

# 1 **Disparities in Kangaroo Care for Premature Infants in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit**

2  
3 Edith Brignoni-Pérez, Ph.D.<sup>a,b</sup>, Melissa Scala, M.D.<sup>c</sup>, Heidi M. Feldman, M.D./Ph.D.<sup>a</sup>, Virginia  
4 A. Marchman, Ph.D.<sup>d</sup>, and Katherine E. Travis, Ph.D.<sup>a</sup>

5  
6 **Affiliations:** <sup>a</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Division of Developmental-Behavioral Pediatrics,  
7 Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA; <sup>b</sup>Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences,  
8 Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA; <sup>c</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Division of Neonatal and  
9 Developmental Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA; and, <sup>d</sup>Department of  
10 Psychology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

11  
12 **Address correspondence to:** Katherine E. Travis  
13 Medical School Office Building  
14 1265 Welch Road  
15 Office x228  
16 Stanford, CA 94305  
17 (650) 498-7690  
18 ktravis1@stanford.edu

19  
20 **Short title:** Disparities in Kangaroo Care for Preterm Infants

21  
22 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** The authors have no conflicts of interest relevant to this article  
23 to disclose.

24  
25 **Funding/Support:** This research work was supported by grants from the *Eunice Kennedy*  
26 *Shriver* National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (K.E. Travis, PI:  
27 5R00HD8474904; H.M. Feldman, PI: 2R01- HD069150) and the National Institute of Mental  
28 Health Postdoctoral Research Training in Child Psychiatry and Neurodevelopment (A. Reiss, PI:  
29 T32 MH019908).

## 30 **Abbreviations**

31 ANCOVA: analysis of covariance  
32 DOB: date of birth  
33 EMR: electronic medical record  
34 GA: gestational age  
35 KC: Kangaroo Care  
36 LPCH: Lucile Packard Children's Hospital  
37 MRI: magnetic resonance imaging  
38 NICU: neonatal intensive care unit  
39 SES: socioeconomic status

## 40 **Table of Contents Summary**

41  
42 Total amount, frequency, and duration of Kangaroo Care for preterm infants in the NICU varied  
43 as a function of family's socioeconomic status and language.

## 44 **What's Known on This Subject**

47 In the United States, disparities in health care delivery and medical outcomes have been  
48 identified on the basis of patient or family socioeconomic status and the language patients or  
49 families use to communicate with clinical staff.

50

51 **What This Study Adds**

52 Extending to the NICU, the amount, frequency, and duration of Kangaroo Care experienced by  
53 preterm infants differed both by family's socioeconomic status and the language families use to  
54 communicate with clinical staff. Policy changes are needed to reduce these disparities.

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93 **Contributors' Statement Page**

94

95 Dr. Brignoni-Pérez conceptualized and designed the study, acquired data from the electronic  
96 medical record, analyzed the data, drafted the initial manuscript, and reviewed and revised the  
97 manuscript. Drs. Scala, Marchman, Feldman, and Travis conceptualized and designed the study,  
98 supervised data abstraction and analysis, and critically reviewed and revised the manuscript for  
99 important intellectual content. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree  
100 to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139 **Abstract:**

140

141 **OBJECTIVES:** The aim of this study was to investigate whether preterm infants whose  
142 families have lower socioeconomic status (SES) or communicate with clinical staff in a language  
143 other than English experience differences in the total amount, frequency, and duration of  
144 Kangaroo Care (KC) compared to preterm infants of higher SES or primarily English-speaking  
145 families.

146

147 **METHODS:** Participants were infants born <32 weeks gestational age (GA),  $N=116$ . We  
148 defined family SES by the infants' health insurance (private/higher vs. public/lower) and family  
149 language by the language mothers used to communicate with clinical staff (English vs. Other  
150 language). Family SES or family language groups were compared on: (1) the total amount of  
151 KC infants experienced during hospitalization; (2) frequency of KC per visitation days; and, (3)  
152 duration of KC events per day.

153

154 **RESULTS:** Infants in the lower SES and Other language groups experienced KC in reduced  
155 amounts, lower frequencies, and shorter durations than infants in either the higher SES or  
156 English language groups. SES and language group differences remained significant after  
157 controlling for family visitation and GA at birth. After controlling for SES, language group  
158 differences in KC duration remained significant.

159

160 **CONCLUSIONS:** Our findings revealed disparities in the total amount, frequency, and  
161 duration of KC in the neonatal intensive care unit as a function of both family SES and language  
162 families used to communicate with clinical staff. These disparities reduced infants' access to this  
163 developmental care practice shown to stabilize clinical status and promote neurodevelopment.  
164 We recommend that hospital nurseries implement policies that minimize such disparities.

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175 **INTRODUCTION**

176 Kangaroo Care (KC) is a developmental care practice that provides parent-to-infant skin-to-skin  
177 contact<sup>1,2</sup>. This practice has been shown to reduce medical complications of preterm birth, such  
178 as hypothermia, sepsis, and rehospitalization<sup>1,2</sup>. It has also been shown to promote infant  
179 growth, breastfeeding, and mother-infant attachment<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, KC has been associated with  
180 improved neurocognitive developmental outcomes, including better hearing, speech, social, and  
181 executive function skills, in preterm infants and children<sup>4,5</sup>. All these benefits are crucial for  
182 infants born very preterm (<32 weeks gestational age, GA), who are likely to encounter many  
183 complications of prematurity that lead to early clinical instability, prolonged hospitalization, and  
184 potentially long-term behavioral, cognitive, social-emotional, language, and learning delays<sup>6-14</sup>.  
185 Developmental care practices have been adopted as a part of the standard of medical care in  
186 many neonatal intensive care units (NICU)<sup>15-19</sup> to reduce preterm-birth-related morbidities,  
187 support parent-infant bonding, and to possibly improve long-term developmental outcomes.  
188 Despite the many apparent benefits of KC, however, several barriers may reduce opportunities  
189 for such practice, including parental factors (e.g., rates of visitation, family comfort with the  
190 practice) and health system factors (e.g., unit design, adequate staff support, parent educational  
191 programs, access to translators)<sup>3,20-28</sup>. Parents and health care providers are also susceptible to  
192 cultural norms and personal beliefs that affect the frequency and amount of KC<sup>20,21,25</sup>.

193       Studies have shown that child and adult patients with lower socioeconomic status (SES)  
194 are consistently less healthy than wealthier and more educated patients<sup>29</sup>. Differences in health  
195 care delivery and medical practices contribute to these disparities. Such findings extend to the  
196 NICUs in the United States, where families experience disparities in health care on the basis of  
197 socioeconomic and cultural/ethnic factors<sup>30</sup>. It has been shown that NICUs with higher

198 proportions of patients from lower SES have overall lower quality care as measured by a  
199 composite of maternal and infant outcome measures<sup>31</sup>. Additionally, health insurance (private  
200 vs. public), a proxy of SES, relates to prenatal and postnatal health opportunities, negatively  
201 impacting the health of those with lower SES<sup>32</sup>. Moreover, in the United States, non-English-  
202 speaking families in the NICU have been shown to be more susceptible to misunderstanding  
203 their child's diagnosis and treatments because clinical staff and families do not share a common  
204 language<sup>33</sup>. To date, there is limited information about whether and how parents' opportunities  
205 to provide KC for their prematurely born infant in the NICU are influenced by their  
206 socioeconomic and linguistic background<sup>3</sup>, despite the beneficial role of this developmental care  
207 practice. In the present study, we investigated whether the family's SES and their preferred  
208 language to communicate with clinical staff influenced the total amount, frequency, and duration  
209 of KC with their preterm infants in the NICU. We hypothesized that infants whose families have  
210 lower SES or communicate with clinical staff in a language other than English would receive  
211 lower total amount, frequency, and duration of KC compared to infants whose families have  
212 higher SES or speak English to clinical staff. These findings would have implications for  
213 building policies and procedures to increase KC in the NICU for groups at increased risk for  
214 adverse health and developmental outcomes.

215

## 216 **METHODS**

217 Participants were infants born at a GA of less than 32 weeks, who were hospitalized at the Lucile  
218 Packard Children Hospital (LPCH) in Stanford. From the electronic medical record (EMR), we  
219 retrospectively acquired data on these infants' experience of KC from May 1, 2018, when  
220 developmental care practices (including KC) at LPCH started being recorded consistently in the

221 EMR by clinical staff, to March 8<sup>th</sup>, 2020, when LPCH changed visitation policies due to  
222 COVID-19. These infants' data are part of a broader study investigating developmental care  
223 practices in relation to brain development, and thus we collected the data from the date of birth  
224 (DOB) until the infants' routine brain imaging session date (MRI) that occurs around 36 weeks  
225 postmenstrual age.

226 The sample ( $N=116$ ) was divided into two groups by each of the two key factors: family  
227 SES and family language. For SES, we used the infant's health insurance as a proxy for this  
228 factor. Private insurance was classified as higher SES and public insurance as lower SES (Table  
229 1). For family language, we used a specific field in the EMR that indicated the language that  
230 mothers used to communicate with clinical staff, specifically either English or another language  
231 (e.g., Spanish, Mandarin, Dari), as a proxy for language primarily used by all family members  
232 with clinical staff. For one participant, these data were missing (i.e., the language their mother  
233 used to communicate with clinical staff), and thus we used the language reported for the father.  
234 At LPCH, translators were available at all times for most common languages either via bedside  
235 iPads or in-person interpreters during daytime hours. Of those families who used a language  
236 other than English ( $n=34$ ), 26 families used Spanish, the largest linguistic representation in the  
237 study location that is not English. The protocols for this study were approved by the Stanford  
238 University Institutional Review Board.

### 239 **Population description, clinical risk, and family visitation**

240 We extracted the following information about the participants to characterize the sample: sex,  
241 GA at birth, days of hospitalization (from DOB to MRI), and race. We also extracted  
242 information about infants' medical conditions, including clinical factors that may have reduced  
243 infants' ability to receive KC or barriers to KC per policy in the LPCH NICU (e.g., necrotizing

244 enterocolitis, proportion of infants requiring high frequency oscillatory ventilator). To account  
245 for parents' availability to perform KC, we determined the frequency of family visitation from  
246 the EMR. At LPCH, parents were permitted to visit at any time of the day, except during  
247 nursing sign out (7:00-7:30 a.m./p.m.). Daily visitation was counted as having occurred if  
248 clinical staff charted that any family member engaged in KC with their infant or had visited at  
249 bedside. We quantified the frequency of family visitation as the percentage of days that families  
250 visited out of the total days an infant was hospitalized (from DOB to MRI).

### 251 **Kangaroo Care**

252 The NICU at LPCH has standardized unit guidelines on developmental care activities to support  
253 parent participation. KC done by any family member was recorded by clinical staff in the  
254 infants' EMR. We derived the following three metrics from the KC data to assess: (1) KC total  
255 amount, the total minutes infants experienced KC from DOB to MRI; (2) KC frequency, the  
256 percentage of days that families performed KC out of the total number of days that families  
257 visited the hospital (total KC days/total visitation days); and, (3) KC duration, the rate in minutes  
258 per day of KC events (total KC minutes/total KC days).

### 259 **Data analyses**

260 We performed separate Chi square tests for each categorical variable and independent samples t-  
261 tests for each continuous variable to compare groups on demographic, clinical, and visitation  
262 variables. For KC total amount, frequency, and duration, we performed separate analyses by  
263 each group factor: family SES or family language. Since the metric KC total amount was  
264 intrinsically biased by the variance in visitation days across infants, we performed a univariate  
265 analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), controlling for family visitation. We also performed  
266 separate univariate ANCOVA to control for demographic or clinical risk factors that were found

267 to differ between the groups. For KC frequency and duration metrics, we carried out separate  
268 analysis of variance by family SES or family language. Also, we performed separate univariate  
269 ANCOVA to control for each demographic or clinical risk factor that differed between the  
270 groups. Threshold for significance was set at  $p < 0.05$ . All analyses were conducted using the  
271 Statistical Package for Social Sciences 26 ([https://www.ibm.com/support/pages/downloading-  
272 ibm-spss-statistics-26](https://www.ibm.com/support/pages/downloading-ibm-spss-statistics-26)).

273

## 274 **RESULTS**

### 275 **Population description, clinical factors, and family visitation**

276 Table 1 shows demographic, clinical, and family visitation variables of the sample divided by  
277 family SES. The groups were balanced in all demographic variables but family language. The  
278 lower SES group had a higher proportion of infants whose families used a language other than  
279 English to communicate with clinical staff. The groups did not statistically differ on clinical  
280 factors. The percentage of days infants in the lower SES group were visited by their families  
281 was significantly lower compared to infants in the higher SES group.

282 Table 2 shows demographic, clinical, and family visitation variables of the sample  
283 divided by family language. The groups were statistically balanced on all demographic variables  
284 other than GA at birth and family SES; the Other language group had infants born at an older GA  
285 and were predominantly from lower SES families. The groups did not statistically differ on  
286 clinical factors. The percentage of days infants in the Other language group were visited by their  
287 families was lower, although not statistically significant, relative to infants in the English group.

### 288 **Kangaroo Care**

289 Table 3 compares KC metrics between family SES groups. The total amount, frequency, and  
290 duration of KC was significantly lower for infants in the lower SES group, as compared to the  
291 higher SES group (Table 3; Figure 1 A-C). Between-group differences in the total amount of  
292 KC remained significant after controlling for family visitation and either GA at birth or family  
293 language. Group differences in frequency and duration of KC also remained significant after  
294 controlling for GA at birth or family language.

295 Table 4 compares KC metrics between family language groups. The total amount,  
296 frequency, and duration of KC was significantly lower for infants in the Other language, as  
297 compared to the English language group (Table 4; Figure 1 D-F). Between-group differences in  
298 the total amount of KC remained significant after controlling for family visitation and GA at  
299 birth, but not when controlling for family visitation and family SES. Group differences in  
300 frequency of KC remained significant after controlling for GA at birth, but not family SES.  
301 Group differences in the duration of KC remained significant after controlling for either GA at  
302 birth or family SES.

303

## 304 **DISCUSSION**

305 Consistent with our hypothesis, we found that KC, however measured, total amount during  
306 hospitalization, frequency during visitation, and duration per day, was experienced less by  
307 infants from lower SES families or whose families spoke a language other than English. These  
308 results were significant after controlling for days of family visitation and for infants' GA at birth.  
309 Disparities in KC found on the basis of family SES also remained significant after controlling for  
310 family language. Disparities found on the basis of family language for KC duration, but not total  
311 amount or frequency, remained significant after controlling for family SES.

312           The present study provides novel evidence that both family SES and family language  
313 other than English are factors that contribute to significant disparities in the total amount,  
314 frequency, and duration of KC experienced by preterm infants in the NICU. Importantly, we  
315 show that disparities in KC were not solely explained by how frequently families visited the  
316 hospital. These findings are generally consistent with previous studies that have examined the  
317 contribution of socio-demographic factors to parental involvement in KC activities. For  
318 example, a study reported that parental holding increases if mothers are White, married, older, or  
319 employed compared to non-White, single, and younger parents<sup>34</sup>. Another study showed that  
320 white mothers are told KC is an activity they could do with their infants 50% more often  
321 compared to non-white mothers<sup>35</sup>. Finally, a survey of parents at multiple European NICUs  
322 found longer periods of KC are associated with increased maternal education<sup>36</sup>. More research is  
323 needed to identify specific barriers in subgroups of disadvantaged populations in the NICU on  
324 the basis of both family SES and family language.

325           KC is reported to improve many clinical<sup>1-3</sup> and neurocognitive developmental<sup>4,5</sup>  
326 outcomes. The optimum dose and timing of KC needed to confer these advantages is unknown.  
327 However, periods of at least 60 minutes per day are generally recommended. Longer periods  
328 may better support infant sleep cycles and offer increased benefits in infant growth,  
329 cardiorespiratory stability, and neurodevelopment<sup>37,38</sup>. To date, the risks of too much KC have  
330 seemed small; thus, general policies have been to encourage as much as an infant can tolerate  
331 medically. If specific thresholds of medical benefit exist, the infants of lower SES families and  
332 non-English-speaking families in the present study may be at a further disadvantage in reaching  
333 goal doses of this important developmental care practice, therefore raising further concern for the  
334 outcomes of these already at-risk infants.

335           The present findings reveal that both family SES and family language should be  
336 individual targets for programmatic interventions to reduce disparities in KC. Recent studies  
337 have shown that both disadvantaged individual (e.g., psychological and physical wellness) and  
338 systemic (e.g., parental leave policies) factors impede the frequency and duration of KC provided  
339 by parents in the NICU<sup>25,26</sup>. Barriers to KC may also overlap with those known to impede  
340 parental visitation, such as unemployment or low income, lack of support for other children (e.g.,  
341 childcare), health insurance, marital status, parents' age, transportation, and work or household  
342 responsibilities<sup>39,40</sup>. Those barriers that can be addressed at the system-level should include, for  
343 example, childcare in the hospital for other children in the family, transportation to/from the  
344 home<sup>25,41</sup>, and increased training of clinical staff on interpreter use<sup>42</sup>. Of note, the NICU at  
345 LPCH has fairly robust resources compared to many other locations in the United States and yet  
346 disparities persist. Until now, most evaluations of disparities in NICU care were done using  
347 larger databases or multicenter qualitative studies<sup>30,43,44</sup>. While these studies provide certain  
348 insights, they can inadvertently lead centers to conclude that the problem exists elsewhere. The  
349 single-center construct of our study is limited by sample size but represents a potentially  
350 powerful example of critical self-reflection necessary for actionable change through quality  
351 improvement initiatives or further interventional research.

352           It is also possible that the role of family SES and family language may operate more  
353 indirectly to impact care delivery. For example, these factors may impact the quality of  
354 interaction between parents and clinical staff. Rates of parent visitation have been shown to be  
355 significantly correlated with parental stress and communication with clinical staff<sup>45</sup> and to  
356 improve when programs are implemented to provide individualized encouragement for maternal  
357 visitation<sup>46</sup>. Possible strategies are policies that promote family-centered approaches in which

358 parents are seen as partners of the clinical staff<sup>47,48</sup> and which expect parents to be present for  
359 longer periods and transition to active caregivers, thus potentially removing many barriers to  
360 visitation and to KC<sup>49</sup>. In societies without social supports of extended parental leave and  
361 childcare programs, these offered models are likely to have little impact on disparities between  
362 groups<sup>50</sup>. More research is needed to understand the potential impact of family-centered care  
363 programs on mitigating disparities, particularly in countries with fewer social programs to  
364 support parents.

365 Another indirect factor could be ambivalence among NICU clinical staff regarding the  
366 importance of family involvement and KC in NICU care, in spite of evidence for its benefits and  
367 endorsement by national organizations. In a 2013 survey of NICU parents and nurses, 63% of  
368 mothers but only 18% of nurses felt that KC should be offered daily, and 90% of mothers  
369 compared to 40% of nurses felt mothers should be partners in care<sup>51</sup>. While parents may not  
370 understand medical barriers to KC, disagreements or communication barriers between family and  
371 clinical staff only hamper efforts at family-centered care. Most national quality metrics used to  
372 gauge NICU care do not include direct measures of family-centered care; best family-centered  
373 care measures are still under discussion<sup>52</sup>. Clinical staff may interpret quality standards as  
374 stressing factors, such as equipment dislodgements like unplanned extubations, as more  
375 important than parent engagement in infant care. National quality standards should include  
376 measures of family-centered developmental care, as well as direct measures of disparate care.

377 Peer support might be an additional support to clinical staff that may help to reduce  
378 disparities in KC. Social support is a key component of health care; thus, training families in the  
379 NICU to support their peers (e.g., language use/communication, encouragement) could  
380 contribute to the family-centered approach to improve access to this important experience<sup>53,54</sup>. It

381 has also been argued that nurses have the ability to ameliorate many of the barriers that parents  
382 encounter to participate as partners in their premature infants' health care, given their important  
383 role in the NICU<sup>48</sup>.

384 Overall, the current findings emphasize the critical issue of equity. The observed  
385 disparities in KC in relation to the family's socioeconomic and language background represent a  
386 challenge to clinical staff in the NICU. Health care professionals must address the need to  
387 provide families of lower SES and those who speak a language other than English with the  
388 resources and services they need to provide comparable opportunity as enjoyed by infants from  
389 wealthier backgrounds and primarily English-speaking families. To achieve equity, NICUs may  
390 need to write or modify policies and practices for increasing parents' visitation, then increasing  
391 family education and support when they are at the hospital, and finally addressing medical and  
392 nursing practices and education to support families to begin and sustain KC. In addition, a  
393 quality improvement approach, now required in many medical settings and in training, may  
394 encourage rapid change faster than could be achieved with intervention studies. Quality  
395 improvement would allow an iterative process based on intervention and careful measurement<sup>55-</sup>  
396 <sup>57</sup>, leading to reduced disparities and ultimately improved outcomes for all infants.

397 This study has limitations. The data were extracted and analyzed from EMRs and may  
398 thus capture inconsistencies in reporting from clinical staff. The sample was not large enough to  
399 explore potential interactions between family SES and family language use. Our measures of  
400 family SES and family language were limited. Finally, this investigation was a single-site study.  
401 More studies are needed to further assess the barriers to KC in the NICU, specifically focused on  
402 parents-clinical staff partnership quality.

403

404 **CONCLUSIONS**

405 This investigation presents an in-depth analysis of KC for preterm infants in a NICU in the  
406 United States in relation to their family’s SES and language use in the hospital, revealing  
407 significant and concerning disparities. We recommend rapid modifications of policies that guide  
408 and promote this developmental care practice in the NICU and quality improvement studies to  
409 assure rapid and effective quantitative changes. A common goal should be to reduce disparities  
410 in KC, a critical early-life experience in this at-risk population.

411

412 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

413

414 We want to thank Maya C. Morales for her assistance. This work was possible also thanks to the  
415 Stanford REDCap platform (<http://redcap.stanford.edu>), which is developed and operated by  
416 Stanford Medicine Research IT team. The REDCap platform services at Stanford are subsidized  
417 by a) Stanford School of Medicine Research Office and b) the National Center for Research  
418 Resources and the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, National Institutes of  
419 Health, through grants KL2 TR001085 and TL1 TR001085.

420 Also, this research used data or services provided by STARR, “STANford medicine  
421 Research data Repository”, a clinical data warehouse containing live EMR data from Stanford  
422 Health Care, the Stanford Children’s Hospital, the University Healthcare Alliance and Packard  
423 Children's Health Alliance clinics, and other auxiliary data from Hospital applications, such as  
424 radiology PACS. STARR platform is developed and operated by Stanford Medicine Research IT  
425 team and is made possible by Stanford School of Medicine Research Office.

426

427

428

429

430

431

432

433

434

435

436

437

438

439

440 **REFERENCES**

- 441
- 442 1. Conde-Agudelo A, Belizán JM, Diaz-Rossello J. Kangaroo mother care to reduce morbidity  
443 and mortality in low birthweight infants. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011;(3):CD002771.  
444 doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002771.pub2
- 445 2. Campbell-Yeo ML, Disher TC, Benoit BL, Johnston CC. Understanding kangaroo care and  
446 its benefits to preterm infants. *Pediatr Health Med Ther*. 2015;6:15-32.  
447 doi:10.2147/PHMT.S51869
- 448 3. Mu P-F, Lee M-Y, Chen Y-C, Yang H-C, Yang S-H. Experiences of parents providing  
449 kangaroo care to a premature infant: A qualitative systematic review. *Nurs Health Sci*.  
450 Published online August 20, 2019. doi:10.1111/nhs.12631
- 451 4. Tessier R, Cristo MB, Velez S, et al. Kangaroo Mother Care: A method for protecting high-  
452 risk low-birth-weight and premature infants against developmental delay. *Infant Behav Dev*.  
453 2003;26(3):384-397. doi:10.1016/S0163-6383(03)00037-7
- 454 5. Feldman R, Rosenthal Z, Eidelman AI. Maternal-Preterm Skin-to-Skin Contact Enhances  
455 Child Physiologic Organization and Cognitive Control Across the First 10 Years of Life.  
456 *Biol Psychiatry*. 2014;75(1):56-64. doi:10.1016/j.biopsych.2013.08.012
- 457 6. Barre N, Morgan A, Doyle LW, Anderson PJ. Language abilities in children who were very  
458 preterm and/or very low birth weight: a meta-analysis. *J Pediatr*. 2011;158(5):766-774.e1.  
459 doi:10.1016/j.jpeds.2010.10.032
- 460 7. Brydges CR, Landes JK, Reid CL, Campbell C, French N, Anderson M. Cognitive outcomes  
461 in children and adolescents born very preterm: a meta-analysis. *Dev Med Child Neurol*.  
462 2018;60(5):452-468. doi:10.1111/dmcn.13685
- 463 8. Church PT, Cavanagh A, Lee SK, Shah V. Academic challenges for the preterm infant:  
464 Parent and educators' perspectives. *Early Hum Dev*. 2019;128:1-5.  
465 doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2018.09.016
- 466 9. Hasler HM, Akshoomoff N. Mathematics ability and related skills in preschoolers born very  
467 preterm. *Child Neuropsychol J Norm Abnorm Dev Child Adolesc*. 2019;25(2):162-178.  
468 doi:10.1080/09297049.2017.1412413
- 469 10. Linsell L, Johnson S, Wolke D, Morris J, Kurinczuk JJ, Marlow N. Trajectories of behavior,  
470 attention, social and emotional problems from childhood to early adulthood following  
471 extremely preterm birth: a prospective cohort study. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry*.  
472 2019;28(4):531-542. doi:10.1007/s00787-018-1219-8
- 473 11. Rogers CE, Anderson PJ, Thompson DK, et al. Regional Cerebral Development at Term  
474 Relates to School-Age Social–Emotional Development in Very Preterm Children. *J Am Acad*  
475 *Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2012;51(2):181-191. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2011.11.009

- 476 12. Spittle AJ, Cameron K, Doyle LW, Cheong JL, Victorian Infant Collaborative Study Group.  
477 Motor Impairment Trends in Extremely Preterm Children: 1991-2005. *Pediatrics*.  
478 2018;141(4). doi:10.1542/peds.2017-3410
- 479 13. Spittle AJ, Treyvaud K, Doyle LW, et al. Early Emergence of Behavior and Social-  
480 Emotional Problems in Very Preterm Infants. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*.  
481 2009;48(9):909-918. doi:10.1097/CHI.0b013e3181af8235
- 482 14. Twilhaar ES, Wade RM, de Kieviet JF, van Goudoever JB, van Elburg RM, Oosterlaan J.  
483 Cognitive Outcomes of Children Born Extremely or Very Preterm Since the 1990s and  
484 Associated Risk Factors: A Meta-analysis and Meta-regression. *JAMA Pediatr*.  
485 2018;172(4):361-367. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2017.5323
- 486 15. Chuang L-J, Wang S-H, Ma M-C, Lin C-N, Chen C-L, Huang M-C. A modified  
487 developmental care bundle reduces pain and stress in preterm infants undergoing  
488 examinations for retinopathy of prematurity: A randomised controlled trial. *J Clin Nurs*.  
489 2019;28(3-4):545-559. doi:10.1111/jocn.14645
- 490 16. Lisanti AJ, Vittner D, Medoff-Cooper B, Fogel J, Wernovsky G, Butler S. Individualized  
491 Family-Centered Developmental Care: An Essential Model to Address the Unique Needs of  
492 Infants With Congenital Heart Disease. *J Cardiovasc Nurs*. 2019;34(1):85-93.  
493 doi:10.1097/JCN.0000000000000546
- 494 17. Als H, McAnulty GB. The Newborn Individualized Developmental Care and Assessment  
495 Program (NIDCAP) with Kangaroo Mother Care (KMC): Comprehensive Care for Preterm  
496 Infants. *Curr Womens Health Rev*. 2011;7(3):288-301. doi:10.2174/157340411796355216
- 497 18. Valizadeh L, Asadollahi M, Mostafa Gharebaghi M, Gholami F. The congruence of nurses'  
498 performance with developmental care standards in neonatal intensive care units. *J Caring*  
499 *Sci*. 2013;2(1):61-71. doi:10.5681/jcs.2013.008
- 500 19. Mouradian LE, Als H. The influence of neonatal intensive care unit caregiving practices on  
501 motor functioning of preterm infants. *Am J Occup Ther Off Publ Am Occup Ther Assoc*.  
502 1994;48(6):527-533. doi:10.5014/ajot.48.6.527
- 503 20. Chan GJ, Labar AS, Wall S, Atun R. Kangaroo mother care: a systematic review of barriers  
504 and enablers. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2016;94(2):130-141J. doi:10.2471/BLT.15.157818
- 505 21. Chan G, Bergelson I, Smith ER, Skotnes T, Wall S. Barriers and enablers of kangaroo  
506 mother care implementation from a health systems perspective: a systematic review. *Health*  
507 *Policy Plan*. 2017;32(10):1466-1475. doi:10.1093/heapol/czx098
- 508 22. Engler AJ, Ludington-Hoe SM, Cusson RM, et al. Kangaroo care: national survey of  
509 practice, knowledge, barriers, and perceptions. *MCN Am J Matern Child Nurs*.  
510 2002;27(3):146-153. doi:10.1097/00005721-200205000-00004
- 511 23. Ferrarello D, Hatfield L. Barriers to skin-to-skin care during the postpartum stay. *MCN Am J*  
512 *Matern Child Nurs*. 2014;39(1):56-61. doi:10.1097/01.NMC.0000437464.31628.3d

- 513 24. Blomqvist YT, Frölund L, Rubertsson C, Nyqvist KH. Provision of Kangaroo Mother Care:  
514 supportive factors and barriers perceived by parents. *Scand J Caring Sci.* 2013;27(2):345-  
515 353. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6712.2012.01040.x
- 516 25. Lewis TP, Andrews KG, Shenberger E, et al. Caregiving can be costly: A qualitative study of  
517 barriers and facilitators to conducting kangaroo mother care in a US tertiary hospital  
518 neonatal intensive care unit. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2019;19(1):227.  
519 doi:10.1186/s12884-019-2363-y
- 520 26. Purdy IB, Craig JW, Zeanah P. NICU discharge planning and beyond: recommendations for  
521 parent psychosocial support. *J Perinatol.* 2015;35(S1):S24-S28. doi:10.1038/jp.2015.146
- 522 27. Seidman G, Unnikrishnan S, Kenny E, et al. Barriers and Enablers of Kangaroo Mother Care  
523 Practice: A Systematic Review. *PLoS ONE.* 2015;10(5). doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0125643
- 524 28. Lee HC, Martin-Anderson S, Dudley RA. Clinician Perspectives on Barriers to and  
525 Opportunities for Skin-to-Skin Contact for Premature Infants in Neonatal Intensive Care  
526 Units. *Breastfeed Med.* 2012;7(2):79-84. doi:10.1089/bfm.2011.0004
- 527 29. Braveman PA, Cubbin C, Egerter S, Williams DR, Pamuk E. Socioeconomic Disparities in  
528 Health in the United States: What the Patterns Tell Us. *Am J Public Health.* 2010;100(Suppl  
529 1):S186-S196. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2009.166082
- 530 30. Sigurdson K, Mitchell B, Liu J, et al. Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Neonatal Intensive Care: A  
531 Systematic Review. *Pediatrics.* 2019;144(2). doi:10.1542/peds.2018-3114
- 532 31. Padula AM, Shariff-Marco S, Yang J, et al. Multilevel social factors and NICU quality of  
533 care in California. *J Perinatol.* Published online March 10, 2020:1-9. doi:10.1038/s41372-  
534 020-0647-8
- 535 32. de Jongh BE, Locke R, Paul DA, Hoffman M. The differential effects of maternal age,  
536 race/ethnicity and insurance on neonatal intensive care unit admission rates. *BMC Pregnancy  
537 Childbirth.* 2012;12(1):97. doi:10.1186/1471-2393-12-97
- 538 33. Palau MA, Meier MR, Brinton JT, Hwang SS, Roosevelt GE, Parker TA. The impact of  
539 parental primary language on communication in the neonatal intensive care unit. *J Perinatol.*  
540 2019;39(2):307-313. doi:10.1038/s41372-018-0295-4
- 541 34. Pineda R, Bender J, Hall B, Shabosky L, Annecca A, Smith J. Parent Participation in the  
542 Neonatal Intensive Care Unit: Predictors and Relationships to Neurobehavior and  
543 Developmental Outcomes. *Early Hum Dev.* 2018;117:32-38.  
544 doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2017.12.008
- 545 35. Hendricks-Munoz K, Mayers R. A Neonatal Nurse Training Program in Kangaroo Mother  
546 Care (KMC) Decreases Barriers to KMC Utilization in the NICU. *Am J Perinatol.*  
547 2014;31(11):987-992. doi:10.1055/s-0034-1371359

- 548 36. Raiskila S, Axelin A, Toome L, et al. Parents' presence and parent–infant closeness in 11  
549 neonatal intensive care units in six European countries vary between and within the  
550 countries. *Acta Paediatr Oslo Nor 1992*. 2017;106(6):878-888. doi:10.1111/apa.13798
- 551 37. El-Farrash RA, Shinkar DM, Ragab DA, et al. Longer duration of kangaroo care improves  
552 neurobehavioral performance and feeding in preterm infants: a randomized controlled trial.  
553 *Pediatr Res*. 2020;87(4):683-688. doi:10.1038/s41390-019-0558-6
- 554 38. Charpak N, Montealegre Pomar A, Bohorquez A. Systematic review and meta-analysis  
555 suggest that the duration of Kangaroo mother care has a direct impact on neonatal growth.  
556 *Acta Paediatr*. Published online July 19, 2020. doi:10.1111/apa.15489
- 557 39. Greene MM, Rossman B, Patra K, Kratovil A, Khan S, Meier PP. Maternal psychological  
558 distress and visitation to the neonatal intensive care unit. *Acta Paediatr Oslo Nor 1992*.  
559 2015;104(7):e306-313. doi:10.1111/apa.12975
- 560 40. Forrest LS. ASSESSING BARRIERS AND FACILITATORS TO PARENTAL  
561 VISITATION AND PARENTING ACTIVITIES DURING INFANT HOSPITALIZATION  
562 IN A NEONATAL INTENSIVE CARE UNIT AND A SPECIAL CARE NURSERY. :118.
- 563 41. Pallás-Alonso CR, Losacco V, Maraschini A, et al. Parental involvement and kangaroo care  
564 in European neonatal intensive care units: a policy survey in eight countries. *Pediatr Crit  
565 Care Med J Soc Crit Care Med World Fed Pediatr Intensive Crit Care Soc*. 2012;13(5):568-  
566 577. doi:10.1097/PCC.0b013e3182417959
- 567 42. Flores G, Torres S, Holmes LJ, Salas-Lopez D, Youdelman MK, Tomany-Korman SC.  
568 Access to hospital interpreter services for limited English proficient patients in New Jersey: a  
569 statewide evaluation. *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2008;19(2):391-415.  
570 doi:10.1353/hpu.0.0007
- 571 43. Sigurdson K, Profit J, Dhurjati R, et al. Former NICU Families Describe Gaps in Family-  
572 Centered Care. *Qual Health Res*. 2020;30(12):1861-1875. doi:10.1177/1049732320932897
- 573 44. Mujahid MS, Kan P, Leonard SA, et al. Birth hospital and racial and ethnic differences in  
574 severe maternal morbidity in the state of California. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Published online  
575 August 13, 2020. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.08.017
- 576 45. Gonya J, Nelin LD. Factors associated with maternal visitation and participation in skin-to-  
577 skin care in an all referral level IIIc NICU. *Acta Paediatr Oslo Nor 1992*. 2013;102(2):e53-  
578 56. doi:10.1111/apa.12064
- 579 46. Zeskind PS, Iacino R. Effects of Maternal Visitation to Preterm Infants in the Neonatal  
580 Intensive Care Unit. *Child Dev*. 1984;55(5):1887. doi:10.2307/1129935
- 581 47. Griffin T. A Family-Centered “Visitation” Policy in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit That  
582 Welcomes Parents As Partners: *J Perinat Neonatal Nurs*. 2013;27(2):160-165.  
583 doi:10.1097/JPN.0b013e3182907f26

- 584 48. Brødsgaard A, Pedersen JT, Larsen P, Weis J. Parents' and nurses' experiences of  
585 partnership in neonatal intensive care units: A qualitative review and meta-synthesis. *J Clin*  
586 *Nurs.* 2019;28(17-18):3117-3139. doi:10.1111/jocn.14920
- 587 49. Ortenstrand A, Westrup B, Broström EB, et al. The Stockholm Neonatal Family Centered  
588 Care Study: effects on length of stay and infant morbidity. *Pediatrics.* 2010;125(2):e278-  
589 285. doi:10.1542/peds.2009-1511
- 590 50. O'Brien K, Robson K, Bracht M, et al. Effectiveness of Family Integrated Care in neonatal  
591 intensive care units on infant and parent outcomes: a multicentre, multinational, cluster-  
592 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health.* 2018;2(4):245-254.  
593 doi:10.1016/S2352-4642(18)30039-7
- 594 51. Hendricks-Muñoz KD, Li Y, Kim YS, Prendergast CC, Mayers R, Louie M. Maternal and  
595 Neonatal Nurse Perceived Value of Kangaroo Mother Care and Maternal Care Partnership in  
596 the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. *Am J Perinatol.* 2013;30(10):875-880. doi:10.1055/s-  
597 0033-1333675
- 598 52. Klawetter S, Greenfield JC, Speer SR, Brown K, Hwang SS. An integrative review: maternal  
599 engagement in the neonatal intensive care unit and health outcomes for U.S.-born preterm  
600 infants and their parents. *AIMS Public Health.* 2019;6(2):160-183.  
601 doi:10.3934/publichealth.2019.2.160
- 602 53. Ardal F, Sulman J, Fuller-Thomson E. Support like a walking stick: parent-buddy matching  
603 for language and culture in the NICU. *Neonatal Netw NN.* 2011;30(2):89-98.  
604 doi:10.1891/0730-0832.30.2.89
- 605 54. Franck LS, O'Brien K. The evolution of family-centered care: From supporting parent-  
606 delivered interventions to a model of family integrated care. *Birth Defects Res.*  
607 2019;111(15):1044-1059. doi:10.1002/bdr2.1521
- 608 55. Jones B, Vaux E, Olsson-Brown A. How to get started in quality improvement. *BMJ.*  
609 Published online January 17, 2019;k5408. doi:10.1136/bmj.k5437
- 610 56. Lachman P, Jayadev A, Rahi M. The case for quality improvement in the Neonatal Intensive  
611 Care Unit. *Early Hum Dev.* 2014;90(11):719-723. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2014.09.003
- 612 57. Edwards K, Impey L. Extreme preterm birth in the right place: a quality improvement  
613 project. *Arch Dis Child - Fetal Neonatal Ed.* 2020;105(4):445-448.  
614 doi:10.1136/archdischild-2019-317741

615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621

622 **Figure caption:**

623

624 **Figure 1. Results of Kangaroo Care by family SES (A-C) or family language (D-F). A.**

625 Total amount of KC during hospitalization by family SES, controlling for family visitation. **B.**

626 Frequency of KC days out of family visitation days by family SES. **C.** Duration of KC events

627 during KC days by family SES. **D.** Total amount of KC during hospitalization by family

628 language, controlling for family visitation. **E.** Frequency of KC days out of family visitation days

629 by family language. **F.** Duration of KC events during KC days by family language. \* =  $p < 0.05$ ;

630 \*\* =  $p < 0.01$ ; \*\*\* =  $p < 0.001$ . Error bars = standard error of the mean.

631

632

633

634

635

636

**Table 1**

Description of the participants by family socioeconomic status.

	<i>Higher</i> <i>n (%) or M (SD)</i>	<i>Lower</i> <i>n (%) or M (SD)</i>	<i>X<sup>2</sup> or t</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Demographics</b>				
Total <i>N</i>	62	54		
Sex: Female	27 (44)	24 (44)	0.01	0.92
GA at Birth (weeks)	28.5 (2.5)	29.2 (2.3)	-1.57	0.12
Hospitalization Duration (days)	62 (32)	53 (27)	1.53	0.13
Family Language Use: English	55 (89)	27 (50)	<b>20.87</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Race: White	13 (21)	10 (19)	0.11	0.74
<b>Clinical Factors</b>				
Apgar 1 (minutes)	5 (2)	6 (2)	-0.56	0.58
Apgar 5 (minutes)	7 (1)	8 (2)	-0.76	0.45
Necrotizing Enterocolitis	5 (8)	5 (9)	0.05	0.82
High Frequency Oscillatory Ventilator	8 (13)	6 (11)	0.13	0.72
<b>Family Visitation</b>				
Visitation Days/Hospital Days (%)	77 (18)	65 (24)	<b>2.94</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>

*Abbreviations:* GA = gestational age; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; bold = significant.

**Table 2**

Description of the participants by family language use.

	<i>English</i> <i>n (%) or M (SD)</i>	<i>Other Language</i> <i>n (%) or M (SD)</i>	<i>X<sup>2</sup> or t</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Demographics</b>				
Total <i>N</i>	82	34		
Sex: Female	34 (41)	17 (50)	0.71	0.40
GA at Birth (weeks)	28.5 (2.5)	29.7 (2.0)	<b>-2.63</b>	<b>0.01</b>
Hospitalization Duration (days)	61 (30)	52 (31)	1.40	0.16
Family Socioeconomic Status: Higher	55 (67)	7 (21)	<b>20.87</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Race: White	20 (24)	3 (9)	3.66	0.06
<b>Clinical Factors</b>				
Apgar 1 (minutes)	5 (2)	6 (2)	-1.30	0.20
Apgar 5 (minutes)	7 (1)	8 (2)	-1.40	0.16
Necrotizing Enterocolitis	9 (11)	1 (3)	1.97	0.16
High Frequency Oscillatory Ventilator	12 (15)	2 (6)	1.84	0.17
<b>Family Visitation</b>				
Visitation Days/Hospital Days (%)	74 (21)	66 (23)	1.89	0.06

*Abbreviations:* GA = gestational age; M = mean; SD = standard deviation; bold = significant.

**Table 3**

Results of Kangaroo Care by family socioeconomic status.

	<i>Higher</i> M (SEM)	<i>Lower</i> M (SEM)	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Kangaroo Care</b>				
Total Amount (minutes) controlled for visitation	2010 (144)	864 (155)	<b>28.37</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for visitation and GA at birth)			<b>26.99</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for visitation and family language)			<b>18.95</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Frequency (%)	45 (2)	23 (2)	<b>42.68</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for GA at birth)			<b>43.44</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for family language)			<b>32.77</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
Duration (minutes/day)	96 (4)	71 (4)	<b>21.05</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for GA at birth)			<b>18.17</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for family language)			<b>10.73</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>

*Abbreviations:* GA = gestational age; M = mean; SEM = standard error of the mean; bold = significant.


**Table 4**

Results of Kangaroo Care by family language use.


	<i>English</i> M (SEM)	<i>Other Language</i> M (SEM)	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Kangaroo Care</b>				
Total Amount (minutes) controlled for visitation	1706 (133)	923 (207)	<b>10.00</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for visitation and GA at birth)			<b>5.04</b>	<b>0.03</b>
(controlled for visitation and SES)			1.93	0.17
Frequency (%)	38 (2)	27 (3)	<b>7.63</b>	<b>0.01</b>
(controlled for GA at birth)			<b>7.99</b>	<b>0.01</b>
(controlled for SES)			0.16	0.69
Duration (minutes/day)	91 (3)	67 (5)	<b>14.83</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for GA at birth)			<b>10.35</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>
(controlled for SES)			<b>5.03</b>	<b>0.03</b>

*Abbreviations:* GA = gestational age; SES = socioeconomic status; M = mean; SEM = standard error of the mean; bold = significant.


A.




B.




C.



D.



E.



F.

