

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

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

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

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

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

Mindfulness-based retreat for mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients: A pilot intervention study protocol

| Journal: | BMJ Open |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2021-060461 |
| Article Type: | Protocol |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 21-Dec-2021 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Robertson, Taylor; The Hospital for Sick Children, Social Work Ahola Kohut, Sara; Hospital for Sick Children, Department of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition; University of Toronto, Psychiatry Telfer, Heather; SickKids, Social Work; SickKids, Transplant and Regenerative Medicine Centre Seifert-Hansen, Mirna; SickKids, Transplant and Regenerative Medicine Centre Mitchell, Joanna; Canadian Donation and Transplantation Research Program Anthony, Samantha; The Hospital for Sick Children, |
| Keywords: | Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Transplant medicine < INTERNAL MEDICINE, MENTAL HEALTH, PAEDIATRICS, Paediatric transplant surgery < PAEDIATRIC SURGERY, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH |



BMJ Open

Mindfulness-based retreat for mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients: A pilot intervention study protocol

Taylor Robertson¹, Sara Ahola Kohut^{2,3,4}, Heather Telfer^{1,5}, Mirna Seifert-Hansen⁵, Joanna Mitchell⁶, Samantha J. Anthony ^{1,4,5,6,7}

- 1. Department of Social Work, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada
- 2. Department of Psychology, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada
- 3. Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto, ON, Canada
- 4. Child Health Evaluative Sciences, Peter Gilgan Centre for Research and Learning, Toronto, ON, Canada
- 5. Transplant and Regenerative Medicine Centre, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada
- 6. Canadian Donation and Transplantation Research Program, Edmonton, AB, Canada
- 7. Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada

Corresponding author: Samantha J. Anthony The Hospital for Sick Children 686 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 0A4 E-mail: samantha.anthony@sickkids.ca

Word count: 2970

| Author | ORCID-ID |
|---------------------------|---------------------|
| Taylor Robertson | 0000-0002-2690-701X |
| Dr. Sara Ahola Kohut | 0000-0003-1562-947X |
| Dr. Samantha J. Anthony | 0000-0002-1800-2333 |
| D1: Sumantina V: Timinonj | 0000 0002 1000 2555 |

2.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

Abstract

Introduction: Mothers are often the primary caregivers for children requiring heart transplantation. Given that a mother's ability to successfully cope with the demands of her caregiving role may be predictive of positive familial psychosocial outcomes, it is critical that maternal coping is assessed and supported in paediatric health care. Mindfulness-based programs are proposed as one intervention that may enhance quality of life, improve distress tolerance and coping, and reduce social isolation in caregiving populations. This pilot study aims to investigate: (1) the implementation success of a mindfulness-based retreat (MBR), and (2) the effectiveness of the MBR at improving quality of life, distress tolerance, coping and perceived social support for mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients.

Methods and Analysis: A convergent parallel, mixed method design is proposed for this pilot study. Quantitative data will be obtained using five standardized instruments completed at three time points: (T1) 24-hours prior to the intervention, (T2) immediately upon completion of the intervention, and (T3) three months post-intervention. Qualitative data will be collected from all participants both through semi-structured focus groups at T2 and individual telephone interviews at T3. Focus groups and individual interviews will be transcribed verbatim for thematic analysis. Quantitative and qualitative data will be merged and compared during interpretation to ensure that the intervention implementation and effectiveness of the MBR retreat are described with comprehensive accuracy.

Ethics and Dissemination: This research study received Institutional Research Ethics Board approval from The Hospital for Sick Children. Informed consent will be obtained prior to participants' study enrollment. This research addresses the quality of life and well-being of

BMJ Open

mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients and will inform a future randomized clinical trial to assess implementation outcomes and intervention effectiveness of MBRs within this population.

Article Summary – Strengths and Limitations

- This pilot study will be the first mindfulness intervention to specifically target the psychosocial needs of mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients through an acute retreat-based mindfulness intervention.
- Results of this study will significantly increase the breadth of knowledge on interventions that may effectively support primary caregivers of paediatric heart transplant recipients and will inform a future randomized clinical trial.
- This is a single-centre study with a proposed small sample which may limit generalizability of findings.

Keywords: quality in health care, transplant medicine, mental health, paediatrics, paediatric transplant surgery, qualitative research

INTRODUCTION

From the time of diagnosis, caring for a child with a chronic illness is often a source of persistent stress for a family system.[1-4] Within paediatric heart transplantation, recipients face life-long medical follow-up that includes regular clinic visits, frequent, often invasive, medical tests and procedures, and immunosuppressive drug therapy with many accompanying side-effects (e.g., high blood pressure, kidney dysfunction, growth delay, infection risks, possible malignancies, and cosmetic effects).[5,6,7] This strict care regimen is disruptive to a family's daily life, and places chronic social, psychological, and financial strain on family systems.[3,7]

Maternal Caregiving Impact in Paediatric Heart Transplant

Mothers are most commonly the primary caregivers for paediatric heart transplant recipients.[5] As such, mothers' quality of life is impacted more than any other family member, by the mounting demands and parenting stressors associated with a child's illness.[5] Previous research on maternal coping in paediatric heart transplantation demonstrates clinically significant levels of psychosocial risk for poor mental health outcomes in 40% of respondents.[3] Additionally, the elevated psychosocial risk and significant emotional impact of transplantation on mothers appears to be enduring,[8,9] with high levels of caregiver burden reported several years post-transplantation.[8] Recent studies have cited the experience of paediatric transplantation as an ongoing source of trauma for parents.[7,10] In a study on parents of heart transplant recipients, (75% of which were mothers), 19% of participants were found to meet the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual – IV diagnostic criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), amounting to a prevalence rate that is two and half times higher than the general population.[7] Untreated symptoms of PTSD are commonly felt within the wider family

BMJ Open

system as they directly impact parenting capacity, and consequently, child health and development, well-being, and adjustment.[11,12]

Increased clinical attention and accessible interventions to support the emotional coping and well-being of mothers may be efficacious to increase maternal coping and instrumental to support paediatric heart transplant recipients' health and well-being. The psychosocial needs of mothers of children with chronic illness are consistently underserved across healthcare settings.[1] Evidence-based interventions to support caregivers in paediatric healthcare are scarce and not prioritized,[13] and existing interventions (e.g., weekly support groups and individual counseling) are time-consuming which parents have cited as their primary barrier to participation in such health interventions.[1] To our knowledge this pilot study will be the first of its kind to specifically target the psychosocial needs of mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients through an acute retreat-based mindfulness intervention.

Mindfulness-Based Interventions

There is empirical evidence that Mindfulness Based Interventions (MBI) significantly reduce psychological distress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms, and improve physical and mental health across many populations.[14,15] Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction is currently the most widely recognized and utilized MBI for the treatment of PTSD and general stress management.[16-18] MBIs more broadly have been shown to improve mental and physical health in populations of caregivers for children with chronic illnesses.[19,20] MBIs are structured programs that incorporate tenets of mindful meditation and assume that the cultivation of compassionate and non-judgmental awareness will lead to a reduction in stress, suffering and symptoms of mental illness.[16-18] In MBIs, participants are guided through exercises that develop mindfulness skills through formal practice.[14,15] These supported

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

opportunities to build capacity practicing mindfulness skills increase the likelihood for postintervention use of these skills as reliable coping tools to minimize distress in everyday life.[14,15]

This study proposes a novel, two-day mindfulness-based weekend retreat adapted for mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients. It is recognized that an increased level of social support is derived from the shared experience of MBIs when offered in a retreat format.[14,19] This may provide benefit to the target population of this study as high prevalence of social isolation has been identified amongst mothers of heart transplant recipients, as well as their shared interest to connect with other mothers in similar positions.[5] MBIs facilitated through a mindfulness-based weekend retreat (MBR) increase the opportunity for social connection amongst participants because of environmental facilitators such as shared accommodations, meal times and free time. Mindfulness is ideally suited for this population to address the inherent stress they experience through their caregiving roles, [7] and group mindfulness practice has the ability to catalyze community building that is sustained beyond a research setting.[21] Given the applicability of a MBR to meet the needs of mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients it is proposed within this pilot study as an intervention with potential to enhance maternal well-being through the development of coping skills, social connectedness, and psychological health.[5,14,16,19,20]

Study Aims

To investigate the feasibility and efficacy of this intervention the research objectives of this pilot study are to: (1) examine implementation outcomes (*i.e., appropriateness, acceptability, adoption, feasibility, fidelity*)[22] of the MBR, and (2) to assess the efficacy of the MBR on maternal quality of life, distress tolerance, coping and perceived social support. This is

BMJ Open

a pilot study and application of the results from this research will inform the study design of a future randomized clinical trial.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

Study Design

A convergent parallel, mixed method design was chosen for this pilot study wherein quantitative and qualitative data will be collected simultaneously and analyzed independently, with results merged during the final interpretative phase to address the study's overall purpose.[22] This mixed methods design will allow for a comprehensive understanding of the study phenomena by incorporating both qualitative description methods to gather a rich account of participant experiences as well as quantitative measures to document the potential changes in participant coping styles, distress tolerance, perceived quality of life and social support.[23] The participant sample size will be equal across both quantitative and qualitative arms of data collection.

Qualitative research is highly valuable in this area because of the subjective impact of a child's illness on a family, and the individualized nature of each mother's parenting experience through transplantation. Qualitative data will be gathered through participation in a focus group on the final day of the retreat and an individual interview three months post-retreat. Focus groups are an efficient and effective method of qualitative data collection to yield anecdotal information about personal experiences and perceptions.[24,25] Group dialogue with mothers about their experiences of the retreat will offer a reflective opportunity to gather participant insights and to address implementation outcomes (*i.e., appropriateness, acceptability, adoption, feasibility, fidelity*)[26] of this intervention for this clinical population. A focus group fits well with the group model of this retreat and is an opportune and feasible way to collect qualitative data from

Page 8 of 26

BMJ Open

this particular sample, given their geographic diversity. Both the focus group and interview will gather participant feedback of parallel variables.

The quantitative instruments selected (*Coping Health Inventory for Parents, Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire, Pediatric Quality of Life (PedsQLTM), Distress Tolerance Scale, Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support*) will capture a measurable and generalizable assessment of maternal coping. The focus group and individual interview will highlight detailed and individualized perspectives of the mothering experience through paediatric heart transplantation, as well as provide insights to the participant experience of the MBR. Integration of the qualitative and quantitative data will highlight a depth of understanding that could not be obtained by either data separately.

Patient and Public Involvement

Caregiver needs and perspectives have been prioritized throughout the MBR pilot study design. At the project's inception, a mother of a pediatric heart transplant recipient was recruited to be a member of the research team as a patient partner (JM). Her lived caregiving experience informed many decisions concerning intervention design as well as methodological choices for outcome measures. The data collection measures identified dually prioritize the need to gather the richest possible data set, with a commitment to refrain from burdening participants with lengthy and arduous measures in consideration of their time.

Intervention Design

The intervention will be a two-day retreat held over a weekend. The MBR will be held at a resort in northern Ontario, Canada and will consist of a structured schedule of mindfulness and compassion-based teaching and practices, including formal meditation, circle sharing, and Page 9 of 26

BMJ Open

deep relaxation.[27] The competencies developed in these exercises will be incorporated into all other retreat activities such as mealtimes, mindful movement (including yoga), and walking meditations. Mindfulness talks will be held on each day of the retreat, offering opportunities for participants to learn about and develop mindfulness skills. Each mindfulness talk in the retreat series will build upon the content of the previous talk, with the goal of moving participants from introspective personal mindfulness practice to interpersonal community building. Opportunities for guided circle sharing (i.e., group practice of mindfulness and interpersonal sharing) and deep relaxation (i.e., personal practice bringing mindful attention to the body to relieve stress) will be integrated throughout the retreat. The MBR will have two primary facilitators who are both mental health professionals (social worker and psychologist) with longstanding personal mindfulness practices. In addition, both facilitators have completed teacher training in mindfulness (Mindful Self-Compassion and Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy), as well as certificates in both Foundations of Applied Mindfulness Meditation and Applied Specialization in Mindfulness Meditation from the University of Toronto, Canada. Lastly, both facilitators have extensive experience practicing in tertiary care hospitals adapting MBIs to support caregivers in chronic

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

disease populations. The facilitators, alongside the research team's patient partner (JM),

adapted the MBR specifically to the paediatric heart transplantation context.

Sample Recruitment

A total of 20 participants will be recruited from The Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids) Labatt Family Heart Centre who meet the following criteria: (1) a mother residing in Ontario who is the primary caregiver of a paediatric heart transplant recipient, who is (2) a minimum of four months post-transplant. Within this study, '*mother*' is defined as a femaleidentifying caregiver to a paediatric heart transplant recipient. Participants are not required to be biologically related to the heart transplant recipient but must be the primary female-identifying caregiver and share residence with the child. Purposive sampling will be used to obtain a sample with maximum variation.[28] Purposive sampling will ensure (1) demographic variation amongst participants, specifically regarding: the mother's age, their child's age, stage of development and gender, and the family's race, ethnicity, composition, and geographic location of residence, and (2) that any mother selected to participate is coping well enough at baseline so as not to be overburdened by participation in the study. Due to resource limitations that prohibit access to language and accessibility services, non-English speaking mothers and those with severe cognitive impairment as determined by a mental health professional will be excluded from participation in this study. Limited resources have also resulted in the restriction for participation in this study to Ontario residents only.

Participant recruitment began in January 2020 and is ongoing. The retreat will be hosted when it is safe to do so according to local COVID-19 public health guidelines. Participant recruitment has involved social work and nursing staff from the Heart Transplant Program at the SickKids Labatt Family Heart Centre, who each received a study description from the research

team and were asked to select and refer mothers for eligibility review. The recruitment request stipulated that each participant must be referred by the social worker or nurse, with whom they have a pre-existing clinical relationship. This ensured that a baseline assessment of coping was included in the referral, to confirm that study participation would not overburden the mother. If the mother consented to participate in this study, she was then referred to the research team who ensured that all eligibility criteria were met. Written informed consent was obtained from each study participant at that time.

Data Collection

Quantitative: Standardized questionnaires will be completed by all study participants at three time-periods: (T1) 24-hours prior to attending the retreat, (T2) 24-hours after attending the retreat, and (T3) three months post-retreat. At each time point, the questionnaires will be completed by participants online through REDCap.[29] Paper copies can be mailed to participants upon request. The three time points will allow for the comparison of outcomes assessed by pre- and post-intervention measures. The following quantitative measures will be used in this study:

- (1) Coping Health Inventory for Parents is a 45-item scale measuring the demands experienced by parents/caregivers of a child with a chronic health condition.[30] The scale evaluates family integration and cooperation, maintenance of social support, selfesteem and psychological stability, and comprehension of the child's medical situation. Reliability has been previously established for this measure.[31]
- (2) *Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire* is a 39-item scale measuring one's propensity to be mindful in their daily life (i.e., observing, describing, acting with awareness, non-

judging of inner experience, and non-reactivity to inner experience).[32] Construct validity has been previously established as well as its use in assessing the utilization of mindfulness skills.[33]

- (3) Pediatric Quality of Life (PedsQLTM) Family Impact Module is a 36-item scale measuring the impact of chronic health conditions of children on parents through eight subscales: physical functioning; emotional functioning; social functioning; cognitive functioning; communication; worry; daily activities; and family relationships. The PedsQLTM Family Impact Module is a widely used measure for the evaluation of parental quality of life.[34] Internal consistency and reliability have been previously established.[34]
- (4) Distress Tolerance Scale is a 14-item scale measuring distress tolerance across three domains: tolerance of distress, appraisal of being distressed, and emotional regulation.[35] Construct validity of this measure has been previously established.[35]
- (5) Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support has 12-items and measures perceived social support across three groups: family, friends and a significant other.[36] Validity and reliability have been previously demonstrated for this instrument.[36]

Demographic and medical forms will be administered to all participants to collect maternal information (e.g., age, race, ethnicity, number of children, annual household income, highest level of education etc.) and child information (e.g., date of transplant, underlying diagnosis, age at time of transplant, and co-morbidities etc.). These forms will be completed by participants using REDCap.[29] Paper copies will be made available upon request.

<u>Qualitative:</u> Qualitative data will be collected at (T2) on the last day of the retreat intervention and (T3) three months post-intervention. Participants will be randomized into two groups of ten

to participate in focus groups on the last day of the retreat. The focus group will be organized by open-ended questions and probes facilitated by members of the research team with extensive experience in qualitative methodology. A second researcher will be present to observe each group and document topics and concepts discussed by participants. Both focus group discussions will be audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. A subsequent semi-structured telephone interview will be completed individually with each participant three months post-intervention with transcription and data analysis to follow.

Data Analysis

Quantitative: Each standardized instrument will be scored individually, and group data will be summarized by the calculation of means and standard deviations. T1 data will be assessed in comparison to T2 and T3 data. Notable changes in scores between each time-point will be descriptively analyzed. Should multiple characteristics present as significantly correlated with the same outcome, repeated measures ANOVA with post-hoc analysis will be used to discern the etiology of this correlation. Descriptive statistics will be used to describe and characterize the sample in this pilot.

<u>Qualitative</u>: All data will be read and analyzed by multiple members of the research team. Deductive thematic analysis will be used, and codes will be determined through line-by-line review of the focus group discussion and individual interviews using NVivo.[37] Through this review process, codes emerging repeatedly in various parts of the transcript will be noted and comparatively analyzed by multiple research team members for purposes of consistency.[37]

<u>Interpretation:</u> Quantitative and qualitative data will be merged to compare both similarities and differences across findings.[22] The research team will compile quantitative statistical results

and compare findings to the qualitative themes present within the focus group and individual interview data. Further analysis will consider how the two sets of data relate, diverge, and interconnect to create a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Ethical Approval

This research study has received approval from the SickKids Research Ethics Board (Number:1000064719). All participants will provide informed consent prior to their involvement in the study. This research study sample will not include participants incapable of providing informed consent or any participants under the age of 18.

Confidentiality and Information Security

All data collected over the course of the research study, including written transcription from the study's qualitative focus group and the subsequent individual telephone interviews, will be de-identified to protect participant confidentiality. Anonymous study identifiers will replace all identifying information present in the transcripts. All identifying information, both paper copy and electronic information, will be kept confidential. Use of data over the course of the study, and dissemination of results will follow standard practice guidelines as determined by the SickKids Research Institute.

Discussion and Dissemination

When a child undergoes heart transplantation, the role of the primary caregiver is notably linked to poor mental health outcomes and pervasive, illness-related parenting stress.[7] Previous research has correlated mindfulness-based practices with positive psychosocial outcomes in

highly distressed populations, [16,38] and specifically in chronic disease populations, MBIs have demonstratively reduced psychological distress and symptoms of mental illness.[14,15] Aside from the benefits derived from direct participation, there is also potential for mindfulness interventions to yield larger systemic rewards. Supporting mothers to improve their coping can increase familial preparedness for post-transplant care management and any potential posttransplant hospitalizations.[6] With the length of hospitalization contributing the largest percentage of any transplant-associated costs,[6] positive caregiver coping and readiness for discharge could ultimately decrease healthcare spending per transplant patient. This innovative research leverages the MBR as an evidence-based intervention to engage mothers meaningfully by acknowledging the complexity of their role as a caregiver and addressing the impact of chronic stress and high caregiver burden.[5,7,39] While this pilot study is a preliminary step in addressing a wider gap in psychosocial intervention support to caregivers, the potential benefits derived are equally promising for individual patients and caregivers as well as the broader healthcare system.

This research is a necessary first step to advance the field of evidence-informed psychosocial interventions within paediatric cardiology and results will inform future iterations of the intervention across other participant groups. While caregiver experiences are unique, the need for support and disease-specific community building within paediatric healthcare is universal. This promising intervention will serve as a critical template for expansion across other clinical caregiving populations in paediatric solid organ transplant and other chronic illness care programs. Additionally, meeting the needs of all family members is vital to address family functioning, coping and resilience over the course of a child's chronic illness. Findings from this pilot study will provide the necessary evidence-base for future investigations examining the BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

transferability of a MBR to support the needs of other caregivers and family members affected by paediatric chronic illness.

The proposed research will inform a future randomized clinical trial to assess implementation outcomes and intervention effectiveness of a MBR within this population. This pilot study will greatly increase the breadth of knowledge about interventions that may support primary caregivers of paediatric heart transplant recipients. Findings will be translated and disseminated throughout cardiology and transplant communities and communicated to local, provincial, and national stakeholders. In addition, findings will be presented at national cardiology and transplant conferences and a manuscript will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Dissemination of results is anticipated to begin in September 2022 and will depend on the scheduled date of the retreat as permitted by provincial COVID-19 gathering restrictions.

This innovative research posits the MBR as an evidence-based intervention to effectively address and support the familial impact of chronic stress and high caregiver burden for mothers.[5,7,39] While this pilot study is a preliminary step in addressing a wider gap in psychosocial intervention support mothers, the potential benefits derived are promising for individual patients and their caregivers.

Abbreviations

MBI - Mindfulness-Based Intervention; MBR– Mindfulness-based Retreat; PTSD–Post Traumatic Stress Disorder

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

С

| 3 | |
|---|--|
| 4 | |
| 5 | |
| 6 | |
| $\begin{array}{c} 4\\ 5\\ 6\\ 7\\ 8\\ 9\\ 10\\ 11\\ 12\\ 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\end{array}$ | |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 26 | |
| 27 | |
| 28 | |
| 29 | |
| 30 21 | |
| 3 I 2 2 | |
| 2∠ 22 | |
| 22 24 | |
| 25 | |
| 36 | |
| 30 | |
| 32 | |
| 30 | |
| 40 | |
| 41 | |
| 42 | |
| 43 | |
| 44 | |
| 45 | |
| 46 | |
| 47 | |
| 48 | |
| 49 | |
| 50 | |
| 51 | |
| 52 | |
| 53 | |
| 54 | |
| 55 | |
| 56 | |
| 57 | |
| 58 | |
| 59 | |
| 60 | |

Funding

Funding for this study is provided by the SickKids Labatt Family Heart Centre Innovation Fund (Grant/Award Number: Not Applicable).

Authors' contributions TR, SJA, SAK, HT, MS-H, and JM participated in the study design. All these individuals are involved in the management of the study. TR drafted this protocol. All authors read, revised, and approved the final protocol.

References

- 1. Murphy N, Christian B, Caplin D et al. The health of caregivers for children with disabilities: caregiver perspectives. *Child Care Health Dev* 2007;33:180-187.
- Kennard B, Petrik K, Stewart S et al. Identifying Factors in Post-Operative Successful Adaptation to Pediatric Liver Transplantation. *Soc Work Health Care* 1991;15:19-33.
- Cousino M, Rea K, Schumacher K et al. A systematic review of parent and family functioning in pediatric solid organ transplant populations. *Pediatr Transplant* 2017;21:e12900.
- Soulvie, M., Desai, P., White, C. and Sullivan, B., 2012. Psychological Distress Experienced by Parents of Young Children with Congenital Heart Defects: A Comprehensive Review of Literature. *J Soc Serv Res*, 38(4), pp.484-502.
- Green A, Meaux J, Huett A et al. Constantly Responsible, Constantly Worried, Constantly Blessed: Parenting after Pediatric Heart Transplant. *Prog Transplant* 2009;19:122-127.
- Levy A, Sobolev B, James D et al. The Costs of Change: Direct Medical Costs of Solid Organ Transplantation in British Columbia, Canada, 1995–2003. *Value in Health* 2009;12:282-292.

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

- Farley L, DeMaso D, D'Angelo E et al. Parenting Stress and Parental Post-traumatic Stress Disorder in Families After Pediatric Heart Transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant* 2007;26:120-126.
- DeMaso, D., Douglas Kelley, S., Bastardi, H., O'Brien, P. and Blume, E., 2004. The longitudinal impact of psychological functioning, medical severity, and family functioning in pediatric heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*, 23(4), pp.473-480.
- Rodrigue, J., MacNaughton, K., Hoffmann, R., Graham-Pole, J., Andres, J., Novak, D. and Fennell, R., 1997. Transplantation in Children: A Longitudinal Assessment of Mothers' Stress, Coping, and Perceptions of Family Functioning. *Psychosomatics*, 38(5), pp.478-486.
- Young, G., Mintzer, L., Seacord, D., Castaneda, M., Mesrkhani, V. and Stuber, M., 2003. Symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in Parents of Transplant Recipients: Incidence, Severity, and Related Factors. *Pediatrics*, 111(6), pp. e725-e731.
- Samuelson, K., Wilson, C., Padrón, E., Lee, S. and Gavron, L., 2016. Maternal PTSD and Children's Adjustment: Parenting Stress and Emotional Availability as Proposed Mediators. *J Clin Psychol*, 73(6), pp.693-706.
- Simons, L., Ingerski, L. and Janicke, D., 2007. Social support, coping, and psychological distress in mothers and fathers of pediatric transplant candidates: A pilot study. *Pediatr Transplant*, 11(7), pp.781-787.
- 13. Jane-Llopis E, Katschnig H, McDaid D et al. Supporting decision-making processes for evidence-based mental health promotion. *Health Promot Int* 2011;26:i140-i146.

BMJ Open

| | Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy - a systematic review of randomized controlle |
|-----|---|
| | trials. Acta Psychiatr Scand 2011;124:102-119 |
| 15. | Visted E, Vøllestad J, Nielsen M et al. The Impact of Group-Based Mindfulness Tra |
| | on Self-Reported Mindfulness: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Mindfulness |
| | 2014;6:501-522. |
| 16. | Siegel D. Mindful awareness, mindsight, and neural integration. The Humanistic |
| | Psychologist 2009;37:137-158. |
| 17. | Müller-Engelmann, M., Wünsch, S., Volk, M. and Steil, R., 2017. Mindfulness-Base |
| | Stress Reduction (MBSR) as a Standalone Intervention for Posttraumatic Stress Disc |
| | after Mixed Traumatic Events: A Mixed-Methods Feasibility Study. Front Psychol, |
| 18. | Kabat-Zinn, J., Massion, A., Kristeller, M., Gay Peterson, L., Fletcher, K., Pbert, L., |
| | Lenderking, W. and Santorelli, S., 1992. Effectiveness of a meditation-based stress |
| | reduction program in the treatment of anxiety disorders. Am J Psychiatry, 149(7), pp |
| | 943. |
| 19. | Minor, H., Carlson, L., Mackenzie, M., Zernicke, K. and Jones, L., 2006. Evaluation |
| | Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) Program for Caregivers of Children w |
| | Chronic Conditions. Soc Work Health Care, 43(1), pp.91-109. |
| 20. | Ruskin D, Young M, Sugar C et al. Mindfulness and Acceptance Interventions for |
| | Parents of Children and Adolescents Diagnosed with Chronic Medical Conditions: A |
| | Systematic Review. J Altern Complement Med 2021;27:120-135. |

21. Duncan, L. and Bardacke, N., 2009. Mindfulness-Based Childbirth and Parenting Education: Promoting Family Mindfulness During the Perinatal Period. *J Child Fam Stud*, 19(2), pp.190-202.

- 22. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: : SAGE Publications, Inc 2018.
- 23. Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? Research in Nursing & Health 2000;23:334–40.
- 24. Kitzinger, J., 1994. The methodology of Focus Groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. *Sociol Health Illn*, 16(1), pp.103-121.
- Krueger, R. and Casey, M., 2014. Focus groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research. Los Angeles [etc.]: Sage.
- 26. Proctor E, Silmere H, Raghavan R et al. Outcomes for Implementation Research: Conceptual Distinctions, Measurement Challenges, and Research Agenda Adm Policy Ment Health 2010;38:65-76.
- 27. Kabat-Zinn J, Santorelli S, Meleo-Meyer F et al. Mindfulness-Based stress reduction authorized curriculum guide. 2017.https://www.umassmed.edu/globalassets/center- formindfulness/documents/mbsr-curriculum-guide-2017.pdf
- 28. Erlandson D. Doing naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage 1993.
- 29. REDCap, 2021. REDCap. [online] Project-redcap.org. Available at: https://www.project-redcap.org/ [Accessed 13 May 2021].
- McCubbin, H., McCubbin, M., Patterson, J., Cauble, A., Wilson, L. and Warwick, W., 1983. CHIP. Coping Health Inventory for Parents: An Assessment of Parental Coping Patterns in the Care of the Chronically Ill Child. *J Marriage Fam*, 45(2), p.359.

BMJ Open

| Ξ |
|--|
| |
| ş |
| 2 |
| 2 |
| ĕ |
| Ť |
| |
| 3 |
| St. |
| σ |
| ublished as 10.1136/b |
| ≌ |
| s |
| ษ |
| ŏ |
| b |
| õ |
| |
| 0 |
| <u> </u> |
| 3 |
| ത് |
| 6 |
| 'bmj |
| ÷. |
| ŏ |
| ŏ |
| - |
| BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http: |
| 20 |
| 12 |
| Ļ |
| ര് |
| Õ |
| 46 |
| 3 |
| 0 |
| ĭ |
| ω |
| ے |
| c |
| 2 |
| Ν |
| 0 |
| 2022 |
| i |
| σ |
| 9 |
| ₹ |
| ≓ |
| 8 |
| ā |
| ð |
| <u> </u> |
| Ŧ |
| S |
| |
| Ŧ |
| ÷ |
| <u> </u> |
| 6 |
| - |
| <u>ے</u> |
| Ę. |
| njopu |
| njoper |
| njopen.l |
| njopen.br |
| /bmjopen.bmj |
| njopen.bmj.c |
| njopen.bmj.cor |
| njopen.bmj.com |
| njopen.bmj.com/ c |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on A |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on Ap |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on Apri |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6 |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 20 |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 202 |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 b |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by gu |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by gue |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by gues: |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. P. |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Pro |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Prote |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protec |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protecte |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by cc |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by cop |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copy |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyric |
| njopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyrigh |

| 31. Patterson, J., McCubbin, H. and Warwick, W., 1990. The impact of family functioning on |
|---|
| health changes in children with cystic fibrosis. Soc Sci Med, 31(2), pp.159-164. |
| 32. Baer, R., Smith, G., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J. and Toney, L., 2006. Using Self-Report |
| Assessment Methods to Explore Facets of Mindfulness. Assessment, 13(1), pp.27-45. |
| 33. Baer, R., Smith, G., Lykins, E., Button, D., Krietemeyer, J., Sauer, S., Walsh, E., |
| Duggan, D. and Williams, J., 2008. Construct Validity of the Five Facet Mindfulness |
| Questionnaire in Meditating and Nonmeditating Samples. Assessment, 15(3), pp.329-342. |
| 34. Scarpelli, A., Paiva, S., Pordeus, I., Varni, J., Viegas, C. and Allison, P., 2008. The |
| Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory [™] (PedsQL [™]) family impact module: reliability and |
| validity of the Brazilian version. Health Qual Life Outcomes, 6(1), p.35. |
| 35. Simons, J. and Gaher, R., 2005. The Distress Tolerance Scale: Development and |
| Validation of a Self-Report Measure. Motiv Emot, 29(2), pp.83-102. |
| 36. Dahlem, N., Zimet, G. and Walker, R., 1991. The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived |
| Social Support: A confirmation study. J Clin Psychol, 47(6), pp.756-761. |
| 37. Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qual Res |
| <i>Psychol</i> , 3(2), pp.77-101. |
| 38. Cahn B, Goodman M, Peterson C et al. Yoga, Meditation and Mind-Body Health: |
| Increased BDNF, Cortisol Awakening Response, and Altered Inflammatory Marker |
| Expression after a 3-Month Yoga and Meditation Retreat. Front Hum Neurosci 2017;11. |
| 39. Cohn J. An Empirical Study of Parents' Reaction to the Diagnosis of Congenital Heart |
| Disease in Infants. Soc Work Health Care 1996; 23:67-79. |
| |
| |
| |

Mr. Adrian Aldcroft Editor-in-Chief British Medical Journal Open December 20, 2021

SickKids The hospital for Sick Children

Dear Mr. Adrian Aldcroft and BMJ Open Editorial Team,

Please find attached a study protocol entitled "Mindfulness-based retreat for mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients: A pilot intervention study protocol," that we herein submit for publication in *BMJ Open.*

Mothers are the most common caregivers for pediatric heart transplant recipients and their ability to cope with the chronic parenting stress associated with their caregiving role is inextricably linked with patient health outcomes. Despite this correlation, the psychosocial needs of caregivers for children with chronic illness are historically underserved in pediatric healthcare.

Our research posits an innovative mindfulness-based retreat intervention that is novel to the caregiving group of mothers of heart transplant recipients. The research goals of this protocol are to assess the efficacy of the mindfulness-based weekend retreat intervention on maternal quality of life, distress tolerance, coping and perceived social support through a convergent parallel, mixed-method study design. Caregiver experiences will be dually captured through participation in a qualitative focus group and individual interview, as well as through five standardized quantitative instruments completed at three time points.

This pilot protocol will significantly increase the breadth of knowledge on interventions that effectively support primary caregivers of pediatric heart transplant recipients. Given the stature of *BMJ Open* as one of the leading communication tools for professionals in the medical field, we are confident that our research will be of interest to the readership.

We confirm that participant recruitment is ongoing. The study has undergone full internal peer review as part of the funding process and has received institutional research ethics board approval. Relevant documentation has been submitted. All authors confirm that this research protocol has not been previously published, nor is it presently under consideration for publication elsewhere. We have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We look forward to further correspondence with your office.

Yours sincerely,

Samantha Anthony, PhD MSW RSW Health Clinician Scientist Child Health Evaluative Sciences | The Hospital for Sick Children 686 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario M5G 0A4 Telephone: 416-813-7654 E-mail: <u>samantha.anthony@sickkids.ca</u>



BMJ Open

| | Research Ethics Board (REB) Study Approval Letter |
|-----|--|
| 201 | 19-09-17 |
| | Samantha Anthony sial Work |
| Stu | B number: 1000064719 dy Title: Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) Retreat for Mothers of Pediatric Heart Transplant cipients |
| | te of Approval: 2019-09-17 biry Date: 2020-09-17 |
| del | ank you for the application submitted on 2019-07-08. The above referenced study was reviewed through a egated process (not by Full Board review). Any concerns arising from this review have been documented an olved. |
| con | e REB voted to approve this study, and your participation as Principal Investigator, as it is found to nply with relevant research ethics guidelines, as well as the Ontario Personal Health Information otection Act (PHIPA), 2004. |
| арр | e Hospital for Sick Children Research Ethics Board hereby issues approval for the above named study. This proval is effective from 2019-09-17 to 2020-09-17. Continuation beyond that date will require further review 3 approval. |
| The | e following documents have been reviewed and are approved: |
| | Protocol version dated August 29, 2019 [MBSR Protocol - 28Aug2019 clean.docx (1.0)] Participant Consent Form version dated August 20, 2019 |
| 2. | Participant Consent Form version dated August 20, 2019 [Consent Form 20Aug2019 clean.docx (1.0)] |
| | Verbal Introduction Script version dated [Verbal study introduction script for participants delivered by member of circle of care 28Aug2019.docx (1.0 Demographic Form version dated August 20, 2019 |
| | [Demographic Form 20Aug2019 clean.docx (1.0)] Recruitment Email For Members of Circle of Care version dated August 28, 2019 [Recruitment Email from study team to members of circle of care 28Aug2019 clean.docx (1.0)] |
| 6. | Introduction Script for Recruitment version dated August 28, 2019 |
| 7. | [Verbal study introduction script for participants delivered by member of circle of care 28Aug2019.docx (1.) Interview Guide version dated August 28, 2019 |
| 8. | [INTERVIEW GUIDE 28Aug2019 clean.docx (1.0)] Focus Group Script version dated August 20, 2019 |
| | [FOCUS GROUP SCRIPT 20Aug2019 clean.docx (1.0)] Exit Interview Guide version dated August 20, 2019 |
| | [Exit Interview Guide 22Aug2019.docx (1.0)] Verbal Telephone Consent Script version dated August 22, 2019 |

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

SickKids

- 11. Master Linking Log version dated August 20, 2019 [MBSR Master linking log 20Aug2019 clean.xlsx (1.0)]
- Follow-up Communications version dated August 22, 2019
 [Lost to follow up email template and telephone script.docx (1.0)]
- Study Questionnaires version last modified August 20, 2019
 [Validated Instruments for Participants to Complete 20Aug2019.docx (1.0)]

During the course of this investigation, any significant deviations from the approved protocol and/or unanticipated developments or significant adverse events should immediately be brought to the attention of the REB.

Elizabeth Stephenson REB Chair 555 University Avenue, Toronto, ON M5G 1X8 Tel: (416) 813-8279 Fax: (416) 813-6515

The SickKids REB operates in compliance with the Tri-Council Policy Statement; ICH Guideline for Good Clinical Practice E6(R1); Ontario Personal Health Information Protection Act (2004); Part C Division 5 of the Food and Drug Regulations; Part 4 of the Natural Health Products Regulations and the Medical Devices Regulations of Health Canada. The approval and the views of the REB have been documented in writing. The REB has reviewed and approved the clinical trial protocol and informed consent form for the trial. All investigational drug trials at SickKids are conducted by qualified investigators.

Furthermore, members of the Research Ethics Board who are named as Investigators in research studies do not participate in discussions related to, nor vote on such studies when they are presented to the REB.

GUIDED – a guideline for reporting for intervention development studies.

Supplementary File 1: Blank Checklist

| Item description | Explanation | Page in manuscript where item is located | Other |
|---|--|---|-------|
| 1. Report the context for which the intervention was developed. | Understanding the context in which an intervention was developed informs readers about the suitability and transferability of the intervention to the context in which they are considering evaluating, adapting or using the intervention. Context here can include place, organisational and wider sociopolitical factors that may influence the development and/or delivery of the intervention (15). | 7-9 | |
| Report the purpose of the intervention development process. | Clearly describing the purpose of the intervention specifies what it sets out to achieve. The purpose may be informed by research priorities, for example those identified in systematic reviews, evidence gaps set out in practice guidance such as The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence or specific prioritisation exercises such as those undertaken with patients and practitioners through the James Lind Alliance. | 4-7 | |
| 3. Report the target population for the intervention development process. | The target population is the population that will potentially benefit from the intervention – this may include patients, clinicians, and/or members of the public. If the target population is clearly described then readers will be able to understand the relevance of the intervention to their own research or practice. Health inequalities, gender and ethnicity are features of the target population that may be relevant to intervention development processes. | 9-10 | |
| 4. Report how any published intervention development approach contributed to the development process | Many formal intervention development approaches exist and are used to guide the intervention development process (e.g. 6Squid (16) or The Person Based Approach to Intervention Development (17)). Where a formal intervention development approach is used, it is helpful to describe the process that was followed, including any deviations. More general approaches to intervention development also exist and have been categorised as follows (3):- Target Population-centred intervention development; evidence and theory-based intervention development; partnership intervention development; implementation-based intervention development; efficacy- based intervention development; step or phased-based intervention development; and intervention-specific intervention development (3). These approaches do not always have specific guidance that describe their use. Nevertheless, it is helpful to give a rich description of how any published approach was operationalised | N/A | |
| 5. Report how evidence from different sources informed the intervention development process. | Intervention development is often based on published evidence and/or primary data that has been collected to inform the intervention development process. It is useful to describe and reference all forms of evidence and data that have informed the development of the intervention because evidence bases can change rapidly, and to explain the manner in which the evidence and/or data was used. Understanding what evidence was and was not available at the time of intervention development can help readers to assess transferability to their current situation. | 7-9 | |
| Report how/if published theory informed the intervention development process. | Reporting whether and how theory informed the intervention development process aids the reader's understanding of the theoretical rationale that underpins the intervention. Though not mentioned in the e-Delphi or consensus meeting, it became increasingly apparent through the development of our guidance that this theory item could relate to either existing published theory or programme theory | 5-6 | |
| Report any use of components from an existing intervention in the current intervention development process. | Some interventions are developed with components that have been adopted from existing interventions. Clearly identifying components that have been adopted or adapted and acknowledging their original source helps the reader to understand and distinguish between the novel and adopted components of the new intervention. | 5-6 | |
| Report any guiding principles, people or factors that were prioritised when making decisions during the intervention development process. | Reporting any guiding principles that governed the development of the application helps the reader to understand the authors' reasoning behind the decisions that were made. These could include the examples of particular populations who views are being considered when designing the intervention, the modality that is viewed as being most appropriate, design features considered important for the target population, or the potential for the intervention to be scaled up. | 8 | |

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

c

Supplementary material

1

| 1 |
|---|
| 2 |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 8 |
| 9 |
| 10 |
| 11 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 14 |
| 15 16 17 18 |
| 16 |
| 17 |
| 18 |
| 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 |
| 20 |
| 20 |
| 21 |
| 22 |
| 23 |
| 24 |
| 25 |
| 26 |
| 27 |
| 28 |
| 29 |
| 30 |
| 31 |
| 27 |
| 33 |
| 55 |
| 34 35 |
| 35 |
| 36 |
| 37 |
| 38 |
| 39 |
| 40 |
| 41 |
| 42 |
| 43 |
| 44 |
| 45 |
| 46 |
| 40 47 |
| |
| |
| 49 |
| 50 |
| 51 |
| 52 |
| 53 |
| 54 |
| 55 |
| 56 |
| 57 |
| 58 |
| 50 |

59 60

| It | em description | Explanation | Page in manuscript where item is located | Other |
|-----|--|---|---|-------|
| 9. | Report how stakeholders contributed to the intervention development process. | Potential stakeholders can include patient and community representatives, local and national policy makers, health care providers and those paying for or commissioning health care. Each of these groups may influence the intervention development process in different ways. Specifying how differing groups of stakeholders contributed to the intervention development process helps the reader to understand how stakeholders were involved and the degree of influence they had on the overall process. Further detail on how to integrate stakeholder contributions within intervention reporting are available (19). | 8-9 | |
| LO. | Report how the intervention changed in content and format from the start of the intervention development process. | Intervention development is frequently an iterative process. The conclusion of the initial phase of intervention development does not necessarily mean that all uncertainties have been addressed. It is helpful to list remaining uncertainties such as the intervention intensity, mode of delivery, materials, procedures, or type of location that the intervention is most suitable for. This can guide other researchers to potential future areas of research and practitioners about uncertainties relevant to their healthcare context. | N/A | |
| 11. | Report any changes to interventions required or likely to be required for subgroups. | Specifying any changes that the intervention development team perceive are required for the intervention to be delivered or tailored to specific sub groups enables readers to understand the applicability of the intervention to their target population or context. These changes could include changes to personnel delivering the intervention, to the content of the intervention, or to the mode of delivery of the intervention. | N/A | |
| .2. | Report important uncertainties at the end of the intervention development process. | Intervention development is frequently an iterative process. The conclusion of the initial phase of intervention development does not necessarily mean that all uncertainties have been addressed. It is helpful to list remaining uncertainties such as the intervention intensity, mode of delivery, materials, procedures, or type of location that the intervention is most suitable for. This can guide other researchers to potential future areas of research and practitioners about uncertainties relevant to their healthcare context. | N/A | |
| 13. | Follow TIDieR guidance when describing the developed intervention. | Interventions have been poorly reported for a number of years. In response to this, internationally recognized guidance has been published to support the high quality reporting of health care? interventions ⁵ and public health interventions ¹⁴ . This guidance should therefore be followed when describing a developed intervention. | N/A | |
| .4. | Report the intervention development process in an open access format. | Unless reports of intervention development are available people considering using an intervention cannot understand the process that was undertaken and make a judgement about its appropriateness to their context. It also limits cumulative learning about intervention development methodology and observed consequences at later evaluation, translation and implementation stages. Reporting intervention development in an open access (Gold or Green) publishing format increases the accessibility and visibility of intervention development research and makes it more likely to be read and used. Potential platforms for open access publication of intervention development include open access journal publications, freely accessible funder reports or a study web-page that details the intervention development process. | N/A | |

 $\ensuremath{^{\ast}\text{e.g.}}$ if item is reported elsewhere, then the location of this information can be stated here.

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

Mindfulness-based retreat for mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients: protocol for a pilot intervention study

| Journal: | BMJ Open |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Manuscript ID | bmjopen-2021-060461.R1 |
| Article Type: | Protocol |
| Date Submitted by the Author: | 25-May-2022 |
| Complete List of Authors: | Robertson, Taylor; The Hospital for Sick Children, Social Work Ahola Kohut, Sara; Hospital for Sick Children, Department of Gastroenterology, Hepatology and Nutrition; University of Toronto, Psychiatry Telfer, Heather; SickKids, Social Work; SickKids, Transplant and Regenerative Medicine Centre Seifert-Hansen, Mirna; SickKids, Transplant and Regenerative Medicine Centre Mitchell, Joanna; Canadian Donation and Transplantation Research Program Anthony, Samantha; The Hospital for Sick Children, |
| Primary Subject Heading : | Mental health |
| Secondary Subject Heading: | Qualitative research, Paediatrics |
| Keywords: | Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT, Transplant medicine < INTERNAL MEDICINE, MENTAL HEALTH, PAEDIATRICS, Paediatric transplant surgery < PAEDIATRIC SURGERY, QUALITATIVE RESEARCH |
| | |

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

BMJ Open

| 2 | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|---|--|
| 3 | 1 | Mindfulness-based retreat for mothers of pae | diatric heart transplant recipients: protocol | |
| 4 | 2 | for a pilot intervention study | | |
| 5 | 2 | for a prior miler vention study | | |
| 6 | 2 | T = 1 = 0 + 1 = 0 + 1 = 1 + 1 + 234 = 1 + 1 | | |
| 7 | 3 | Taylor Robertson ¹ , Sara Ahola Kohut ^{2,3,4} , Heath | er Teller ^{1,3} , Mirna Sellert-Hansen ³ , Joanna | |
| 8 | 4 | Mitchell ⁶ , Samantha J. Anthony ^{1,4,5,6,7} | | |
| 9 | | | | |
| 10 | 5 | 1. Department of Social Work, The Hospita | l for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada | |
| 11 | 6 | 2. Department of Psychology, The Hospital | for Sick Children, Toronto, ON, Canada | |
| 12 | 7 | 3. Department of Psychiatry, University of | | |
| 13 | 8 | | Gilgan Centre for Research and Learning, | |
| 14 | 9 | Toronto, ON, Canada | Singun Centre for Research and Dearning, | |
| 15 | | | antra The Hegnitel for Siels Children Terente | |
| 16 17 | 10 | | entre, The Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, | |
| 17 19 | 11 | ON, Canada | | |
| 18 19 | 12 | 6. Canadian Donation and Transplantation | | |
| 20 | 13 | 7. Factor-Inwentash Faculty of Social Work | x, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada | |
| 21 | | | | |
| 22 | 14 | Correspondence to: | | |
| 23 | 15 | Samantha J. Anthony | | |
| 24 | 16 | The Hospital for Sick Children | | |
| 25 | 17 | 686 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 0A4 | | |
| 26 | 18 | E-mail: <u>samantha.anthony@sickkids.ca</u> | | |
| 27 | 18 | E-man. samantia.anthony@sickkids.ca | | |
| 28 | | W 1 4 2457 | | |
| 29 | 20 | Word count: 3457 | | |
| 30 | 21 | | | |
| 31 | 22 | | | |
| 32 | 23 | | | |
| 33 | | Author | ORCID-ID | |
| 34 25 | | Taylor Robertson | 0000-0002-2690-701X | |
| 35 36 | | Dr. Sara Ahola Kohut | 0000-0003-1562-947X | |
| 37 | | Dr. Samantha J. Anthony | 0000-0002-1800-2333 | |
| 38 | 24 | Di. Sumundia S. Emiliony | 0000 0002 1000 2333 | |
| 39 | 27 | | | |
| 40 | 25 | | | |
| 41 | 2.3 | | | |
| 42 | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 43 | 26 | | | |
| 43 44 | 26 | | | |
| | | | | |
| 44 45 46 | 26 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 | 26 27 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 | 26 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 | 26 27 28 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 | 26 27 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 | 26 27 28 29 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 | 26 27 28 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 | 26 27 28 29 30 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 | 26 27 28 29 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 | 26 27 28 29 30 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 | 26 27 28 29 30 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 | 26 27 28 29 30 | | | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 | 26 27 28 29 30 | | 1 | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 | 26 27 28 29 30 | For peer review only - http://bmjoper | | |

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

| 1 2 | | | | | |
|--|----|--|--|--|--|
| 3 1 Abstract | | | | | |
| 5 6 | 2 | Introduction: Mothers are often the primary caregivers for children requiring heart | | | |
| 7 8 | 3 | transplantation. Given that a mother's ability to successfully cope with the demands of her | | | |
| 9 10 11 | 4 | caregiving role may be predictive of positive familial psychosocial outcomes, it is critical that | | | |
| 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | 5 | maternal coping is assessed and supported in paediatric health care. Mindfulness-based programs | | | |
| | 6 | are proposed as one intervention that may enhance quality of life, improve distress tolerance and | | | |
| | 7 | coping, and reduce social isolation in caregiving populations. This pilot study aims to | | | |
| 19 20 | 8 | investigate: (1) the implementation success of a mindfulness-based retreat (MBR), and (2) the | | | |
| 21 22 | 9 | effectiveness of the MBR at improving quality of life, distress tolerance, coping and perceived | | | |
| 23 24 | 10 | social support for mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients. | | | |
| 25 26 | | | | | |
| 27 28 20 | 11 | Methods and analysis: A convergent parallel, mixed method design is proposed for this pilot, | | | |
| 29 30 31 | 12 | exploratory study. Twenty mothers will participate in this pilot MBR held at a resort in Ontario, | | | |
| 32 33 34 | 13 | Canada. Quantitative data will be obtained using five standardized instruments completed at | | | |
| 35 36 37 | 14 | three timepoints: (T1) 24-hours prior to the intervention, (T2) immediately upon completion of | | | |
| 38 39 40 | 15 | the intervention, and (T3) three months post-intervention. Qualitative data will be collected from | | | |
| 40 41 42 | 16 | all participants both through semi-structured focus groups at T2 and individual telephone | | | |
| 43 44 | 17 | interviews at T3. Focus groups and individual interviews will be transcribed verbatim for | | | |
| 45 46 | 18 | thematic analysis. Quantitative and qualitative data will be merged and compared during | | | |
| 47 48 49 | 19 | interpretation to ensure that the intervention implementation and effectiveness of the MBR | | | |
| 49 50 51 52 | 20 | retreat are described with comprehensive accuracy. The primary outcomes will be feasibility in | | | |
| 53 54 | | | | | |
| 55 | | | | | |
| 56 57 | | | | | |
| EO | | 2 | | | |

| 1 2 | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 3 4 5 | 1 | relation to implementation effectiveness and participants' perception of social support for | | | | |
| 6 7 8 9 | 2 | efficacy of the MBR intervention. | | | | |
| 10 11 | 3 | Ethics and dissemination: This study received Institutional Research Ethics Board approval | | | | |
| 12 13 | 4 | from The Hospital for Sick Children (Number:1000064719). Informed consent will be obtained | | | | |
| 14 15 | | | | | | |
| 16 17 | 5 | prior to participant enrollment. Findings will be disseminated via conference presentations and | | | | |
| 18 19 20 | submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. | | | | | |
| Keywords: quality in health care, transplant medicine, mental health, paediatrics, pae | | | | | | |
| 23 24 25 | 8 | transplant surgery, qualitative research | | | | |
| 26 27 28 | 9 | Strengths and limitations of this study | | | | |
| 29 30 | 10 | | | | | |
| 31 32 | 10 | • Our mixed-methods study design will allow for a comprehensive understanding of the | | | | |
| 33 34 35 | 11 | study phenomena that could not be ascertained by qualitative or quantitative methods | | | | |
| 36 | 12 | alone. | | | | |
| 37 38 39 | 13 | • Patient engagement is prioritized throughout this protocol, with the inclusion of a patient | | | | |
| 40 41 | 14 | partner as a member of the research team to guide decisions concerning intervention | | | | |
| 42 43 | 15 | design, as well as methodological choices for outcome measures. | | | | |
| 44 45 46 | 16 | • The completion of quantitative outcome measures at three timepoints will allow for | | | | |
| 47 48 | 17 | intervention efficacy description across five domains of functioning (i.e., quality of life, | | | | |
| 49 50 | 18 | utilization of mindfulness skills, distress tolerance, coping and perceived social support). | | | | |
| 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 50 | | | | | | |
| 59 60 | | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml | | | | |

Page 4 of 28

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

BMJ Open

• This pilot study is exploratory in nature and designed to assess and inform a richer understanding of the implementation outcomes of this novel mindfulness-based retreat intervention for this clinical population.

• This is a single-centre study with a proposed small sample, which may limit the generalizability of the findings.

6 INTRODUCTION

From the time of diagnosis, caring for a child with a chronic illness is often a source of persistent stress for a family system.[1-4] Within paediatric heart transplantation, recipients face life-long medical follow-up that includes regular clinic visits, frequent, often invasive, medical tests and procedures, and immunosuppressive drug therapy with many accompanying side-effects (e.g., high blood pressure, kidney dysfunction, growth delay, infection risks, possible malignancies, and cosmetic effects).[5,6,7] This strict care regimen is disruptive to a family's daily life, their self-care and sleep routine[8], and places chronic social, psychological, and financial strain on family systems.[3,7] Maternal caregiving impact in paediatric heart transplant Mothers are most commonly the primary caregivers for paediatric heart transplant recipients.[5] As such, mothers' quality of life is impacted more than any other family member, by the mounting demands and parenting stressors associated with a child's illness.[5] Previous research on maternal coping in paediatric heart transplantation demonstrates clinically significant levels of psychosocial risk for poor mental health outcomes in 40% of respondents.[3] Additionally, the elevated psychosocial risk and significant emotional impact of transplantation on mothers appears to be enduring, [9,10] with high levels of caregiver burden reported several years post-transplantation.[9] Recent studies have cited the experience of

Page 5 of 28

BMJ Open

paediatric transplantation as an ongoing source of trauma for parents.[7,11] In a study on parents of heart transplant recipients, (75% of which were mothers), 19% of participants were found to meet the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual - IV diagnostic criteria for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), amounting to a prevalence rate that is two and half times higher than the general population.[7] Untreated symptoms of PTSD are commonly felt within the wider family system as they directly impact parenting capacity, and consequently, child health and development, well-being, and adjustment.[12,13] Increased clinical attention and accessible interventions to support the emotional coping and well-being of mothers may be efficacious to increase maternal coping and instrumental to support paediatric heart transplant recipients' health and well-being. The psychosocial needs of mothers of children with chronic illness are consistently underserved across healthcare settings.[1] Evidence-based interventions to support caregivers in paediatric healthcare are scarce and not prioritized, [14] and existing interventions (e.g., weekly support groups and individual counseling) are time-consuming which parents have cited as their primary barrier to participation in such health interventions.[1] To our knowledge this pilot study will be the first of its kind to specifically target the psychosocial needs of mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients through an retreat-based mindfulness intervention.

18 Mindfulness-based interventions

There is empirical evidence that mindfulness-based interventions (MBIs) significantly reduce psychological distress, anxiety, and depressive symptoms, and improve physical and mental health across many populations.[15,16] Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction is currently the most widely recognized and utilized MBI for the treatment of PTSD and general stress management.[17-19] MBIs more broadly have been shown to improve mental and physical

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

| 1 | health in populations of caregivers for children with chronic illnesses.[20,21] MBIs are | | |
|----|---|--|--|
| 2 | structured programs that incorporate tenets of mindful meditation and assume that the | | |
| 3 | cultivation of compassionate and non-judgmental awareness will lead to a reduction in stress, | | |
| 4 | suffering and symptoms of mental illness.[17-19] In MBIs, participants are guided through | | |
| 5 | exercises that develop mindfulness skills through formal practice.[15,16] These supported | | |
| 6 | opportunities to build capacity practicing mindfulness skills increase the likelihood for post- | | |
| 7 | intervention use of these skills as reliable coping tools to minimize distress in everyday | | |
| 8 | life.[15,16] This exploratory study proposes a novel, two-day mindfulness-based weekend | | |
| 9 | retreat adapted for mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients. It is recognized that an | | |
| 10 | increased level of social support is derived from the shared experience of MBIs when offered | | |
| 11 | in a retreat format.[15,20] This may provide benefit to the target population of this study as | | |
| 12 | high prevalence of social isolation has been identified amongst mothers of heart transplant | | |
| 13 | recipients, as well as their shared interest to connect with other mothers in similar positions.[5] | | |
| 14 | MBIs facilitated through a mindfulness-based weekend retreat (MBR) increase the opportunity | | |
| 15 | for social connection amongst participants because of environmental facilitators such as shared | | |
| 16 | accommodations, meal times and free time. The remote location while attending the retreat is | | |
| 17 | essential to provide mothers some space from their caregiving demands at home to focus both | | |
| 18 | on their own needs and on the mindfulness curriculum. The shared physical space while at the | | |
| 19 | retreat is intentional to increase community amongst participants over the two-day retreat. | | |
| 20 | Mindfulness is ideally suited for this population to address the inherent stress they | | |
| 21 | experience through their caregiving roles,[7] and group mindfulness practice has the ability to | | |
| 22 | catalyze community building that is sustained beyond a research setting.[22] Given the | | |
| 23 | applicability of a MBR to meet the needs of mothers of paediatric heart transplant recipients it | | |
| | | | |

BMJ Open

| 2 | |
|----------|-----|
| 3 | |
| 4 5 | |
| 6 | 4 |
| 7 8 | |
| 9 10 | |
| 11 | 2 |
| 12 13 | 4 |
| 14 15 | (|
| 16 | |
| 17 18 | |
| 19 | 8 |
| 20 21 | , |
| 22 23 | (|
| 24 25 | 2 |
| 25 26 | 1.4 |
| 27 | 1(|
| 28 29 | 1 |
| 30 31 | 1 |
| 32 | 12 |
| 33 34 | 13 |
| 35 | 1. |
| 36 37 | 14 |
| 38 | 1: |
| 39 40 | 1. |
| 41 42 | 10 |
| 43 | 11 |
| 44 45 | |
| 46 | 18 |
| 47 48 | 19 |
| 49 50 | 20 |
| 51 | 20 |
| 52 53 | 2 |
| 54 | |
| 55 56 | |
| 57 | |
| 58 59 | |
| 60 | |

| 1 | is proposed within this pilot study as an intervention with potential to enhance maternal well- |
|----------|---|
| 2 | being through the development of coping skills, social connectedness, and psychological |
| 3 | health.[5,15,17,20,21] |
| 4 | Study aims |
| 5 | To investigate the feasibility and efficacy of this intervention, the research objectives of this pilot |
| 6 | study are to: (1) examine implementation outcomes (<i>i.e., appropriateness, acceptability,</i> |
| 7 | adoption, feasibility, fidelity)[23] of the MBR, and (2) assess the efficacy of the MBR on |
| 8 | maternal quality of life, distress tolerance, coping and perceived social support. The primary |
| 9 | outcomes will be feasibility in relation to implementation effectiveness and participants' |
| 10 | perception of social support for efficacy of the MBR intervention. |
| 11 | |
| 12 | METHODS AND ANALYSIS |
| 13 | Study design |
| 14 | A convergent parallel, mixed method design was chosen for this pilot study wherein quantitative |
| 15 | and qualitative data will be collected simultaneously and analyzed independently, with results |
| 16 | merged during the final interpretative phase to address the study's overall purpose.[23] This |
| 17 | mixed methods design will allow for a comprehensive understanding of the study phenomena by |
| | mixed methods design will drow for a comprehensive understanding of the study phenomena by |
| 18 | incorporating both qualitative description methods to gather a rich account of participant |
| 18 19 | |
| | incorporating both qualitative description methods to gather a rich account of participant |
| 19 | incorporating both qualitative description methods to gather a rich account of participant experiences as well as quantitative measures to document the potential changes in participant |

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

| 2 |
|--|
| _ |
| 3 |
| 4 |
| 5 |
| 6 |
| 7 |
| 7 8 |
| 9 |
| |
| 10 |
| 11 |
| 12 |
| 13 |
| 13 14 |
| 15 |
| 16 |
| 16 17 18 |
| 18 |
| 10 |
| 19 20 |
| 20 |
| 21 |
| 22 |
| 23 |
| 24 |
| 25 |
| 26 27 |
| 20 |
| 27 |
| 28 |
| 29 |
| 30 |
| 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 |
| 32 |
| 33 |
| 34 |
| 35 |
| 26 |
| 20 |
| 37 |
| 38 |
| 39 |
| 40 |
| 41 |
| 42 |
| 43 |
| 44 |
| 45 |
| 43 46 |
| |
| 47 |
| 48 |
| 49 |
| 50 |
| 51 |
| 52 |
| 53 |
| 55 |
| 54 55 |
| |
| 56 |
| 57 |
| 58 |
| 59 |
| 60 |
| - |

1

| 1 | Qualitative research is highly valuable in this area because of the subjective impact of a |
|----|--|
| 2 | child's illness on a family, and the individualized nature of each mother's parenting experience |
| 3 | through transplantation. Qualitative data will be gathered through participation in a focus group |
| 4 | on the final day of the retreat and an individual interview three months post-retreat. Focus groups |
| 5 | are an efficient and effective method of qualitative data collection to yield anecdotal information |
| 6 | about personal experiences and perceptions.[25,26] Group dialogue with mothers about their |
| 7 | experiences of the retreat will offer a reflective opportunity to gather participant insights and to |
| 8 | address implementation outcomes (i.e., appropriateness, acceptability, adoption, feasibility, |
| 9 | fidelity)[27] of this intervention for this clinical population. Fidelity of this intervention will be |
| 10 | assessed through the components of treatment fidelity (facilitator factors include design, training, |
| 11 | and delivery and participant factors include receipt and enactment) put forth by The Treatment |
| 12 | Fidelity Workgroup of the National Institutes of Health Behavior Change Consortium.[28] A |
| 13 | focus group fits well with the group model of this retreat and is an opportune and feasible way to |
| 14 | collect qualitative data from this particular sample, given their geographic diversity. Both the |
| 15 | focus group and interview will gather participant feedback of parallel variables. |
| 16 | The quantitative instruments selected (Coping Health Inventory for Parents, Five Facet |
| 17 | Mindfulness Questionnaire, Pediatric Quality of Life (Peds QL^{TM}), Distress Tolerance Scale, |
| 18 | Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support) will capture a measurable and |
| 19 | generalizable assessment of maternal coping. The focus group and individual interview will |
| 20 | highlight detailed and individualized perspectives of the mothering experience through paediatric |
| 21 | heart transplantation, as well as provide insights to the participant experience of the MBR. |
| 22 | Integration of the qualitative and quantitative data will highlight a depth of understanding that |
| 23 | could not be obtained by either data separately. |
| | |

| 1 | Patient and public involvement |
|----|--|
| 2 | Caregiver needs and perspectives have been prioritized throughout the MBR pilot study design. |
| 3 | At the project's inception, a mother of a pediatric heart transplant recipient was recruited to be a |
| 4 | member of the research team as a patient partner (JM). Her lived caregiving experience informed |
| 5 | many decisions concerning intervention design as well as methodological choices for outcome |
| 6 | measures. The data collection measures identified dually prioritize the need to gather the richest |
| 7 | possible data set, with a commitment to refrain from burdening participants with lengthy and |
| 8 | arduous measures in consideration of their time. |
| 9 | Intervention design |
| 10 | The intervention will be a two-day retreat held over a weekend. The MBR will be held at a |
| 11 | resort in northern Ontario, Canada and will consist of a structured schedule of mindfulness and |
| 12 | compassion-based teaching and practices, including formal meditation, circle sharing, and |
| 10 | |
| 13 | deep relaxation.[29] The competencies developed in these exercises will be incorporated into |
| 14 | all other retreat activities such as mealtimes, mindful movement (including yoga), and walking |
| 15 | meditations. Mindfulness talks will be held on each day of the retreat, offering opportunities |
| 16 | for participants to learn about and develop mindfulness skills. Each mindfulness talk in the |
| 17 | retreat series will build upon the content of the previous talk, with the goal of moving |
| 18 | participants from introspective personal mindfulness practice to interpersonal community |
| 19 | building. Opportunities for guided circle sharing (i.e., group practice of mindfulness and |
| | 9 |

| 2 | | |
|----------------------|----|--|
| 3 4 5 | 1 | interpersonal sharing) and deep relaxation (i.e., personal practice bringing mindful attention to |
| 6 7 8 | 2 | the body to relieve stress) will be integrated throughout the retreat. |
| 9 10 11 12 | 3 | The MBR will have two primary facilitators who are both mental health professionals |
| 12 13 14 15 | 4 | (social worker and psychologist) with longstanding personal mindfulness practices. In |
| 16 17 18 | 5 | addition, both facilitators have completed teacher training in mindfulness (Mindful Self- |
| 19 20 21 22 | 6 | Compassion and Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy), as well as certificates in both |
| 23 24 25 | 7 | Foundations of Applied Mindfulness Meditation and Applied Specialization in Mindfulness |
| 26 27 28 | 8 | Meditation from the University of Toronto, Canada. Lastly, both facilitators have extensive |
| 29 30 31 32 | 9 | experience practicing in tertiary care hospitals adapting MBIs to support caregivers in chronic |
| 33 34 35 | 10 | disease populations. The facilitators, alongside the research team's patient partner (JM), |
| 36 37 38 | 11 | adapted the MBR specifically to the paediatric heart transplantation context. |
| 39 40 41 | 12 | Sample recruitment |
| 42 43 | 13 | A total of 20 participants will be recruited from The Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids) |
| 44 45 | 14 | Labatt Family Heart Centre who meet the following criteria: (1) a mother residing in Ontario |
| 46 47 48 | 15 | who is the primary caregiver of a paediatric heart transplant recipient, who is (2) a minimum of |
| 49 50 | 16 | four months post-transplant. Within this study, 'mother' is defined as a female-identifying |
| 51 52 | 17 | caregiver to a paediatric heart transplant recipient. Participants are not required to be biologically |
| 53 54 55 56 | 18 | related to the heart transplant recipient but must be the primary female-identifying caregiver and |
| 57 58 59 | | 1 |

Page 11 of 28

BMJ Open

share residence with the child. Purposive sampling will be used to obtain a sample with maximum variation.[30] Purposive sampling will ensure demographic variation amongst participants, specifically regarding: the mother's age, their child's age, stage of development and gender, and the family's race, ethnicity, composition, and geographic location of residence. Due to resource limitations that prohibit access to language and accessibility services, non-English speaking mothers and those with severe cognitive impairment as determined by a mental health professional will be excluded from participation in this study. Limited resources have also resulted in the restriction for participation in this study to Ontario residents only. Participant recruitment began in January 2020 and is ongoing. The retreat will be hosted when it is safe to do so according to local COVID-19 public health guidelines. Participant recruitment has involved social work and nursing staff from the Heart Transplant Program at the SickKids Labatt Family Heart Centre, who each received a study description from the research

13 team and were asked to select and refer mothers for eligibility review. If the mother consented to

14 participate in this study, she was then referred to the research team who ensured that all

15 eligibility criteria were met. Written informed consent was obtained from each study participant

17 Sample size

at that time.

A sample size of 20 participants is adequate to obtain data saturation in qualitative studies[31,32] and aligns with the recommended class size for traditional MBSR teaching which informed the overall intervention design.[29] This sample size is also intentional to facilitate social connection within the participant group and to allow for richer discussion within mindfulness practices, such as circle sharing.[29] Mixed- method mindfulness research predominantly describes a sample size ranging from 10-20 participants for optimal intervention delivery.[31]

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

| 1 | Data collection |
|----|---|
| 2 | Quantitative: Standardized questionnaires will be completed by all study participants at three |
| 3 | time-periods: (T1) 24-hours prior to attending the retreat, (T2) 24-hours after attending the |
| 4 | retreat, and (T3) three months post-retreat. At each timepoint, the questionnaires will be |
| 5 | completed by participants online through REDCap.[33] Paper copies can be mailed to |
| 6 | participants upon request. The three timepoints will allow for the comparison of outcomes |
| 7 | assessed by pre- and post-intervention measures. The following quantitative measures will be |
| 8 | used in this study: |
| 9 | (1) Coping Health Inventory for Parents is a 45-item scale measuring the demands |
| 10 | experienced by parents/caregivers of a child with a chronic health condition.[34] The |
| 11 | scale evaluates family integration and cooperation, maintenance of social support, self- |
| 12 | esteem and psychological stability, and comprehension of the child's medical situation. |
| 13 | Reliability has been previously established for this measure.[35] |
| 14 | (2) Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire is a 39-item scale measuring one's propensity to |
| 15 | be mindful in their daily life (i.e., observing, describing, acting with awareness, non- |
| 16 | judging of inner experience, and non-reactivity to inner experience).[36] Construct |
| 17 | validity has been previously established as well as its use in assessing the utilization of |
| 18 | mindfulness skills.[37] |
| 19 | (3) Pediatric Quality of Life (PedsQL TM) Family Impact Module is a 36-item scale measuring |
| 20 | the impact of chronic health conditions of children on parents through eight subscales: |
| 21 | physical functioning; emotional functioning; social functioning; cognitive functioning; |

communication; worry; daily activities; and family relationships. The PedsQLTM Family

Page 13 of 28

| 1 2 | | |
|----------------------------------|----|---|
| 3 4 | 1 | Impact Module is a widely used measure for the evaluation of parental quality of life.[38] |
| 5 6 | 2 | Internal consistency and reliability have been previously established.[38] |
| 7 8 | 3 | (4) Distress Tolerance Scale is a 14-item scale measuring distress tolerance across three |
| 9 10 11 | 4 | domains: tolerance of distress, appraisal of being distressed, and emotional |
| 12 13 | 5 | regulation.[39] Construct validity of this measure has been previously established.[39] |
| 14 15 | 6 | (5) Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support has 12-items and measures |
| 16 17 | 7 | perceived social support across three groups: family, friends and a significant other.[40] |
| 18 19 20 21 | 8 | Validity and reliability have been previously demonstrated for this instrument.[40] |
| 22 23 24 | 9 | Demographic and medical forms will be administered to all participants to collect |
| 25 26 | 10 | maternal information (e.g., age, race, ethnicity, number of children, annual household income, |
| 27 28 | 11 | highest level of education etc.) and child information (e.g., date of transplant, underlying |
| 29 30 | 12 | diagnosis, age at time of transplant, and co-morbidities etc.). These forms will be completed by |
| 31 32 33 | 13 | participants using REDCap.[33] Paper copies will be made available upon request. |
| 34 35 36 37 | 14 | Qualitative: Qualitative data will be collected at (T2) on the last day of the retreat intervention |
| 37 38 39 | 15 | and (T3) three months post-intervention. Participants will be divided into two groups of ten to |
| 40 41 | 16 | participate in focus groups on the last day of the retreat, again utilizing purposive selection to |
| 42 43 | 17 | ensure maximum variation in focus groups demographics. The focus group will be organized by |
| 44 45 | 18 | open-ended questions and probes facilitated by members of the research team with extensive |
| 46 47 48 | 19 | experience in qualitative methodology. Focus group guiding questions will probe several areas |
| 48 49 50 | 20 | around implementation and efficacy of the MBR intervention, including but not limited to: i) |
| 51 52 | 21 | decision-making around attending the retreat (e.g., hopes, expectations, worries), ii) experience |
| 53 54 55 56 57 58 | 22 | and acceptability of participating in the retreat (e.g., impact on domains of well-being), iii) |
| 50 | | 1 |

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

appropriateness of the retreat content (e.g., what components are useful and not useful), iv) feasibility (e.g., ease of participation), and v) post-retreat impressions (e.g., would the participant recommend the retreat to other mothers of heart transplant recipients?). While the questions are important, we plan to remain flexible in terms of probing (e.g., asking follow-up questions) based on participant answers and interactions A second researcher will be present to observe each group and document topics and concepts discussed by participants. Both focus group discussions will be audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. A subsequent semi-structured telephone interview will be completed individually with each participant three months post-intervention with transcription and data analysis to follow. **Data analysis** Quantitative: Each standardized instrument will be scored individually, and group data will be summarized by the calculation of means and standard deviations. T1 data will be assessed in comparison to T2 and T3 data. Notable changes in scores between each time-point will be descriptively analyzed. Should multiple characteristics present as significantly correlated with the same outcome, repeated measures ANOVA with post-hoc analysis will be used to discern the etiology of this correlation. Descriptive statistics will be used to describe and characterize the sample in this pilot. Qualitative: All data will be read and analyzed by multiple members of the research team. Deductive thematic analysis will be used, and codes will be determined through line-by-line review of the focus group discussion and individual interviews using NVivo.[41] Through this

21 review process, codes emerging repeatedly in various parts of the transcript will be noted and

comparatively analyzed by multiple research team members for purposes of consistency.[41]

1,

BMJ Open

Interpretation: Quantitative and qualitative data will be merged to compare both similarities and differences across findings.[23] The research team will compile quantitative statistical results and compare findings to the qualitative themes present within the focus group and individual interview data. Further analysis will consider how the two sets of data relate, diverge, and interconnect to create a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena.

6 ETH

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

This research study has received approval from the SickKids Research Ethics Board
(Number:1000064719). All participants will provide informed consent prior to their involvement
in the study. This research study sample will not include participants incapable of providing
informed consent or any participants under the age of 18.

The proposed research will inform a future randomized clinical trial to assess implementation outcomes and intervention effectiveness of a MBR within this population. This pilot study will greatly increase the breadth of knowledge about interventions that may support primary caregivers of paediatric heart transplant recipients. Findings will be translated and disseminated throughout cardiology and transplant communities and communicated to local, provincial, and national stakeholders. In addition, findings will be presented at national cardiology and transplant conferences and a manuscript will be submitted for publication in a peer-reviewed journal. Timing for dissemination of results will depend on the scheduled date of the retreat as permitted by provincial COVID-19 gathering restrictions.

All data collected over the course of the research study, including written transcription from the study's qualitative focus group and the subsequent individual telephone interviews, will be de-identified to protect participant confidentiality. Anonymous study identifiers will replace

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

all identifying information present in the transcripts. All identifying information, both paper copy and electronic information, will be kept confidential. Use of data over the course of the study, and dissemination of results will follow standard practice guidelines as determined by the SickKids Research Institute.

DISCUSSION

When a child undergoes heart transplantation, the role of the primary caregiver is notably linked to poor mental health outcomes and pervasive, illness-related parenting stress.[7] Previous research has correlated mindfulness-based practices with positive psychosocial outcomes in highly distressed populations, [17,42] and specifically in chronic disease populations, MBIs have demonstratively reduced psychological distress and symptoms of mental illness.[15,16] Aside from the benefits derived from direct participation, there is also potential for mindfulness interventions to yield larger systemic rewards. Supporting mothers to improve their coping can increase familial preparedness for post-transplant care management and any potential post-transplant hospitalizations.[6] With the length of hospitalization contributing the largest percentage of any transplant-associated costs.[6] positive caregiver coping and readiness for discharge could ultimately decrease healthcare spending per transplant patient. This innovative research leverages the MBR as an evidence-based intervention to engage mothers meaningfully by acknowledging the complexity of their role as a caregiver and addressing the impact of chronic stress and high caregiver burden. [5,7,43] While this pilot study is a preliminary step in addressing a wider gap in psychosocial intervention support to caregivers, the potential benefits derived are equally promising for individual patients and caregivers as well as the broader healthcare system.

Page 17 of 28

BMJ Open

This research is a necessary first step to advance the field of evidence-informed psychosocial interventions within paediatric cardiology and results will inform future iterations of the intervention across other participant groups. While caregiver experiences are unique, the need for support and disease-specific community building within paediatric healthcare is universal. This promising intervention will serve as a critical template for expansion across other clinical caregiving populations in paediatric solid organ transplant and other chronic illness care programs. Additionally, meeting the needs of all family members is vital to address family functioning, coping and resilience over the course of a child's chronic illness. Some study limitations should be considered. This is an exploratory single-centre study with a small sample size, which could potentially limit the generalizability of the results. Exclusion of non-English speaking mothers and mothers residing outside of Ontario is another limitation of the study that was necessary for the delivery of mindfulness teachings in a group retreat-based format, but one that must be noted when considering the demographics of study participants. Abbreviations MBI - Mindfulness-Based Intervention; MBR- Mindfulness-based Retreat; PTSD-Post Traumatic Stress Disorder Contributors TR, SJA, SAK, HT, MS-H, and JM participated in the study design. All these individuals are involved in the management of the study. TR drafted this protocol. All authors read, revised, and approved the final protocol. **Competing interests**

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

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-060461 on 8 July 2022. Downloaded from http://bmjopen.bmj.com/ on April 6, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright

| | 1 | The authors | declare | that they | have no | competing | interests. |
|--|---|-------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|
|--|---|-------------|---------|-----------|---------|-----------|------------|

References

- Funding for this study is provided by the SickKids Labatt Family Heart Centre Innovation Fund
- (Grant/Award Number: NA).
- fcar 1. Murphy N, Christian B, Caplin D et al. The health of caregivers for children with disabilities: caregiver perspectives. Child Care Health Dev 2007;33:180-187.
 - 2. Kennard B, Petrik K, Stewart S et al. Identifying Factors in Post-Operative Successful Adaptation to Pediatric Liver Transplantation. Soc Work Health Care 1991;15:19-33.
 - 3. Cousino M, Rea K, Schumacher K et al. A systematic review of parent and family functioning in pediatric solid organ transplant populations. Pediatr Transplant
 - 2017;21:e12900.

BMJ Open

| 1 2 | | | |
|--|----|---|---------------|
| 3 4 | 1 | 4. Soulvie, M., Desai, P., White, C. and Sullivan, B., 2012. Psychological Distre | ess |
| 5 6 | 2 | Experienced by Parents of Young Children with Congenital Heart Defects: A | |
| 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | 3 | Comprehensive Review of Literature. J Soc Serv Res, 38(4), pp.484-502. | |
| | 4 | 5. Green A, Meaux J, Huett A et al. Constantly Responsible, Constantly Worrie | d, |
| | 5 | Constantly Blessed: Parenting after Pediatric Heart Transplant. Prog Transpla | ant |
| 14 15 | 6 | 2009;19:122-127. | |
| 16 17 18 | 7 | 6. Levy A, Sobolev B, James D et al. The Costs of Change: Direct Medical Cost | ts of Solid |
| 19 20 | 8 | Organ Transplantation in British Columbia, Canada, 1995–2003. Value in He | alth |
| 21 22 | 9 | 2009;12:282-292. | |
| 23 24 25 | 10 | 7. Farley L, DeMaso D, D'Angelo E et al. Parenting Stress and Parental Post-tra | umatic |
| 26 27 | 11 | Stress Disorder in Families After Pediatric Heart Transplantation. J Heart Lui | ng |
| 28 29 | 12 | Transplant 2007;26:120-126. | |
| 30 31 32 | 13 | 8. Keilty K, Cohen E, Spalding K et al. Sleep disturbance in family caregivers o | f children |
| 33 34 | 14 | who depend on medical technology. Arch Dis Child 2017;103:137-142. | |
| 35 36 | 15 | 9. DeMaso, D., Douglas Kelley, S., Bastardi, H., O'Brien, P. and Blume, E., 200 | 04. The |
| 37 38 | 16 | longitudinal impact of psychological functioning, medical severity, and famil | у |
| 39 40 41 | 17 | functioning in pediatric heart transplantation. J Heart Lung Transplant, 23(4) | , pp.473- |
| 42 43 | 18 | 480. | |
| 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 | 19 | 10. Rodrigue, J., MacNaughton, K., Hoffmann, R., Graham-Pole, J., Andres, J., N | Novak, D. |
| | 20 | and Fennell, R., 1997. Transplantation in Children: A Longitudinal Assessme | ent of |
| | 21 | Mothers' Stress, Coping, and Perceptions of Family Functioning. Psychosome | atics, 38(5), |
| 51 52 | 22 | pp.478-486. | |
| 53 54 55 | | | |
| 55 56 57 | | | |
| 58 59 | | | 1 |

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

Page 20 of 28

BMJ Open

1

| 2 | | |
|----------------|----|---|
| 3 4 | 1 | 11. Young, G., Mintzer, L., Seacord, D., Castaneda, M., Mesrkhani, V. and Stuber, M., 2003. |
| 5 6 | 2 | Symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder in Parents of Transplant Recipients: |
| 7 8 | 3 | Incidence, Severity, and Related Factors. Pediatrics, 111(6), pp. e725-e731. |
| 9 10 11 | 4 | 12. Samuelson, K., Wilson, C., Padrón, E., Lee, S. and Gavron, L., 2016. Maternal PTSD and |
| 12 13 | 5 | Children's Adjustment: Parenting Stress and Emotional Availability as Proposed |
| 14 15 | 6 | Mediators. J Clin Psychol, 73(6), pp.693-706. |
| 16 17 | 7 | 13. Simons, L., Ingerski, L. and Janicke, D., 2007. Social support, coping, and psychological |
| 18 19 | 8 | distress in mothers and fathers of pediatric transplant candidates: A pilot study. <i>Pediatr</i> |
| 20 21 22 | 9 | Transplant, 11(7), pp.781-787. |
| 23 24 | 10 | 14. Jane-Llopis E, Katschnig H, McDaid D et al. Supporting decision-making processes for |
| 25 26 | 11 | evidence-based mental health promotion. <i>Health Promot Int</i> 2011;26:i140-i146. |
| 27 28 | 12 | 15. Fjorback L, Arendt M, Ørnbøl E et al. Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction and |
| 29 30 31 | 13 | Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy - a systematic review of randomized controlled |
| 32 33 | 13 | trials. Acta Psychiatr Scand 2011;124:102-119 |
| 34 35 | 14 | 16. Visted E, Vøllestad J, Nielsen M et al. The Impact of Group-Based Mindfulness Training |
| 36 37 | 16 | on Self-Reported Mindfulness: a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. <i>Mindfulness</i> |
| 38 39 40 | | |
| 40 41 | 17 | 2014;6:501-522. |
| 42 43 | 18 | 17. Siegel D. Mindful awareness, mindsight, and neural integration. The Humanistic |
| 44 45 | 19 | Psychologist 2009;37:137-158. |
| 46 47 48 | 20 | 18. Müller-Engelmann, M., Wünsch, S., Volk, M. and Steil, R., 2017. Mindfulness-Based |
| 49 50 | 21 | Stress Reduction (MBSR) as a Standalone Intervention for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder |
| 51 52 | 22 | after Mixed Traumatic Events: A Mixed-Methods Feasibility Study. Front Psychol, 8. |
| 53 54 | | |
| 55 56 | | |
| 57 | | |
| 58 59 | | 2 |
| 60 | | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml |

| 1 2 | | |
|--|----|--|
| 2 3 4 | 1 | 19. Kabat-Zinn, J., Massion, A., Kristeller, M., Gay Peterson, L., Fletcher, K., Pbert, L., |
| 5 6 | 2 | Lenderking, W. and Santorelli, S., 1992. Effectiveness of a meditation-based stress |
| 7 8 9 | 3 | reduction program in the treatment of anxiety disorders. Am J Psychiatry, 149(7), pp.936- |
| 10 11 | 4 | 943. |
| 12 13 | 5 | 20. Minor, H., Carlson, L., Mackenzie, M., Zernicke, K. and Jones, L., 2006. Evaluation of a |
| 14 15 16 | 6 | Mindfulness-Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) Program for Caregivers of Children with |
| 17 18 | 7 | Chronic Conditions. Soc Work Health Care, 43(1), pp.91-109. |
| 19 20 | 8 | 21. Ruskin D, Young M, Sugar C et al. Mindfulness and Acceptance Interventions for |
| 21 22 | 9 | Parents of Children and Adolescents Diagnosed with Chronic Medical Conditions: A |
| 23 24 25 | 10 | Systematic Review. J Altern Complement Med 2021;27:120-135. |
| 26 27 | 11 | 22. Duncan, L. and Bardacke, N., 2009. Mindfulness-Based Childbirth and Parenting |
| 28 29 | 12 | Education: Promoting Family Mindfulness During the Perinatal Period. J Child Fam |
| 30 31 32 | 13 | <i>Stud</i> , 19(2), pp.190-202. |
| 33 34 | 14 | 23. Creswell JW, Creswell JD. Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods |
| 35 36 | 15 | approaches. Thousand Oaks, CA: : SAGE Publications, Inc 2018. |
| 37 38 39 | 16 | 24. Sandelowski M. Whatever happened to qualitative description? Res Nurs Health |
| 39 40 41 | 17 | 2000;23:334–40. |
| 42 43 | 18 | 25. Kitzinger, J., 1994. The methodology of Focus Groups: the importance of interaction |
| 44 45 | 19 | between research participants. Sociol Health Illn, 16(1), pp.103-121. |
| 46 47 48 | 20 | 26. Krueger, R. and Casey, M., 2014. Focus groups: A Practical Guide for Applied Research. |
| 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 | 21 | Los Angeles [etc.]: Sage. |
| 57 58 59 | | 2 |
| 60 | | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml |

Page 22 of 28

BMJ Open

1

2

58 59

60

| 3 4 | 1 | 27. Proctor E, Silmere H, Raghavan R et al. Outcomes for Implementation Research: |
|----------------|----|--|
| 5 6 | 2 | Conceptual Distinctions, Measurement Challenges, and Research Agenda Adm Policy |
| 7 8 | 3 | Ment Health 2010;38:65-76. |
| 9 10 11 | 4 | 28. Kechter A, Amaro H, Black D. Reporting of Treatment Fidelity in Mindfulness-Based |
| 12 13 | 5 | Intervention Trials: A Review and New Tool Using NIH Behavior Change Consortium |
| 14 15 | 6 | Guidelines. Mindfulness 2018;10:215-233. |
| 16 17 18 | 7 | 29. Kabat-Zinn J, Santorelli S, Meleo-Meyer F et al. Mindfulness-Based stress reduction |
| 19 20 | 8 | authorized curriculum guide. 2017.https://www.umassmed.edu/globalassets/center- for- |
| 21 22 | 9 | mindfulness/documents/mbsr-curriculum-guide-2017.pdf |
| 23 24 25 | 10 | 30. Erlandson D. Doing naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage 1993. |
| 25 26 27 | 11 | 31. Frank P, Marken M. Developments in Qualitative Mindfulness Practice Research: a Pilot |
| 28 29 | 12 | Scoping Review. Mindfulness 2021;13:17-36. 9 |
| 30 31 | 13 | 32. Vasileiou K, Barnett J, Thorpe S, Young T. Characterising and justifying sample size |
| 32 33 34 | 14 | sufficiency in interview-based studies: systematic analysis of qualitative health research |
| 35 36 | 15 | over a 15-year period. BMC Medical Res Methodol. 2018;18(1):1-18. |
| 37 38 | 16 | 33. REDCap, 2021. REDCap. [online] Project-redcap.org. Available at: |
| 39 40 41 | 17 | <https: www.project-redcap.org=""></https:> [Accessed 13 May 2021]. |
| 41 42 43 | 18 | 34. McCubbin, H., McCubbin, M., Patterson, J., Cauble, A., Wilson, L. and Warwick, W., |
| 44 45 | 19 | 1983. CHIP. Coping Health Inventory for Parents: An Assessment of Parental Coping |
| 46 47 | 20 | Patterns in the Care of the Chronically Ill Child. J Marriage Fam, 45(2), p.359. |
| 48 49 50 | 21 | 35. Patterson, J., McCubbin, H. and Warwick, W., 1990. The impact of family functioning on |
| 50 51 52 | 22 | health changes in children with cystic fibrosis. Soc Sci Med, 31(2), pp.159-164. |
| 53 54 | | |
| 55 56 | | |
| 50 57 | | |

| | BM |
|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| - | |
| | n: fir: |
| | rst pub |
| | olishe |
| 9 | das |
| | 10.11 |
| | 36/bn |
| | niope |
| : | as 10.1136/bmiopen-2021-060461 on 8 J |
| | 1-06 |
| | 0461 |
| | on 8 |
| | |
| | 2022 |
| - | Dow |
| | nload |
| - | ed fro |
| | |
| | p://br |
| | bmiopen.br |
| | <u>n</u> bm |
| | i.com |
| - | on / |
| 4 | April 6 |
| | 202 |
| | 4 bv o |
| | uest. |
| | Prote |
| | icted |
| | by co |
| 5 T J T S | novria |
| | þ |

| 2 | | |
|----------------|----|---|
| 3 4 | 1 | 36. Baer, R., Smith, G., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J. and Toney, L., 2006. Using Self-Report |
| 5 6 | 2 | Assessment Methods to Explore Facets of Mindfulness. Assessment, 13(1), pp.27-45. |
| 7 8 | 3 | 37. Baer, R., Smith, G., Lykins, E., Button, D., Krietemeyer, J., Sauer, S., Walsh, E., |
| 9 10 11 | 4 | Duggan, D. and Williams, J., 2008. Construct Validity of the Five Facet Mindfulness |
| 12 13 | 5 | Questionnaire in Meditating and Nonmeditating Samples. Assessment, 15(3), pp.329-342. |
| 14 15 16 | 6 | 38. Scarpelli, A., Paiva, S., Pordeus, I., Varni, J., Viegas, C. and Allison, P., 2008. The |
| 16 17 18 | 7 | Pediatric Quality of Life Inventory [™] (PedsQL [™]) family impact module: reliability and |
| 19 20 | 8 | validity of the Brazilian version. Health Qual Life Outcomes, 6(1), p.35. |
| 21 22 | 9 | 39. Simons, J. and Gaher, R., 2005. The Distress Tolerance Scale: Development and |
| 23 24 25 | 10 | Validation of a Self-Report Measure. Motiv Emot, 29(2), pp.83-102. |
| 25 26 27 | 11 | 40. Dahlem, N., Zimet, G. and Walker, R., 1991. The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived |
| 28 29 | 12 | Social Support: A confirmation study. J Clin Psychol, 47(6), pp.756-761. |
| 30 31 32 | 13 | 41. Braun, V. and Clarke, V., 2006. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qual Res |
| 32 33 34 | 14 | <i>Psychol</i> , 3(2), pp.77-101. |
| 35 36 | 15 | 42. Cahn B, Goodman M, Peterson C et al. Yoga, Meditation and Mind-Body Health: |
| 37 38 | 16 | Increased BDNF, Cortisol Awakening Response, and Altered Inflammatory Marker |
| 39 40 41 | 17 | Expression after a 3-Month Yoga and Meditation Retreat. Front Hum Neurosci 2017;11. |
| 42 43 | 18 | 43. Cohn J. An Empirical Study of Parents' Reaction to the Diagnosis of Congenital Heart |
| 44 45 | 19 | Disease in Infants. Soc Work Health Care 1996; 23:67-79. |
| 46 47 | | |
| 48 | | |
| 49 | | |
| 50 | | |
| 51 | | |
| 52 53 | | |
| 53 54 | | |
| | | |

3 4

24

| BMJ Open | | Page | |
|--------------------|------------|---|--------------------------|
| | | BMJ Open Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials | |
| SPIRIT 2013 Check | klist: Rec | ommended items to address in a clinical trial protocol and related documents* 및 | |
| Section/item | ltem No | Description 2022. Dog | Addressed on page number |
| Administrative inf | ormatior | n nhoaded | Page 1 |
| Title | 1 | Descriptive title identifying the study design, population, interventions, and, if application are a study design, population, interventions, and, if application are a study design, population, interventions, and, if application are a study design, population, interventions, and a study design are a study design. | |
| Trial registration | 2a | Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registry | N/A |
| | 2b | All items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data Set | N/A |
| Protocol version | 3 | Date and version identifier | Page 1 |
| Funding | 4 | Sources and types of financial, material, and other support | Page 19 |
| loles and | 5a | Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors | Page 1 and 19 |
| responsibilities | 5b | Trial identifier and registry name. If not yet registered, name of intended registryAll items from the World Health Organization Trial Registration Data SetDate and version identifierSources and types of financial, material, and other supportNames, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributorsName and contact information for the trial sponsor | N/A |
| | 5c | Role of study sponsor and funders, if any, in study design; collection, management, apalysis, and interpretation of data; writing of the report; and the decision to submit the report for publication, including | N/A |
| | | whether they will have ultimate authority over any of these activities | N/A |
| | 5d | Composition, roles, and responsibilities of the coordinating centre, steering committee endpoint adjudication committee, data management team, and other individuals or groups over applicable (see Item 21a for data monitoring committee) | |
| | | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml | |

| Page 25 of 28 | | | BMJ Open | | |
|--|--------------------------|------------|---|------------|---|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Introduction | n- 2021 | | | |
| | Background and rationale | 6a | Description of research question and justification for undertaking the trial, including sللله المشامع والمسابق studies (published and unpublished) examining benefits and harms for each intervent | Page 5-7 | - |
| | | 6b | Explanation for choice of comparators | N/A | _ |
| 8 9 | Objectives | 7 | Specific objectives or hypotheses | Page 8 | _ |
| 10 11 12 | Trial design | 8 | Description of trial design including type of trial (eg, parallel group, crossover, factorial, single group), allocation ratio, and framework (eg, superiority, equivalence, noninferiority, explorators) | Page 8-11 | _ |
| 13 14 15 | Methods: Participa | nts, inte | erventions, and outcomes | | |
| 16 17 18 | Study setting | 9 | Description of study settings (eg, community clinic, academic hospital) and list of countries where data will be collected. Reference to where list of study sites can be obtained | Page 10 | _ |
| 19 20 | Eligibility criteria | 10 | Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants. If applicable, eligibility criteria for study centres and individuals who will perform the interventions (eg, surgeons, psychotherapists) | Page 11-12 | _ |
| 21 22 23 24 | Interventions | 11a | Interventions for each group with sufficient detail to allow replication, including how and when they will be administered | Page 10-11 | _ |
| 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 | | 11b | Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions for a given trial participant (eg, drug dose change in response to harms, participant request, or improving/worsening disease) | N/A | _ |
| | | 11c | Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols, and any procedures for monitoring adherence | N/A | _ |
| 31 32 33 | | 11d | (eg, drug tablet return, laboratory tests) | N/A | _ |
| 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 | Outcomes | | Primary, secondary, and other outcomes, including the specific measurement variable (eg, systolic blood pressure), analysis metric (eg, change from baseline, final value, time to event), method of aggregation (eg, | Page 8 | _ |
| | | | | | |
| | Participant timeline | 13 | Time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants. A schematic diagram is highly recommended (see Figure) | Page 11-12 | _ |
| 42 43 44 45 46 | | | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml | | 2 |

Page 26 of 28

| | | BMJ Open | Pag |
|--|----------|--|------------|
| Sample size | 14 | Estimated number of participants needed to achieve study objectives and how it was determined, including clinical and statistical assumptions supporting any sample size calculations | Page 11 |
| Recruitment | 15 | Strategies for achieving adequate participant enrolment to reach target sample size | N/A |
| Methods: Assignm | ent of i | nterventions (for controlled trials) | |
| Allocation: | | | |
| Sequence | 16a | Method of generating the allocation sequence (eg, computer-generated random numbers), and list of any | N/A |
| generation | | factors for stratification. To reduce predictability of a random sequence, details of any planned restriction (eg, blocking) should be provided in a separate document that is unavailable to those who enrol participants or assign interventions | |
| Allocation concealment mechanism | 16b | Mechanism of implementing the allocation sequence (eg, central telephone; sequentially numbered, opaque, sealed envelopes), describing any steps to conceal the sequence until interventions are assigned | N/A |
| Implementation | 16c | Who will generate the allocation sequence, who will enrol participants, and who will assign participants to interventions | N/A |
| Blinding (masking) | 17a | ع. Who will be blinded after assignment to interventions (eg, trial participants, care provieers, outcome assessors, data analysts), and how | N/A |
| | 17b | If blinded, circumstances under which unblinding is permissible, and procedure for revealing a participant's allocated intervention during the trial | N/A |
| Methods: Data coll | ection | management, and analysis | |
| | | | Page 12-15 |
| Data collection methods | 18a | Plans for assessment and collection of outcome, baseline, and other trial data, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, duplicate measurements, training of assessors) and a description of study instruments (eg, questionnaires, laboratory tests) along with their reliability and validity, if known. Reference to where data collection forms can be found, if not in the protocol | |
| | 18b | Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up, including list of any outcome data to be | N/A |
| | | collected for participants who discontinue or deviate from intervention protocols | |
| | | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml | |

| Page 27 of 28 | | | BMJ Open 36/bmj | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|------------|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Data management | 19 | Plans for data entry, coding, security, and storage, including any related processes to promote data quality (eg, double data entry; range checks for data values). Reference to where details of data management procedures can be found, if not in the protocol | Page 14-17 |
| | Statistical methods | 20a | Statistical methods for analysing primary and secondary outcomes. Reference to where other details of the statistical analysis plan can be found, if not in the protocol | Page 14-15 |
| 8 9 | | 20b | Methods for any additional analyses (eg, subgroup and adjusted analyses) | N/A |
| 10 11 12 | | 20c | Definition of analysis population relating to protocol non-adherence (eg, as randomised analysis), and any statistical methods to handle missing data (eg, multiple imputation) | N/A |
| 13 14 15 | Methods: Monitorir | ng | oa ded | |
| 16 17 | Data monitoring | 21a | Composition of data monitoring committee (DMC); summary of its role and reporting structure; statement of | N/A |
| 18 19 20 | | | about its charter can be found, if not in the protocol. Alternatively, an explanation of why a DMC is not needed | |
| 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 | | 21b | Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines, including who will have access to these interim results and make the final decision to terminate the trial | N/A |
| | Harms | 22 | Plans for collecting, assessing, reporting, and managing solicited and spontaneously geported adverse | N/A |
| | Auditing | 23 | Frequency and procedures for auditing trial conduct, if any, and whether the process will be independent | N/A |
| | | from investigators and the sponsor | | |
| | Ethics and dissemination | | | |
| 34 35 | Research ethics | 24 | Plans for seeking research ethics committee/institutional review board (REC/IRB) approval | Page 16 |
| 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 | approval Protocol amendments | 25 | Plans for communicating important protocol modifications (eg, changes to eligibility creteria, outcomes, | N/A |
| | | | analyses) to relevant parties (eg, investigators, REC/IRBs, trial participants, trial registries, journals, regulators) | |
| | | | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml | |

Page 28 of 28

| | | | BMJ Open Pa | age 28 | | |
|---|--|-----|---|--------|--|--|
| 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Consent or assent | 26a | Who will obtain informed consent or assent from potential trial participants or authorised surrogates, and how (see Item 32) $\frac{9}{2}$ | _ | | |
| | | 26b | Additional consent provisions for collection and use of participant data and biological specimens in ancillary | _ | | |
| | Confidentiality | 27 | How personal information about potential and enrolled participants will be collected, shared, and maintained | _ | | |
| 10 11 12 | Declaration of interests | 28 | Financial and other competing interests for principal investigators for the overall trial and each study site $Page 19$ | _ | | |
| 13 14 15 | Access to data | 29 | Statement of who will have access to the final trial dataset, and disclosure of contracteral agreements that | _ | | |
| 16 17 18 | Ancillary and post- trial care | 30 | Provisions, if any, for ancillary and post-trial care, and for compensation to those who suffer harm from trial | _ | | |
| 19 20 21 22 23 | Dissemination policy | 31a | Plans for investigators and sponsor to communicate trial results to participants, healthcare professionals, the public, and other relevant groups (eg, via publication, reporting in results databases, or other data sharing arrangements), including any publication restrictions | _ | | |
| 23 24 25 | | 31b | Authorship eligibility guidelines and any intended use of professional writers | _ | | |
| 26 27 28 | | 31c | Plans, if any, for granting public access to the full protocol, participant-level dataset, and statistical code | _ | | |
| 29 30 31 32 | Appendices Informed consent materials | 32 | Model consent form and other related documentation given to participants and authors and surrogates $\frac{N/A}{2}$ | _ | | |
| 33 34 35 36 | Biological specimens | 33 | Plans for collection, laboratory evaluation, and storage of biological specimens for genetic or molecular | _ | | |
| 37 38 39 40 41 | *It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the SPIRIT 2013 Explanation & Elaboration for important clarification on the items. Amendments to the protocol should be tracked and dated. The SPIRIT checklist is copyrighted by the SPIRIT Group under the Creative Commons " <u>Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported</u> " license. | | | | | |
| 42 43 44 | | | For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml | 5 | | |