

Provision of care for families affected by craniofacial conditions: The views of non-specialist health professionals

Abstract

Objective: A diagnosis of a congenital craniofacial condition can have a significant impact on the psychological wellbeing of the affected family. As the first health professionals likely to come into contact with families, non-specialists, such as diagnostic sonographers, midwives, and health visitors play a crucial role in facilitating familial adjustment. Yet, previous research has demonstrated parental dissatisfaction with the care delivered by non-specialists. The aim of this study was to investigate the provision of care for families affected by craniofacial conditions from the perspective of non-specialist health professionals, with a view to informing the development of educational materials.

Design: Individual semi-structured telephone interviews ($n = 14$) were conducted with three diagnostic sonographers, two fetal medicine consultants, three midwives, four health visitors, and two children's nurses.

Results: Participants identified a range of barriers to the delivery of optimal care, including dealing with parental reactions, time pressure, hospital protocols and resources, a lack of contact with specialist craniofacial teams, and the emotional impact of delivering a diagnosis. Most participants had received no prior training in the area of congenital craniofacial conditions, while those who had felt current training materials were insufficient. All participants expressed a desire for further training and provided guidance regarding preferred content and format.

Conclusions: This study provides insight into the challenges faced by non-specialists, as well as a range of information and training needs which could improve their knowledge and confidence. Suggestions for the development of educational materials for non-specialist health professionals are made.

Key words: craniofacial; cleft lip and palate; diagnosis; feeding; maternal health; training

26

27

28 **Introduction**

29 In high-income countries, fetal anomaly screening at 18 to 21 weeks gestation now routinely includes
30 screening for a cleft lip (e.g. Public Health England, 2013). Other craniofacial anomalies may also be
31 detected during this scan. If identified, expectant parents are usually given a second appointment to confirm
32 the diagnosis and to discuss options with a fetal medicine consultant. A cleft palate is rarely detected during
33 antenatal screening, and therefore almost all are diagnosed following the birth. A visual assessment of the
34 palate should be carried out, and additional craniofacial anomalies should be screened for (Royal College
35 of Paediatrics and Child Health, 2014). In all cases, a referral should be made to the specialist
36 cleft/craniofacial team within 24 hours of the diagnosis (Public Health England, 2013).

37 Whether identified antenatally or postnatally, a diagnosis of a congenital craniofacial condition can have a
38 significant impact on the psychological wellbeing of the parents, and the family unit as a whole (Nelson et
39 al., 2012a; Feragen & Stock, 2017). Parents have reported complex emotional responses to the diagnosis,
40 including grief, shock, anger, guilt, and worry (Nelson et al., 2012a), in addition to raised levels of stress,
41 anxiety, and depression (Stock et al., 2019a). Parents must grapple with feeding difficulties, process a
42 wealth of new medical information, and embark on a daunting, long-term multidisciplinary healthcare
43 pathway (Nelson et al., 2012b), which often involves surgical intervention within the first year of the child's
44 life.

45 As the first health professionals likely to come into contact with expectant or new parents, diagnostic
46 sonographers, fetal medicine consultants, and midwives play a crucial role in facilitating parental
47 adjustment to the diagnosis. These non-specialists must impart the news of the diagnosis to the family,
48 explain the prognosis of the condition, discuss the option of further screening tests and termination of the
49 pregnancy, and make the appropriate referrals. Midwives are also important in the delivery of a
50 comprehensive feeding plan. Later, health visitors will take over responsibility for postnatal care from the
51 midwives, and children's nurses will be on hand to support the family through early medical treatment.

52 Satisfaction with healthcare is a key predictor of parental wellbeing and familial adjustment (Stock et al.,
53 2019a). Prior research has indicated that families value health professionals' expertise and interpersonal
54 skills, as well as the continuity and coordination of care (Knapke et al., 2010; Nelson & Kirk, 2013). While
55 the service provided by the specialist craniofacial teams is consistently highly rated (Nelson & Kirk, 2013;
56 Feragen et al., 2017), previous research has demonstrated parental dissatisfaction with the care delivered
57 by non-specialist health professionals. During the diagnostic experience, parents have reported a lack of
58 knowledge among non-specialists about these conditions and their long-term implications, and/or the
59 delivery of inaccurate, inconsistent, or overwhelming information (Stock & Rumsey, 2015; Searle et al.,
60 2016; Searle et al., 2018; Costa et al., 2019; Stock et al., 2019b). In the case of an antenatal diagnosis,
61 parents have also reported feeling rushed to make decisions regarding further screening tests and/or
62 termination of the pregnancy (Searle et al., 2016; Stock et al., 2019c). Following the birth, the late diagnosis
63 of cleft palate, conflicting information surrounding feeding methods, and a lack of support during home-
64 based care has also been described by parents (Lindberg & Berglund, 2014; Stock & Rumsey, 2015; Tierney
65 et al., 2015; Searle et al., 2016; Costa et al., 2019). In addition, specialist health professionals working
66 within craniofacial teams have communicated that much of their initial consultations with parents are spent
67 trying to dispel myths, correct inaccuracies, and reduce parental distress, as a result of negative interactions
68 with non-specialist health professionals (Stock et al., 2019d).

69 While a breadth of research detailing parental dissatisfaction with the care provided by non-specialist health
70 professionals now exists, few studies have pursued potential solutions. Further, the perspective of non-
71 specialist health professionals has remained absent from the literature. The aim of this study was to
72 investigate the provision of care for families affected by craniofacial conditions from the perspective of
73 non-specialist health professionals, with a view to informing the development of educational materials.

74

75 **Method**

76 *Design*

77 This study utilised individual semi-structured telephone interviews to elicit the views of non-specialist
78 health professionals working in a variety of disciplines.

79 *Procedure*

80 Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Faculty Research Committee at the **University of the**
81 **West of England**. Health professionals were invited to participate in the study using a variety of different
82 methods, including advertisements on social media and department-wide emails to university and hospital-
83 based staff. Potential participants contacted the researcher by email to express an interest in the study and
84 were subsequently sent information about what the study would entail, as well as ethical considerations,
85 such as their right to withdraw. A mutually convenient time to conduct the telephone interview was then
86 agreed with each participant. Participants were given several opportunities to ask any questions throughout
87 their involvement in the study. Verbal informed consent from each participant was audio recorded before
88 the interview began. All interviews were conducted by the first author, who is trained in interviewing
89 methods. The interview itself consisted of four broad areas: health professionals' training and employment
90 history and their understanding of their role; experiences of working with families affected by craniofacial
91 conditions; current approaches to service delivery for these families; and views on if and how services could
92 be improved. Interviews lasted 57 minutes on average.

93 *Participants*

94 Participants in this study ($n = 14$) included three diagnostic sonographers, two fetal medicine consultants,
95 three midwives, four health visitors, and two children's nurses. Six participants also held an academic post
96 at the time of the interview. Ten participants were female, and all participants were White British. The
97 average length of time participants had spent working in their roles since qualifying was thirteen years
98 (range 3-30 years). All participants were based in the UK and had prior experience of working with families
99 affected by cleft lip and palate and/or other congenital craniofacial conditions.

100 *Data Analysis*

101 Interviews were transcribed verbatim and subjected to inductive thematic analysis. The following steps
102 were taken, in accordance with Braun and Clarke's 2006 guidelines: (1) becoming familiar with the data;

103 (2) identifying interesting features of the data; (3) searching for themes; (4) reviewing themes; (5) defining
104 and naming themes; and (6) producing the report. Analysis was seen as a recursive process, and detailed
105 notes were written throughout. A high degree of commonality was found between interviews, and fourteen
106 interviews were deemed sufficient to address the research question effectively. Themes were subsequently
107 chosen for their prevalence and/or their importance (or “keyness”) in relation to the research question. All
108 transcripts were analysed by the first and second authors, who are trained in qualitative analysis.

109

110 **Results**

111 Thematic analysis identified two key themes within the data: 1) Barriers to the Delivery of Optimal Care;
112 and 2) Non-Specialists’ Training Needs. Themes were consistent across all disciplines, and therefore data
113 were merged. Each theme, composed of several subthemes, is described in further detail below and
114 illustrated using exemplar quotes.

115

116 **Barriers to the Delivery of Optimal Care**

117 *Handling Parents’ Reactions*

118 Particularly in the case of the 20-week anomaly scan, participants reported that parents could often be
119 unprepared for hospital appointments, and/or unaware of the purpose of an appointment.

120 *“Very often parents want pictures and they want to know the gender... Sometimes they bring their whole*
121 *family and it’s very much a social event. That’s the problem really because it’s an anomaly scan...they*
122 *don’t always know why they are there” – Diagnostic Sonographer #2.*

123 Participants also highlighted that individuals can respond very differently to medical information and have
124 different information and support needs.

125 *“Every family is different, so every visit is different... We try to judge what each family understands and*
126 *what information or support they might need... We have to assess on the spot and adapt quickly, and that*

127 *can be a real challenge... Even when you think you have a formula that works, you will find that it still*
128 *doesn't work for everyone” – Health Visitor #3.*

129 ***Time Pressure***

130 Participants stated that the limited time allocated to each of their patients could be a barrier to delivering
131 information sensitively, and to providing personalised care.

132 Diagnostic Sonographer #2: *“Within 30 minutes we have to do the pre-counselling, the scan itself, take*
133 *pictures, assess the gender of the baby, and deal with any anomalies, as well as fill out the paperwork and*
134 *get a second opinion... You might also be running late and have the next patient waiting outside, so you*
135 *are always under a fair amount of pressure”.*

136 Children’s Nurse #1: *“We might only get a small handful of opportunities to see the families before and*
137 *after their child has surgery...so you want to build that rapport and get as much information in that time*
138 *as you can, so you can work out how best to support them”.*

139 ***Hospital Protocols and Resources***

140 Participants described how the delivery of a suspected diagnosis was affected in part by the hospital
141 environment.

142 Diagnostic Sonographer #2: *“To be honest it’s a minefield because...we don’t have an environment which*
143 *is conducive to counselling parents when they’re distressed... You just can’t do it in a scan room”.*

144 Participants commented on how hospital protocols and resources often impact on the timeliness of referrals.

145 Diagnostic Sonographer #3: *“It could be a Friday evening or Saturday morning when I’m scanning these*
146 *women, and hardly any other staff are around... If Monday is a [national holiday] too or if someone is off*
147 *sick then it won’t even get to the doctor’s desk until Wednesday. That’s an unacceptable waiting time in*
148 *my opinion”.*

149 Fetal Medicine Consultant #2: *“How efficiently families get referred on can depend on whether you have*
150 *a fetal medicine department within the hospital where the scans are performed”.*

151 Participants also reported inconsistencies in the delivery of care, both within and between hospitals.

152 Health Visitor #2: *“The two other hospitals I’ve worked in, they did things very differently to the hospital*
153 *I’m in now... I know from speaking to colleagues that they approach situations in different ways... We don’t*
154 *always agree on what is the best approach”.*

155 ***Working alongside Specialists***

156 Participants described how it could sometimes be a challenge to make contact with specialist craniofacial
157 teams.

158 Health Visitor #4: *“The parents mentioned that I may be able to do a joint visit with the specialist cleft*
159 *nurse... I thought ‘fantastic!’ so the parents gave me the number and it just took weeks and weeks until I*
160 *was able to speak to somebody... I know they’re as busy as anyone...but was really frustrating because I*
161 *knew the parents were relying on me”.*

162 In addition, participants reported a difference of opinion regarding how care should best be delivered.

163 Midwife #1: *“I think there is a risk of conflicting advice... What can happen sometimes is that babies who*
164 *struggle to feed go straight onto formula milk... I appreciate they may not be able to breastfeed, but my*
165 *biggest concern is that clefts teams don’t fully appreciate the nutritional benefits that come with breast*
166 *milk...and the importance of baby-parent bonding”.*

167 ***Emotional Impact on Non-Specialist HPs***

168 Participants described the emotional impact that can sometimes occur when working with a family affected
169 by a congenital condition.

170 Diagnostic Sonographer #1: *“I’ve always got a fear that the family are going to remember me as the lady*
171 *who ruined their pregnancy... Especially for newly qualified sonographers, the 20-week scans can be very*
172 *daunting”.*

173 Health Visitor #1: *“I can get so worried thinking “is this family missing out?” because there’s something*
174 *they need to know that I don’t know... I get quite frustrated and anxious... You also don’t want to go to*
175 *somebody’s house and for it to be obvious that you don’t know what you’re talking about”.*

177 Non-Specialists' Training Needs**178 Experiences of Prior Training**

179 The majority of participants reported that they had received no training on congenital craniofacial
180 conditions.

181 Midwife #2: *“In terms of training, there was absolutely nothing. It all comes down to self-inquiry and how
182 self-driven you are... A lot of the time I’ll just be improvising based on something I’ve read”*.

183 Children’s Nurse #2: *“While I was a student the curriculum was focused on conceptual holistic nursing...
184 You might be lucky to learn about individual conditions on placement, but otherwise they don’t really
185 feature”*.

186 Those that had received some training did not feel it had addressed all their questions.

187 Diagnostic Sonographer #1: *“One example is the ‘Breaking Bad News’ training, which tends to be centred
188 around telling parents that their baby has died... It’s never usually about breaking news in other
189 circumstances, such as anomalies... There are some skills you can transfer across but [the training]
190 definitely doesn’t cover all aspects”*.

191 Fetal Medicine Consultant #2: *“What’s interesting about craniofacial conditions is that sometimes they
192 can be isolated, and sometimes they can be part of an underlying genetic abnormality... The level of
193 complexity can vary considerably, so we don’t necessarily know the significance of the diagnosis until after
194 the birth, which makes delivering balanced information all the more difficult... I haven’t come across any
195 training that addresses the nuances of that”*.

196 Information Needs

197 All participants expressed a desire for further training in the area of congenital craniofacial conditions.
198 Specifically, participants discussed a need to better understand the patient journey as a whole, in order to
199 feel more confident during consultations.

200 Fetal Medicine Consultant #1: *“Anatomically and genetically I know what the condition is, but I’d like to*
201 *be more confident in knowing what the surgery will involve, the treatment pathway...what comes next for*
202 *the family”*.

203 Children’s Nurse #2: *“I see families around the time of surgical admission, but that’s six months down the*
204 *line already... I’d like to know more about what happens in that first six months...the screening and the*
205 *preparation for surgery...so I can understand the journey [the family] has been on before they get to me”*.

206 Participants also wanted to understand the differences between usual care guidelines and recommendations
207 for infants with craniofacial conditions.

208 Health Visitor #1: *“There are things outside the normal guidelines that I don’t know... For example, cleft*
209 *lip is going to have a huge impact on the weaning process...and it’s also done earlier because the baby*
210 *needs to be prepared for surgery... My nightmare would be to walk in and give a family our standard*
211 *advice, only to find out that it’s completely wrong”*.

212 Participants expressed a need for greater awareness of the potential social and emotional impacts on the
213 family.

214 Health Visitor #4: *“I understand what the conditions are, but it’s also about what the diagnosis will mean*
215 *for the parents... How do you assess how they’re coping with their baby’s upcoming surgery?... How do*
216 *you make sure they can handle other people’s reactions if they go out [in public]? What’s the best way to*
217 *check on the mental health of the mums and dads and check how their relationship is doing?”*.

218 Participants also commented on needing some support to address the challenges unique to having a child
219 born with a facial difference.

220 Children’s Nurse #1: *“One of the main challenges for me is when parents see their child after surgery and*
221 *suddenly their child looks different... I’m well versed in reassuring parents about the operation, any side*
222 *effects, recovery times, etc., but actually preparing them for the appearance change is quite a unique*
223 *thing”*.

224 Finally, participants discussed the importance of having written patient information and other resources
225 available, in order to bridge any gaps between referrals and to prevent families accessing unreliable
226 information via the internet.

227 Diagnostic Sonographer #1: *“At the moment we’ve got nothing... It would be fantastic to have a leaflet or
228 something to give the parents, so they didn’t go home waiting for their next appointment and wondering
229 what this was... Some families don’t understand very much English, so there’s also a need for information
230 to be translated”*.

231 Health Visitor #3: *“I recently found out about the Cleft Lip and Palate Association website and Facebook
232 page, which I think could be great resources for parents and would potentially stop them from using ‘Doctor
233 Google’”*.

234 ***Training Preferences***

235 When asked about the ideal training format, participants felt that face-to-face contact would be preferable,
236 but also acknowledged the difficulties of delivering this.

237 Health Visitor #4: *“You’d get the best buy-in from in-person sessions...running workshops for health
238 professionals or coming to staff meetings...but of course that raises questions regarding people’s time and
239 hospital resources... Another option would be delivering a lecture to students while they’re still training,
240 although again it might be difficult to get it into the curriculum”*.

241 Participants therefore recommended that online resources would provide a helpful starting point.

242 Midwife #3: *“In the absence of a study day, or in the case of focusing on specific conditions, I think online
243 resources would be really good... Something you could look at as and when a case arises”*.

244 Yet, participants reported that online content would need to be relatively brief, citing a need to capture
245 students’ attention, and acknowledging that health professionals often have to study in their spare time.

246 Children’s Nurse #1: *“I think it’s got to be bite-sized... It might be videos, tutorials...but it would have to
247 be four to five minutes maximum on each topic area”*.

248 Irrespective of the delivery format, all participants felt that hearing from affected families as part of training
249 would be essential.

250 Children's Nurse #2: *"Getting feedback from the families would be immensely beneficial... What were the*
251 *things that helped them? What could we have done better? What language should we be using?"*

252

253 **Discussion**

254 The aim of this study was to investigate the provision of care for families affected by craniofacial conditions
255 from the perspective of non-specialist health professionals, with a view to informing the development of
256 educational materials. The findings provide important insight into the challenges faced by non-specialists,
257 as well as a range of information and training needs which could improve non-specialists' knowledge and
258 confidence, and the patients' experience. Participants also provided guidance regarding the preferred
259 content and format of educational materials.

260 ***Synthesis of Findings and Recommendations***

261 Previous research has demonstrated parental dissatisfaction with the service provided by non-specialist
262 health professionals, such as sonographers, midwives, and health visitors, in the context of congenital
263 craniofacial conditions. This has predominantly included a perceived lack of knowledge and empathy, and
264 has been reported to impact considerably on medical decision-making and long-term parental wellbeing
265 (Lindberg & Berglund, 2014; Stock & Rumsey, 2015; Tierney et al., 2015; Searle et al., 2016; Searle et al.,
266 2018; Costa et al., 2019; Stock et al., 2019a). The current study investigated these findings from a novel
267 perspective and identified a number of barriers faced by non-specialist health professionals. First, non-
268 specialists are unlikely to have received training on the long-term implications of craniofacial conditions
269 or the typical treatment pathway, which may affect their ability to accurately portray the significance of the
270 diagnosis to parents. Existing training on how to 'deliver bad news' may not comprehensively cover the
271 skills needed to discuss the detection of an anomaly and the options that are subsequently available to
272 parents. In addition, non-specialists may not have access to guidance on how to deliver a diagnosis when
273 the aetiology is complex and the prognosis is uncertain. Expectant parents may be unaware that the purpose

274 of the 18-21-week antenatal scan is to screen for anomalies, which may add to the shock experienced if an
275 anomaly is detected. Participants acknowledged that they may lack the skills required to judge parental
276 need and provide appropriate counselling in the moment. Further, non-specialists may be under pressure
277 to keep to time, and may be juggling competing demands, including ensuring they have satisfied the
278 requirements of the full scan or postnatal assessment. Hospital protocols and resources may also play a
279 significant role in the diagnostic experience. For example, the timing of assessments and the geographical
280 location of the hospital may impact on the availability of senior staff who are able to provide a second
281 opinion and may result in a delay in referral. Some participants commented that their hospital lacked a
282 separate, private room, conducive to supporting distressed parents, where the diagnosis could be discussed
283 in more detail. Midwives and health visitors discussed the challenge of not knowing when and how to
284 deviate from the usual care guidelines, for example, in the case of feeding and weaning infants. Participants
285 also lacked understanding of the social and emotional impacts common to affected families, and how to
286 address the unique challenges posed by a congenital craniofacial condition, such as the child having a
287 visible facial difference and undergoing appearance-altering surgery. Finally, participants described
288 discrepancies between and within different hospitals in the approaches used to diagnose and treat affected
289 families, resulting in variations in national care delivery.

290 While prior literature has suggested the need for training for non-specialist health professionals (Searle et
291 al., 2016; Costa et al., 2019; Stock et al., 2019b; Stock et al., 2019c), the current study is the first to examine
292 the preferred content that such educational materials might include (see Table 1 for a summary). The
293 provision of such guidance may also alert staff to the hospital resources that are required and reduce overall
294 variations in the delivery of care over time. Further, access to educational materials may help to increase
295 non-specialists' confidence and reduce the emotional impact described by some participants, which had
296 resulted from a lack of knowledge and uncertainty surrounding the best approach to care. The present study
297 has also highlighted a preference among non-specialists for in-person training sessions, delivered to both
298 students and qualified professionals. Where in-person sessions are less feasible, or if content needs to be
299 condition-specific, then brief, complementary online training resources were requested. Participants also
300 requested having access to written materials which they could give to parents in order to bridge any gaps

301 between referrals and to prevent families accessing unreliable information via the internet. This echoes
302 previous research, which has demonstrated the importance of written resources for families following a
303 diagnosis, during postnatal care, and in preparation for medical treatment (Knapke et al., 2010; McCorkell
304 et al., 2012; Searle et al., 2016). Resources produced by various charitable organisations, such as the
305 American Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Association (US), the Cleft Lip and Palate Association (UK), and the
306 Antenatal Results and Choices group (UK) could be ideal, but local hospitals do not always seem to be
307 aware of these resources. One way of overcoming this challenge could be increased contact between local
308 hospitals and specialist craniofacial teams. Participants felt that both parties could benefit from an increase
309 in joint working, through the sharing of knowledge and resources, and by conducting combined visits with
310 families where indicated. Such an approach may also help to improve the continuity of care and avoid the
311 potential for conflicting advice to be given to families (Tierney et al., 2015; Searle et al., 2016; Costa et al.,
312 2019; Stock et al., 2019c).

313 *Methodological Considerations*

314 When analysed as a whole group, this study meets the sample size criteria recommended for this type of
315 qualitative research (Braun & Clarke, 2006). However, participation from each individual discipline was
316 small, and cannot be deemed to be representative of non-specialist health professionals as a whole.
317 Nonetheless, commonality in the themes reported across disciplines was observed, and consensus on the
318 preferred content and format of educational resources was reached. In order to ensure the relevance of
319 resources for all non-specialist health professionals, the future development of educational materials should
320 involve close collaboration with non-specialists, in addition to comprehensive evaluation of any resources
321 that are produced.

322

323 **Conclusions**

324 This study investigated the provision of care for families affected by craniofacial conditions from the
325 perspective of non-specialist health professionals, with a view to informing the development of educational
326 materials. The findings demonstrate a high degree of concordance between the experiences of non-

327 specialist health professionals, and previously published reports provided by parents and specialist
328 craniofacial teams. Current training for non-specialist health professionals in the area of congenital
329 craniofacial conditions appears to be insufficient, and opportunities for the development of further resources
330 are therefore suggested.

331

332 **References**

333 Costa B, Williams JR, Martindale A, Stock NM, the VTCT Foundation at the Centre for Appearance
334 Research. Parents' experiences of diagnosis and care following the birth of a child with cleft lip and/or
335 palate. *Brit J Midwifery*, 2019;27(3):151-160.

336 Feragen KB, Semb G, Heliövaara A, Lohmander A, Johannessen EC (...), Rumsey N. Scandcleft
337 randomised trials of primary surgery for unilateral cleft lip and palate: 10. Parental perceptions of
338 appearance and treatment outcomes in their 5-year-old child. *J Plast Surg Hand Surg*. 2017;51:81-87.

339 Feragen KB, Stock NM. Psychological adjustment to craniofacial conditions (excluding oral clefts):
340 A review of the literature. *Psychol Health*. 2017;32(3):253-288.

341 Knapke SC, Bender P, Prows C, Schultz JR, Saal HM. Parental perspectives of children born with
342 cleft lip and/or palate: a qualitative assessment of suggestions for healthcare improvements and
343 interventions. *Cleft Palate Craniofac J*. 2010;47(2):143-150.

344 Lindberg N, Berglund AL. Mothers' experiences of feeding babies born with cleft lip and palate.
345 *Scand J Caring Sci*. 2014;28:66-73.

346 McCorkell G, McCarron C, Blair S, Coates V. Parental experiences of cleft lip and palate services.
347 *Community Pract*. 2012;85(8):24-27.

348 Nelson P, Glenny AM, Kirk, S, Caress AL. Parents' experiences of caring for a child with a cleft
349 lip and/or palate: a review of the literature. *Child Care Health Dev*. 2012a;38:6-20.

350 Nelson PA, Kirk SA. Parents' perspectives of cleft lip and/or palate services: A qualitative
351 interview. *Cleft Palate Craniofac J*. 2013;50(3):275-285.

352 Nelson PA, Kirk SA, Caress AL, Glenny AM. Parents' emotional and social experiences of caring
353 for a child through cleft treatment. *Qual Health Res.* 2012b;22(3):346-359.

354 Public Health England. NHS Fetal anomaly screening programme overview. 2013. Available at:
355 <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/fetal-anomaly-screening-programme-overview>. Accessed 23 January 2019.

356 Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health. *Palate examination: Identification of cleft palate in*
357 *the newborn*. London; RCPCH: 2014.

358 Searle A, Neville P, Ryan S, Waylen A. The role of the clinical nurse specialist from the perspective
359 of parents of children born with cleft lip and/or palate in the United Kingdom. *Clin Nurs Spec.*
360 2018;32(3)121-128.

361 Searle A, Ryan S, Waylen A. Health professional communication and the diagnosis and care of
362 infants born with cleft lip and palate in the UK. *J Neonatal Nurs.* 2016;22(5):236-243.

363 Stock NM, Costa B, White P, Rumsey N. Risk and protective factors for psychological distress in
364 families following a diagnosis of cleft lip and/or palate. *Cleft Palate Craniofac J.* 2019a. doi:
365 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1055665619862457>.

366 Stock NM, Costa B, Williams JR, Martindale A, the VTCT Foundation at the Centre for Appearance
367 Research. Breaking the news: Parents' experiences of receiving an antenatal diagnosis of cleft lip. *Cleft*
368 *Palate Craniofac J.* 2019b;56(9):1149-1156.

369 Stock NM, Costa B, Williams JR, Martindale A, the VTCT Foundation at the Centre for Appearance
370 Research. Parental views of antenatal testing and termination following a diagnosis of cleft lip. *Psychol*
371 *Health Med.* 2019c;24(4):456-469.

372 Stock NM, Rumsey N. Parenting a child with a cleft: the fathers' perspective. *Cleft Palate Craniofac*
373 *J.* 2015;52(1):31-43.

374 Stock NM, Zucchelli F, Hudson N, Kiff JD, Hammond V. Promoting psychosocial adjustment in
375 individuals born with cleft lip and/or palate and their families: Current clinical practice in the United
376 Kingdom. *Cleft Palate Craniofac J.* 2019d. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1055665619868331>.

377 Tierney S, Blackhurst M, Scahill R, Callery P. Loss and rebuilding: A qualitative study of late
378 diagnosis of cleft palate. *J Spec Pediatr Nurs.* 2015;20(4):280-289.