parents highlighted that the  
56  
57  
58 CV-19 context influenced their experience of the online intervention that was offered as part  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4 of the pathway. For example, many parents reported being more comfortable working  
5  
6  
7 remotely and the online intervention was, therefore, seen as more acceptable and accessible.  
8  
9

10 The weekly phone calls from the CWP were also felt by parents to be an essential part of the  
11  
12  
13 intervention process, personalising their experience of the online modules, and maintaining  
14  
15  
16 their family's engagement with the modules. Nonetheless, the CV-19 social distancing  
17  
18  
19 restrictions meant many parents reported not having the opportunity to speak with friends or  
20  
21  
22 school staff informally about their experience of the pathway. The adjunct of social support,  
23  
24  
25 such as via a closed peer support group for parents, was considered to be a valuable  
26  
27  
28 component to consider in future studies, as this parent describes:  
29  
30  
31

32  
33  
34 *Parent: "I think the creation of a group would definitely help some people...I think*  
35 *there are people that would like to have those conversations within a safe space...*  
36 *and you know that other families are having...experiences that aren't too dissimilar*  
37 *to you and having that just makes it a bit more relaxing and it gives you the*  
38 *opportunity to open up about certain things. I think it's helpful to relax the worries*  
39 *that perhaps parents can have and it's not always your fault and it's not always what*  
40 *you are doing it's sometimes just having that openness just makes it easier."*  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Consistent with previous studies (e.g. [9]), parents described concerns about the  
47  
48  
49 availability of follow-on support and how they would manage any residual anxiety problems  
50  
51  
52 their child may have once they completed the intervention. Similarly, several professionals  
53  
54  
55 expressed concerns about how families who were still struggling despite completing the  
56  
57  
58 pathway would be adequately supported. Nonetheless, this finding underscores the  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 importance of having steps in place to support families beyond the intervention stage for the  
4  
5  
6 screening/intervention pathway to be considered acceptable. A core component of the present  
7  
8  
9  
10 intervention pathway was to teach parents skills and strategies to support their child beyond  
11  
12  
13 the intervention. Moreover, a pre-planned component of the intervention was for the study  
14  
15  
16 CWP to contact families one month post-intervention to check in, and the content of the  
17  
18  
19 check in call was amended to ensure troubleshooting could be carried out as well as making  
20  
21  
22  
23 referrals to further formal support where necessary.  
24  
25  
26

27 *Parent: "I think the fact is that even though you are discharging [families] if you identify*  
28 *that they need more help then you are going to point them in the right direction, aren't*  
29 *you? So, they aren't just being left in limbo which is important."*  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 **Research phase: identifying and addressing potential secondary impacts of pathway.** The  
35  
36  
37 pathway was generally perceived and experienced as a positive and helpful opportunity for  
38  
39  
40 families to support their child with anxiety problems. However, concerns were expressed that  
41  
42  
43 the delivery of a screening/intervention pathway in schools could cause some children to be  
44  
45  
46 labelled or bullied. Some practitioners felt this could be due to poor mental health literacy  
47  
48  
49 within schools, while parents described that bullying or labelling could arise if their data,  
50  
51  
52 such as whether their family were involved in the intervention, were shared across school  
53  
54  
55 staff. Nonetheless, the introduction of the pathway to a school was considered by parents,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 teachers, and practitioners to be an opportunity to improve a school community's  
5  
6  
7 understanding of mental health. The research team acted on these insights by providing clear  
8  
9  
10 information about confidentiality as well as psychoeducation at several stages throughout the  
11  
12  
13 pathway, including during parent and teacher briefings and within the information sheets.  
14  
15  
16  
17 The research team also delivered an in-class lesson focusing on psychoeducation about  
18  
19  
20 anxiety problems and problem solving to Y4 children following the screening session. A  
21  
22  
23 reduction in mental health-related stigma in schools is a frequently cited benefit of school  
24  
25  
26 screening/interventions [34]. Whether stigma is reduced in primary school settings following  
27  
28  
29 the implementation of such a pathway has yet to be evaluated but is an important direction  
30  
31  
32  
33 for future research.

34  
35  
36  
37 *Professional: "I would hope that it would reduce the stigma around it and I would hope*  
38 *that it would be something that other parents would be interested in finding out more*  
39 *about and that as those children progress through school they can take what they've*  
40 *learnt with their parents and use it so that when they get to secondary school... to prevent*  
41 *it from being such an issue then."*  
42  
43  
44

45 In Table 3 below, we present each research phase and detail the challenges, mitigations,  
46  
47  
48 and lessons learned in each phase informed by the co-design process.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Table 3.** Challenges, mitigations and lessons learned from qualitative data collections

Challenges encountered	How we mitigated these	Lessons learned
<b>Research phase: appraising the existing need for support and context</b>		
Parents/teachers may not recognise anxiety as a problem	Offering universal screening for the Y4 class	Universal screening offered a way to identify children who may be struggling with anxiety, but difficulties were not previously recognised as such
Parents may not know how to access help for their child	Integrated pathway for screening and intervention so families are offered help if potential difficulties were identified.	Schools and families were receptive to a screening programme if an intervention to problems found was also being offered
Formal support may not be easily accessible	Integrated pathway included screening and intervention so families would not need to be referred elsewhere to access support for anxiety problems. Rapid contact with a mental health professional was available to support further signposting to resources and further services if required. Intervention was made available to all families interested in taking it up, not solely those who screened positive for a likely anxiety problem.	An inclusive offer for access to a low level intervention was of interest to families, even those who did not have a child who screened positive for a likely problem. Low level or early mental health interventions may not be sufficient for complex needs cases and team must be prepared to provide resources and make referrals as part of the intervention.
<b>Research phase: engaging schools</b>		
School staff are bombarded with offers for mental health interventions	Used university logos on materials, refer to previous evidence, and offer face-to-face meetings with staff to answer questions	Future studies should take steps to ensure school-based screening/intervention studies are seen as credible and trustworthy to schools

Schools are under considerable and changing CV-19 pressures to provide children with mental health care	Pathway incorporates an efficient intervention to be offered to families in cases where children met criteria for likely anxiety problems, and which can be delivered remotely.	There is an increasing demand for schools to offer accessible mental health support to children and young people due to CV-19 and a screening/intervention pathway may be especially welcome as a consequence.
<b>Research phase: participant recruitment</b>		
There may be stigma around mental health problems and help seeking. There may be a lack of trust in formal services and interventions where families have had negative previous experiences.	Universal screening was offered to Y4 within a supported information session at school. Information was shared with parents and school staff explaining all procedures, including guidance to address data sharing concerns.	‘Opt out’ (rather than ‘opt in’) was considered to be a more inclusive approach for engaging families - i.e. all children are included unless parents/carers request for them not to be. Parents/carers are given clear information and opportunities to ‘opt out’.
Schools and families may not have a good understanding of mental health	Training materials were provided to staff about the project which included psychoeducation. Staff training briefing, including in-person meetings, telephone calls, and a short information video was offered. Assembly, an in-class lesson and parent evenings were offered to provide psychoeducation to children and parents/carers.	Brief video about the pathway and the steps involved was considered more accessible and engaging than an information sheet. School staff reported not being approached by families to ask questions about the pathway but nonetheless staff appreciated being informed about how the pathway operated. Being able to contact the research team and receive personalised feedback was valued and allayed parents’ concerns.
Parents did not attend information sessions or reported not hearing about the project	Brief information video about the project made and posted online and circulated via school mailing lists	Delivery of information in a varied and accessible format (e.g. information video) is preferred by parents who often have many competing demands on their time
<b>Research phase: screening</b>		

<p>Concerns about the accuracy and content of screening questionnaires</p>	<p>Underpinning work to improve accuracy and content of screening measures (with stakeholder involvement). Clear information was provided to parents and teachers about the content and purpose of the questionnaires in advance. Parents had the option for their child to complete the questionnaire at home with them instead of in class. Screening for likely case criteria was done by encouraging parent, child, and teacher completion of the screening questionnaires to provide a more complete picture of the child's difficulties. Language for communicating about screening developed with stakeholders to ensure sensitivity.</p>	<p>Researchers must be transparent and clear when giving information to families and school to ensure school-based screening/intervention studies are understood and are credible and trustworthy. It is important to stakeholders that multiple views about a child's anxiety are heard to reflect the different experiences in different contexts.</p>
<p>Schools feel unable to offer a screening session in classrooms</p>	<p>Dedicated team facilitate administration of screening questionnaire session in small groups outside the classroom. Information assembly and in-class lesson provided by research team to explain what the questionnaires were for in context of wider psychoeducation.</p>	<p>Having a dedicated team presence can feel reassuring to teachers who may lack confidence in having mental health related discussions. This approach may also reduce burden for staff.</p>
<p>Concerns about adequate privacy during screening questionnaire completion</p>	<p>The option of completion of screening questionnaire at home via online/paper was also offered to children. Option to complete in classroom on a tablet offered.</p>	<p>Participating children ultimately did not report privacy concerns if they completed the questionnaires at school (pre-CV-19). Children enjoyed taking part in the study and feeling 'part of the pathway. Having the option for their child to complete at home was felt to be reassuring for parents. Tablet option was considered more engaging as well as ensuring privacy</p>

<p>Concerns about the ability of families to take part when schools moved to remote learning due to CV-19</p>	<p>Schools were provided with information sheets and envelopes to mail home to families as schools reported that families were inundated with emails and postal communication was preferred (although this was not taken up by families). Online questionnaires were delivered via a user-friendly and secure platform. The dedicated team were available and responded quickly to teacher/ parent questions about the study and accessing the questionnaires.</p>	<p>Responding to parental needs, such as being overwhelmed by emails, and delivering information via other channels, helped to disseminate accessible information about the study. Responding quickly to concerns helped to continue families' and staff interest and trust in the project. Families found that due to increased remote working and school work, completion of online questionnaires for the study was not challenging and they did not have concerns about data being stored online. Postal response rate was low (during CV-19 restrictions).</p>
<p><b>Research phase: feedback of screening outcomes</b></p>		
<p>School staff have considerable pre-existing demands on their time</p>	<p>Dedicated team delivers feedback to families about screening questionnaires directly</p>	<p>Families found feedback from the CWP directly to be acceptable as the practitioner was seen as a neutral party, independent of the school, and could answer their queries</p>
<p>Parents may find the feedback surprising or may be distressed to hear that their child has possible anxiety problems</p>	<p>Stakeholders gave input into the content of the feedback letter to families. This letter was followed up by a phone call to discuss any concerns and answer questions</p>	<p>Feedback of screening questionnaire scores may be a shocking (or validating) moment for families and research teams should be prepared to approach the subject sensitively.</p>
<p>Parents of children who screen positive for likely anxiety problems may choose not to take up the intervention</p>	<p>Future help seeking is encouraged by making it clear that treatment is potentially accessible. Resources are provided which could be useful in future. A psychoeducation lesson is provided to all children including simple guidance on managing anxiety.</p>	<p>Future studies should consider what appropriate steps can be taken to support child anxiety problems where parents are not able to participate in the intervention for any reason.</p>

<p>Parents of children who screen positive for a likely problem may feel they are being forced to take up the intervention</p>	<p>Important to highlight that the intervention is optional and that the school/other services will not be informed whether or not they choose to be involved in the intervention</p>	<p>It is essential that clear information is given about confidentiality (and its limits) and data sharing to reassure families. Researchers should be conscious and sensitive that not all families may have positive supportive relationships with their child's school/services</p>
<p>School staff feel they should be informed about the children meeting criteria for potential anxiety problems to fulfil their duty of care</p>	<p>School staff are copied in to feedback letters that are sent to families where parents consented</p>	<p>School will have procedures in place to fulfil their duty of care to children that must be considered when identifying potential child anxiety problems</p>
<p><b>Research phase: delivery of online intervention</b></p>		
<p>Parents feel they would benefit from peer support</p>	<p>This potential add on was explored with parents and what format this would be preferred given CV-19 social distancing restrictions (e.g. WhatsApp, Facebook group)</p>	<p>Future studies should bear in mind the context in which parents engage with mental health interventions and that they may find informal peer support valuable for themselves as well</p>
<p>Lack of school attendance due to CV-19 removed many sources of children's anxieties</p>	<p>Information highlighted that skills learnt in the parent intervention will be applicable for the future. Responses to routine parent questionnaires needed to be interpreted in the context of CV-19 circumstances (e.g. children not attending school)</p>	<p>It is essential to be prepared to adapt or respond when measures are not applicable to the context</p>
<p>Parents may not feel an online intervention is acceptable as opposed to more traditional face-to-face support</p>	<p>Families were informed that the intervention that was being delivered online was based on a widely used treatment</p>	<p>Parents found the online intervention to be acceptable and it often fitted better around their schedules than face-to-face support. Weekly phone calls from the CWP were felt to be essential to personalise the experience and maintain momentum</p>



<p>Parents are concerned about next steps to support their child once the intervention modules are completed</p>	<p>CWP highlighted that referrals would be made for further support if needed after the intervention. A phone call from wellbeing practitioner was delivered at four week follow up to embed learning and offer guidance.</p>	<p>It will be important to be prepared to support making referrals on to other local services if the intervention offered does not entirely resolve child's difficulties</p>
<p><b>Research phase: assessing secondary impacts of pathway</b></p>		
<p>Concern that involvement in the study may lead to children being labelled or bullied</p>	<p>Clear information provided to teachers, children, and families via school assembly, in-class lesson and information sheets which includes psychoeducation about mental health. Confidentiality is explained to families, including what data will and will not be shared with the school</p>	<p>It is important to be mindful that mental health stigma is an endemic issue but providing psychoeducation as part of the school-based screening/intervention represents an opportunity to improve language around and understanding of mental health</p>
<p>Ensuring that the pathway maximises potential for wide and long-term benefits, e.g. through increased mental health literacy in school context</p>	<p>Psychoeducation provided about mental health in several stages, including during teacher training about the project, parent information sheets and feedback, as well as during the assembly and class lesson for children</p>	<p>There is the potential for school communities to have improved emotional and mental health literacy via the dissemination of linked psychoeducation. Future evaluations should aim to track changes over time in mental health stigma in schools - such as before and after study implementation - and tailor their psychoeducation and information sheets accordingly.</p>

Note. Y4 = Year four.

## Discussion

Using co-design and data collection from multiple sources, we identified several key barriers and facilitators to participation for both schools and families, including difficulties accessing (or delivering) reliable mental health support for children; concerns about mental health-related stigma; concerns about the trustworthiness and effectiveness of the pathway; and the adverse impact of CV-19 restrictions on participation. Our iterative co-design approach allowed for the research team to actively respond to users' concerns which may have ultimately improved how the pathway procedures were experienced. As described in Table 3, the developed pathway ultimately consisted of: (i) the circulation of credible and transparent study information and psychoeducation in a variety of formats to school staff, children, and parents; (ii) screening for anxiety problems using child, teacher, and parent report online and paper questionnaires; (iii) the sensitive delivery of written and verbal feedback to parents directly regarding screening questionnaire outcomes; and (iv) the offer and delivery of a brief parent-led intervention.

### Recommendations for future school screening/intervention studies

1  
2  
3  
4 Our findings offer key lessons for future studies aiming to deliver engaging and  
5  
6  
7 sustainable school-based screening and intervention procedures. For example, our study  
8  
9  
10 demonstrated that despite recent studies which have found that parents are the most effective  
11  
12  
13 reporters to identify anxiety diagnoses among pre-adolescent children [20,35], our  
14  
15  
16 participants considered that the inclusion and triangulation of parents/child/teacher report on  
17  
18  
19 screening questionnaires was valuable. This highlights that future studies may need to strike a  
20  
21  
22 balance between what is psychometrically reliable and what procedures feel valid and  
23  
24  
25 meaningful to participants themselves to bolster engagement. Moreover, we found that  
26  
27  
28 parents were especially concerned about data privacy and sharing – particularly if they had  
29  
30  
31 previously had negative experiences with their child’s school or formal services. The need to  
32  
33  
34 share participant data with school staff in order to meet their duty of care had to be carefully  
35  
36  
37 weighed against parents’ concerns about them or their child being labelled or judged and a  
38  
39  
40 desire for privacy. In response, the research team opted for transparency, providing parents  
41  
42  
43 with clear information about what data would (and would not) be shared with whom, with  
44  
45  
46 consent obtained for this at the outset. CV-19 restrictions meant that the research team  
47  
48  
49 provided screening feedback to parents directly about the screening outcomes and this  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60 improvised solution was found to be preferable to families to feedback being given by school

1  
2  
3 staff. Future screening/intervention efforts may benefit from using an independent source  
4  
5  
6  
7 (e.g. not connected to the school) who is knowledgeable about child mental health to deliver  
8  
9  
10 feedback to parents. Furthermore, receiving feedback on screening outcomes was found to  
11  
12  
13 be a crucial part of the pathway which if done well, could facilitate engagement with the  
14  
15  
16 intervention and/or encourage future help-seeking. Knowledge of which research phase(s)  
17  
18  
19 and elements of the screening/intervention pathway may be especially critical – and produce  
20  
21  
22 potential long term positive outcomes - for participants may help to guide future studies.  
23  
24

25  
26  
27 Taken together, these points underscore the need for evaluations to include consideration of  
28  
29  
30 the implications of procedures, involving stakeholders and users in actively considering what  
31  
32  
33 broader (and perhaps unexpected) outcome the steps taken may have.  
34  
35

### 36 37 **Merits and challenges of using a co-design methodology**

38  
39

40  
41 In the present study, our use of co-design presented a number of benefits and  
42  
43  
44 challenges, as well as transferrable learning points that may be applicable to other studies. A  
45  
46  
47 core strength of using a co-design approach is that it allows for the recognition that users may  
48  
49  
50 have a variety of pre-existing and conflicting beliefs and concerns about mental health and  
51  
52  
53 help-seeking and ensures that these concerns are heard and can be effectively responded to  
54  
55  
56  
57 [12]. In the present study, we were able to gain an in-depth understanding about what barriers  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and facilitators for pathway engagement exist and to co-create solutions with our participants.  
4  
5

6  
7 For example, stigma-related concerns were expressed regarding the screening process which  
8  
9

10 led to the recommendation that an 'opt out' approach may be more inclusive. Our 'fast and  
11  
12

13 direct' analytic approach meant the pathway procedures could be quickly and meaningfully  
14  
15

16 adapted in response to feedback to help ensure optimal user engagement. The co-design  
17  
18

19 methodology used also allowed for the collection of data from a broad range of users  
20  
21

22 (parents, children, teachers, practitioners) at various stages of the pathway, providing in-  
23  
24

25 depth insight into their experiences and concerns at each research stage. The inclusion of a  
26  
27

28 range of perspectives highlighted that some school staff and practitioners may have very  
29  
30

31 different views from families about the potential risks and benefits to a screening/intervention  
32  
33

34 pathway. For example, a number of school staff and practitioners expressed beliefs that a  
35  
36

37 screening process was beneficial as some parents may downplay or deflect child anxiety  
38  
39

40 difficulties, while parents described school staff dismissing their concerns. Incorporating  
41  
42

43 multiple views via co-design paints a fuller picture of the context in which a  
44  
45

46 screening/intervention pathway is being introduced and can allow for key contextual factors  
47  
48

49 to be recognised and considered. The inclusion of stakeholders as members of the research  
50  
51

52 team also provided valuable guidance in shaping the initial 'blueprint' of the  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 screening/intervention procedures which were further refined in subsequent focus groups and  
4  
5  
6  
7 interviews. However, this inclusive approach to data collection did yield a considerable  
8  
9  
10 amount of data which could be challenging to manage and meaningfully report. Given the  
11  
12  
13 amount of research data that goes unpublished (or ‘research waste’ [36]), this is a  
14  
15  
16  
17 consideration for future studies.

### 20 **Strengths and limitations**

23  
24 This study has several strengths. Amongst the strengths is the inclusion of key  
25  
26  
27 stakeholders in the research team who not only provided guidance on procedures but also  
28  
29  
30 supported the development of sensitive participant-facing documents and interpretation of  
31  
32  
33 data. A second strength is the range of participant views included using multiple eliciting  
34  
35  
36 techniques and different time points, allowing concerns to be well captured and responded to.  
37  
38  
39  
40 Third, the research team were able to adapt to the unforeseen social distancing restrictions  
41  
42  
43 imposed following CV-19 – for example, by carrying out data collection remotely – and our  
44  
45  
46 findings and adaptations may be useful to future studies that are likely face similar  
47  
48  
49 difficulties for the foreseeable future. However, given the changes that were made, it is  
50  
51  
52 unclear how our adapted pathway procedures would be received by schools and families in  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57 ‘normal’ circumstances. That said, CV-19 has led to an increased demand for child mental  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 health services [37] and the screening/intervention pathway procedures that have been  
4  
5  
6 developed here may ultimately have a beneficial impact in improving child mental health and  
7  
8  
9 delivering support to families through schools. Another strength of this study was the  
10  
11  
12 inclusion of schools in Stages 2-4 that had varying numbers of children with Special  
13  
14  
15 Educational Needs and relatively high numbers of children with English as an additional  
16  
17  
18 language (who may generally be underrepresented in research).  
19  
20  
21  
22

23  
24 A number of weaknesses should also be highlighted. Schools with high numbers of  
25  
26  
27 pupils eligible for free school meals due to low family incomes were underrepresented [26].  
28  
29  
30 Despite the targeted recruitment of parents in challenging circumstances (e.g. foster parents,  
31  
32  
33 military connected parents), another weakness is that our sample may not capture the diverse  
34  
35  
36 views of families with different backgrounds and who are living in different circumstances.  
37  
38  
39 The majority of participating adults (ie parents, practitioners, school staff) in this study were  
40  
41  
42 also female which may limit the generalizability of the findings to fathers and male  
43  
44  
45 staff/practitioners. Future studies should endeavour to capture their views which are often  
46  
47  
48 overlooked in investigations of the development, and treatment of anxiety disorders in  
49  
50  
51 children [38]. Moreover, possibly due to families being overwhelmed or difficult to contact  
52  
53  
54 due to CV-19 restrictions, we were unable to meet some of our recruitment targets (e.g. for  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4 parents who chose not to participate in the pathway). Thus, a final weakness of this study is  
5  
6  
7 that comparatively little is known about why some families may chose not to take participate  
8  
9  
10 in the pathway and, as many of these families are likely to be those who could benefit the  
11  
12  
13 most, it is important that researchers establish how best to capture their perspectives in future  
14  
15  
16 research.  
17  
18

## 19 20 **Conclusions**

21  
22  
23 Despite these limitations, this study adds to the literature in several ways. First, it  
24  
25  
26 illustrates that a screening/intervention pathway for child mental health problems in schools  
27  
28  
29 *can* be inclusively co-designed in partnership with parents, children, school staff and mental  
30  
31  
32 health practitioners. Given the sensitive and often stigmatised nature of mental health  
33  
34  
35 screening and treatment, this study highlights that a methodological approach such as co-  
36  
37  
38 design can lead to an in-depth understanding of users concerns and the co-creation of  
39  
40  
41 solutions, optimising study procedures and improving the chances of successful  
42  
43  
44 implementation. A well-designed screening/intervention pathway may bridge the gap  
45  
46  
47 between children and families' needs for and access to early mental health treatment which is  
48  
49  
50 pressingy required given the extensive waiting lists and high thresholds for accepting  
51  
52  
53 referrals for many specialist services [39]. Finally, the findings from this study underscore  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 that there may be tangible potential secondary benefits to offering a well-designed school-  
4  
5  
6 based screening/intervention pathway. An effective and acceptable pathway could not only  
7  
8  
9  
10 foster child wellbeing but also promote future help-seeking, highlighting that school-based  
11  
12  
13 screening/intervention efforts for child mental health are both promising and worthwhile.  
14  
15  
16  
17 Future studies should systematically evaluate the co-designed pathway to examine whether  
18  
19  
20 reductions in child mental health problems are achieved and if wider benefits are found.  
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

## References

- 1 Polanczyk G V., Salum GA, Sugaya LS, *et al.* Annual research review: A meta-analysis of the worldwide prevalence of mental disorders in children and adolescents. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines* 2015;**56**:345–65. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12381
- 2 Kessler RC, Amminger GP, Aguilar-Gaxiola S, *et al.* Age of onset of mental disorders: A review of recent literature. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*. 2007;**20**:359–64. doi:10.1097/YCO.0b013e32816ebc8c
- 3 Schwartz C, Barican J Lou, Yung D, *et al.* Systematic review Six decades of preventing and treating childhood anxiety disorders: a systematic review and meta-analysis to inform policy and practice. *Based Mental Health* 2019;**22**:103–10. doi:10.1136/ebmental-2019-300096
- 4 James AC, Reardon T, Soler A, *et al.* Cognitive behavioural therapy for anxiety disorders in children and adolescents. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2020;**2020**. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013162.PUB2
- 5 Reardon T, Harvey K, Baranowska M, *et al.* What do parents perceive are the barriers and facilitators to accessing psychological treatment for mental health problems in children and adolescents? A systematic review of qualitative and quantitative studies. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2017;**26**. doi:10.1007/s00787-016-0930-6
- 6 Costello EJ, He J, Sampson NA, *et al.* Services for Adolescents With Psychiatric Disorders: 12-Month Data From the National Comorbidity Survey–Adolescent. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ps201100518> 2014;**65**:359–66. doi:10.1176/APPI.PS.201100518
- 7 Levitt JM, Saka N, Hunter Romanelli L, *et al.* Early identification of mental health problems in schools: The status of instrumentation. *Journal of School Psychology* 2007;**45**:163–91. doi:10.1016/J.JSP.2006.11.005
- 8 O'Brien D, Harvey K, Howse J, *et al.* Barriers to managing child and adolescent mental health problems: A systematic review of primary care practitioners' perceptions. *British Journal of General Practice* 2016;**66**:e693–707. doi:10.3399/bjgp16X687061
- 9 Soneson E, Childs-Fegredo J, Anderson JK, *et al.* Acceptability of screening for mental health difficulties in primary schools: A survey of UK parents. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;**18**:1–12. doi:10.1186/s12889-018-6279-7
- 10 Kelleher KJ, Campo J V., Gardner WP. Management of pediatric mental disorders in primary care: Where are we now and where are we going? *Current Opinion in Pediatrics* 2006;**18**:649–53. doi:10.1097/MOP.0B013E3280106A76
- 11 Bate P, Robert G. Toward More User-Centric OD: Lessons From the Field of Experience-Based Design and a Case Study. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306297014> 2016;**43**:41–66. doi:10.1177/0021886306297014
- 12 Palmer VJ, Chondros P, Piper D, *et al.* The CORE study protocol: A stepped wedge cluster randomised controlled trial to test a co-design technique to optimise psychosocial recovery outcomes for people affected by mental illness in the community mental health setting. *BMJ Open* 2015;**5**:e006688. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006688

- 1  
2  
3 13 National Institute for Health Research. PPI (Patient and Public Involvement) resources  
4 for applicants to NIHR research programmes. London: 2019.  
5  
6 14 Larkin M, Boden ZVR, Newton E. On the Brink of Genuinely Collaborative Care:  
7 Experience-Based Co-Design in Mental Health.  
8 <http://dx.doi.org/101177/1049732315576494> 2015;**25**:1463–76.  
9 doi:10.1177/1049732315576494  
10  
11 15 Gustavsson SM, Andersson T. Patient involvement 2.0: Experience-based co-design  
12 supported by action research: <https://doi.org/101177/1476750317723965>  
13 2017;**17**:469–91. doi:10.1177/1476750317723965  
14  
15 16 Dewar B, Mackay R, Smith S, *et al.* Use of emotional touchpoints as a method of  
16 tapping into the experience of receiving compassionate care in a hospital setting:  
17 <http://dx.doi.org/101177/1744987109352932> 2009;**15**:29–41.  
18 doi:10.1177/1744987109352932  
19  
20 17 Dewa LH, Lavelle M, Pickles K, *et al.* Young adults' perceptions of using wearables,  
21 social media and other technologies to detect worsening mental health: A qualitative  
22 study. *PLOS ONE* 2019;**14**:e0222655. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0222655  
23  
24 18 Mulvale G, Moll S, Miatello A, *et al.* Co-designing Services for Youth With Mental  
25 Health Issues: Novel Elicitation Approaches. doi:10.1177/1609406918816244  
26  
27 19 Mulvale G, Green J, Miatello A, *et al.* Finding harmony within dissonance: Engaging  
28 patients, family/caregivers and service providers in research to fundamentally  
29 restructure relationships through integrative dynamics. *Health Expectations*  
30 2021;**24**:147–60. doi:10.1111/HEX.13063  
31  
32 20 Reardon T, Spence SH, Hesse J, *et al.* Identifying children with anxiety disorders using  
33 brief versions of the Spence Children's Anxiety Scale for children, parents, and  
34 teachers. *Psychological Assessment* 2018;**30**:1342–55. doi:10.1037/pas0000570  
35  
36 21 Creswell C, Willetts L, Murray L, *et al.* Treatment of child anxiety: an exploratory study  
37 of the role of maternal anxiety and behaviours in treatment outcome. *Clinical*  
38 *Psychology & Psychotherapy* 2008;**15**:38–44. doi:10.1002/cpp.559  
39  
40 22 Thirlwall K, Cooper PJ, Karalus J, *et al.* Treatment of child anxiety disorders via guided  
41 parent-delivered cognitive-behavioural therapy: Randomised controlled trial. *British*  
42 *Journal of Psychiatry* 2013;**203**:436–44. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.126698  
43  
44 23 Williamson V, Larkin M, Reardon T, *et al.* Codesign and development of a primary  
45 school based pathway for child anxiety screening and intervention delivery: a  
46 protocol, mixed-methods feasibility study. *BMJ Open* 2021;**11**:e044852.  
47 doi:10.1136/BMJOPEN-2020-044852  
48  
49 24 NHS. Children's wellbeing practitioner | Health Careers.  
50 2020.[https://www.healthcareers.nhs.uk/explore-roles/psychological-therapies/roles-](https://www.healthcareers.nhs.uk/explore-roles/psychological-therapies/roles-psychological-therapies/childrens-wellbeing-practitioner)  
51 [psychological-therapies/roles-](https://www.healthcareers.nhs.uk/explore-roles/psychological-therapies/roles-psychological-therapies/childrens-wellbeing-practitioner)  
52 [psychological-therapies/childrens-wellbeing-practitioner](https://www.healthcareers.nhs.uk/explore-roles/psychological-therapies/roles-psychological-therapies/childrens-wellbeing-practitioner) (accessed 21 Feb 2022).  
53  
54 25 Thirlwall K, Cooper P, Creswell C. Guided parent-delivered cognitive behavioral  
55 therapy for childhood anxiety: Predictors of treatment response. *Journal of Anxiety*  
56 *Disorders* 2017;**45**:43–8. doi:10.1016/j.janxdis.2016.11.003  
57  
58 26 Creswell C, Violato M, Fairbanks H, *et al.* Clinical outcomes and cost-effectiveness of  
59 brief guided parent-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy and solution-focused  
60 brief therapy for treatment of childhood anxiety disorders: a randomised controlled  
trial. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2017;**4**:529–39. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30149-9

- 1  
2  
3 27 GOV. Schools, pupils and their characteristics, Academic Year 2019/20. GOV.UK.  
4 2020.[https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/school-pupils-](https://explore-education-statistics.service.gov.uk/find-statistics/school-pupils-and-their-characteristics)  
5 and-their-characteristics (accessed 21 Sep 2021).  
6  
7 28 Salzano G, Passanisi S, Pira F, *et al.* Quarantine due to the COVID-19 pandemic from  
8 the perspective of adolescents: the crucial role of technology. *Italian Journal of*  
9 *Pediatrics* 2021;47:1–5. doi:10.1186/S13052-021-00997-7  
10  
11 29 Kenny RM, Galloghly E, Porter CM, *et al.* 'Living in a Zoom world': Survey mapping  
12 how COVID-19 is changing family therapy practice in the UK. *Journal of Family*  
13 *Therapy* 2021;43:272–94. doi:10.1111/1467-6427.12332  
14  
15 30 King N. Template analysis. In G. Symon & C. Cassell (Eds.), *Qualitative methods and*  
16 *analysis in organizational research: A practical guide* (pp. 118–134). 1998;:118–  
17 34.<https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1999-02931-006> (accessed 16 Jul 2021).  
18  
19 31 Reñosa MDC, Mwamba C, Meghani A, *et al.* Selfie consents, remote rapport, and  
20 Zoom debriefings: collecting qualitative data amid a pandemic in four resource-  
21 constrained settings. *BMJ Global Health* 2021;6:e004193. doi:10.1136/BMJGH-2020-  
22 004193  
23  
24 32 Hackett CL, Mulvale G, Miatello A. Co-designing for quality: Creating a user-driven  
25 tool to improve quality in youth mental health services. *Health Expectations*  
26 2018;21:1013–23. doi:10.1111/HEX.12694  
27  
28 33 Newlove-Delgado T, McManus S, Sadler K, *et al.* Child mental health in England  
29 before and during the COVID-19 lockdown. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2021;8:353–4.  
30 doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(20)30570-8  
31  
32 34 Lindow JC, Hughes JL, South C, *et al.* The Youth Aware of Mental Health Intervention:  
33 Impact on Help Seeking, Mental Health Knowledge, and Stigma in U.S. Adolescents.  
34 *Journal of Adolescent Health* 2020;67:101–7. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2020.01.006  
35  
36 35 Nauta MH, Scholing A, Rapee RM, *et al.* A parent-report measure of children's  
37 anxiety: Psychometric properties and comparison with child-report in a clinic and  
38 normal sample. *Behaviour Research and Therapy* 2004;42:813–39.  
39 doi:10.1016/S0005-7967(03)00200-6  
40  
41 36 Chen Y long, Yang K hu. Avoidable waste in the production and reporting of evidence.  
42 *The Lancet*. 2009;374:786. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)61591-9  
43  
44 37 Adegboye D, Williams F, Collishaw S, *et al.* Understanding why the COVID-19  
45 pandemic-related lockdown increases mental health difficulties in vulnerable young  
46 children. *JCPP Advances* 2021;1:e12005. doi:10.1111/JCV2.12005  
47  
48 38 Bögels S, Phares V. Fathers' role in the etiology, prevention and treatment of child  
49 anxiety: A review and new model. *Clinical Psychology Review* 2008;28:539–58.  
50 doi:10.1016/J.CPR.2007.07.011  
51  
52 39 Wise J. Progress on children's mental health services is too slow, says commissioner  
53 for England. *BMJ* 2018;363:k4953. doi:10.1136/BMJ.K4953  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Figure captions:  
4

5  
6 *Figure 1.* Overview of the co-design process for developing the school-based screening and  
7  
8  
9 intervention pathway  
10

11  
12  
13 *Note.* Y4 = Year four.  
14

15  
16  
17 *Figure 2.* Levels of investigation in co-design process  
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

For peer review only





Figure 1. Overview of the co-design process for developing the school-based screening and intervention pathway

Note. Y4 = Year four.

Review 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



**Figure 2**

Levels of investigation in co-design process

1  
2  
3 **Supplementary material – interview guides for children, parents and other stakeholders.**  
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

For peer review only



## Indicative guide for in-depth interviews following child participation

### Notes

- *Activities and language will be adapted for each participant group*
- *Guides will be adapted as the project progresses, in response to feedback and as procedures become more clearly defined, and participants have experience of some or all parts of the process (eg completed questionnaires, took part in the intervention)*

### Introduction

- Researcher/s introduce the aim of the research and the discussion group.
- Researcher/s summarise key activities (questionnaires, feedback, online intervention)

### Issues to explore in the interview

- What did you think about the iCATS assembly where iCATS was first introduced?
- Was there any more information you would have liked to know about iCATS before joining in?
- What did you think about the lesson on fears and worries?
- What bits did you like about the lesson? What bits did you not like?
- What did you think about filling in the questionnaire about your fears and worries?
- Did you do the questionnaire at home or at school?
  - Would you have preferred to fill in the questionnaire at home with your parent(s) or at school?
- Did you do the questionnaire on paper or on the iPad?
- Could anything have been done differently to make filling in the questionnaire easier for you?
- What did you think about your parent(s) doing the lessons to help you with your fears and worries?
- How did doing the iCATS activities with your parent(s) make you feel?
  - Were there any activities you found really fun? Were any activities hard? Why do you think that was?
- How did you find using the Monster's Journey app game?
- Did you speak to anyone (e.g. friends, family, teachers) about your parents doing the lessons to help you with your fears and worries?
  - What did you say? How did they respond?
  - If you didn't speak to anyone, why was this?
- Do you think your parents doing the lessons about your fears and worries had any effect on other members of your family or how your family gets along? Why or why not?
- Is there any extra help for your fears or worries that you would have liked to have?
- Are there any other thoughts you have about the iCATS project that we should know?

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

For peer review only

## Indicative guide for in-depth interviews following parent participation

### Notes

- *Activities and language will be adapted for each participant group*
- *Guides will be adapted as the project progresses, in response to feedback and as procedures become more clearly defined, and participants have experience of some or all parts of the process (eg completed questionnaires, took part in the intervention)*

### Introduction

- Researcher/s introduce the aim of the research and the discussion group.
- Researcher/s summarise key activities (questionnaires, feedback, online intervention)
- Researcher confirms what stage of iCATS family is at (or where they dropped out)

#### 1. Issues to explore in the interview

- a. How have you found taking part in the iCATS study so far?
  - i. How did you hear about the project?
  - ii. What made you want to get involved?
    1. Was there anything you think could have been done to encourage you/others to get involved?
  - iii. What did you hope to get out of taking part in iCATS?
  - iv. How did you get on with the screening questionnaires and consent forms?
    1. Did you fill these in or did your child's other parent? Why was this?
    2. Was there anything that could've been made easier for you here?
  - v. How did you find accessing these online?
  - vi. How did your child get on with these?
    1. Did they do the questionnaire at home with you or at school? What did you think about this approach?
    2. (if applicable) – did they need any help from you to fill them in? Why or why not?
  - vii. How did you feel about your child's teacher also filling in a questionnaire about your child?
  - viii. What are your thoughts about the questionnaires and your information being completed online?
    1. Would you be more comfortable with paper copies managed by your child's school?
  - ix. Was there anything that you feel could have been done differently here?

- 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
- b. How did you find the feedback about your child's score?
    - i. What did you think of the feedback letter?
      - 1. Was the outcome what you expected?
    - ii. How did you find the telephone feedback call?
    - iii. Initially we planned for the school iCATS lead to give this feedback, how did you find the feedback coming from the research team instead?
    - iv. Did you have any concerns at this stage?
    - v. What did you think about the things that were said in the feedback call and letter?
    - vi. Could anything have been done differently here?
      - 1. Was there any more information you would have liked to have had?
  - c. How did you find accessing OSI?
    - i. What did you think of the resource and exercises?
    - ii. What did you think about everything being online/remote?
      - 1. How do you think this compares to a F2F course?
    - iii. How did you find doing the activities with your child?
    - iv. What impact do you think the activities have had on their fears and worries?
    - v. How do you feel about managing your child's difficulties with fears and worries having done OSI?
      - 1. Has there been any change in your family life since taking up iCATS?
    - vi. What did you think of the weekly phone calls?
    - vii. How have you found the 1 month break?
      - 1. OR How do you feel about their being a 1 month break?
    - viii. How do you feel about your child's 'discharge plan'?
      - 1. Will you share this with your child's school? Why or why not?
    - ix. In an ideal world, is there any other support or help you would've liked to receive?
      - 1. Could anything have been made easier for you/others to keep engaging with OSI?
  - d. Have you spoken to or interacted with your child's school about iCATS?
    - i. What was this experience like?
    - ii. Could anything have been improved here?
  - e. Have you spoken with other people about iCATS?
    - i. After finishing OSI do you think you will speak to other people about it?

- 1  
2  
3 f. Is there anything we can do to make sure iCATS works well for other families in  
4 future?  
5  
6 g. Do you think iCATS may have any broader effects on your child's school or your  
7 community?  
8  
9

10  
11  
12  
13 **2. Issues to explore in the interview for those who dropped out**  
14

- 15 h. At what stage did you begin to feel like iCATS wasn't suitable for you?  
16  
17 i. Do you think your experiences of CV-19 had any impact on this decision?  
18  
19 j. Was there anything you didn't feel you were getting from the iCATS / OSI project  
20 that could be improved?  
21  
22 k. How does your child feel about not being involved in the project anymore?  
23  
24 l. Did you have any particular needs you didn't feel were addressed by iCATS/OSI?  
25  
26 m. Did you access the online resources (pdf) instead?  
27 i. Why or why not?  
28  
29 ii. How did you get on with these?  
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

## Indicative guide for focus groups and in-depth interviews following teacher participation

### Notes

- *Activities and language will be adapted for each participant group*
- *Guides will be adapted as the project progresses, in response to feedback and as procedures become more clearly defined, and participants have experience of some or all parts of the process (eg completed questionnaires, took part in the intervention)*

### Introduction

- Researcher/s introduce the aim of the research and the discussion group.
- Researcher/s summarise key activities (questionnaires, feedback, online intervention)
- Researcher confirms what stage of iCATS family is at (or where they dropped out)

### 1. Issues to explore in the interview

- n. How have you found being part of the iCATS study so far?
  - i. How did you hear about the project?
  - ii. What made you and your school want to get involved?
    1. Was there anything you think could have been done to encourage your school (and other schools) to get involved?
  - iii. What did you hope you/your pupils would get out of taking part in iCATS?
  - iv. How did you get on with the screening questionnaires and consent forms?
    1. Was there anything that could've been made easier for you here?
    2. What did you think about filling in the questionnaires about your pupils?
    3. What did you think about the number/length of questionnaires?
  - v. How did you find accessing these online?
  - vi. How did your pupils get on with these?
    1. Did they do the questionnaire at home or at school? What did you think about this approach?
    2. (if applicable) – did they need any help from you to fill them in? Why or why not?
  - vii. Was there anything that you feel could have been done differently here?
- o. How did you find the feedback about pupils' scores?
  - i. What did you think of the feedback letter? Did you see a copy?
    1. Were the outcomes what you were expecting?

- 1  
2  
3 ii. Initially we planned for the school iCATS lead to give this feedback, how do  
4 you feel about the feedback coming from the research team instead?  
5  
6 iii. Did you have any concerns at this stage?  
7  
8 iv. Could anything have been done differently here?  
9  
10 1. Was there any more information you would have liked to have had?  
11  
12 p. Have you spoken to or interacted with your pupils or parents about their experience  
13 of iCATS?  
14  
15 i. What was this experience like?  
16  
17 ii. Did you get asked any questions by pupils/parents? How did this go?  
18  
19 iii. Could anything have been improved here?  
20  
21 q. Have you spoken with other people about iCATS? (e.g. colleagues, your own  
22 friends/family)  
23  
24 r. Is there anything we can do to make sure iCATS works well for other schools or  
25 families in future?  
26  
27 s. Do you think iCATS may have any broader effects on your child's school or your  
28 community?  
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