

1 **Navigating uncertain illness trajectories for young children**
2 **with serious infectious illness: a mixed-methods modified**
3 **grounded theory study.**

4 **Authors and Affiliations**

5 Sarah Neill¹, Lucy Bray², Bernie Carter³, Damian Roland⁴, Enitan D Carrol⁵, Natasha Bayes⁶, Lucie

6 Riches⁷, Joanne Hughes⁸, Poornima Pandey⁹, Jennifer O'Donnell¹⁰, Sue Palmer-Hill¹¹

7

8 ¹ School of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Health, University of Plymouth, Devon, UK and Faculty
9 of Science, Charles Sturt University, Bathurst, Australia

10 ² Faculty of Health, Social Care and Medicine, Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, UK

11 ³ Faculty of Health, Social Care & Medicine, Edge Hill University, Ormskirk, Lancashire, UK

12 and Faculty of Health and Environmental Sciences, AUT University, New Zealand.

13 ⁴ Paediatric Emergency Medicine Leicester Academic (PEMLA) Group, Children's Emergency

14 Department, Leicester Royal Infirmary, Leicester, UK & SAPPHIRE Group, Health Sciences, Leicester

15 University, Leicester, UK

16 ⁵ Department of Clinical Infection, Microbiology and Immunology. University of Liverpool Institute of

17 Infection, Veterinary and Ecological Sciences, and Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust,

18 Liverpool, UK

19 ⁶ Faculty of Health, Education and Society, University of Northampton, Northampton, UK

20 ⁷ Support Services, Meningitis Now, Stroud, Gloucestershire, UK

21 ⁸ Parent and Patient Safety Ambassador, Mother's Instinct and Harmed Patients Alliance, UK

22 ⁹ Department of Paediatrics, Kettering General Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Kettering,

23 Northamptonshire, UK

24 ¹⁰ Visiting Lecturer, Human Factors and Investigation, London City University, London and Cranfield

25 University, Cranfield, Bedfordshire, UK

26 ¹¹ Northamptonshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, Northampton, UK

27 **Abstract**

28 Infectious illness is the biggest cause of death in children due to a physical illness, particularly in
29 children under five years. If mortality is to be reduced for this group of children, it is important to
30 understand factors affecting their pathways to hospital.

31 The aim of this study was to retrospectively identify organisational and environmental factors, and
32 individual child, family, and professional factors affecting timing of admission to hospital for children
33 under five years of age with a serious infectious illness (SII).

34 **Methods**

35 An explanatory modified grounded theory mixed methods design was used in collaboration with
36 parents. Two stages of data collection were conducted: Stage 1, interviews with 22 parents whose
37 child had recently been hospitalised with a SII and 14 health professionals (HPs) involved in their pre-
38 admission trajectories; Stage 2, focus groups with 18 parents and 16 HPs with past experience of SII
39 in young children. Constant comparative analysis generated the explanatory theory.

40 **Findings**

41 The core category was 'navigating uncertain illness trajectories for young children with serious
42 infectious illness'. Uncertainty was prevalent throughout the parents' and HPs' stories about their
43 experiences of navigating social rules and overburdened health services for these children. The
44 complexity of and lack of continuity within services, family lives, social expectations and hierarchies
45 provided the context and conditions for children's, often complex, illness trajectories. Parents
46 reported powerlessness and perceived criticism leading to delayed help-seeking. Importantly,
47 parents and professionals missed symptoms of serious illness. Risk averse services were found to
48 refer more children to emergency departments.

49 **Conclusions**

50 Parents and professionals have difficulties recognising signs of SII in young children and can feel
51 socially constrained from seeking help. The increased burden on services has made it more difficult
52 for professionals to spot the seriously ill child.

53 **Keywords**

54 Serious infectious illness, illness trajectories, parents, children under 5 years, uncertainty

55 **Background**

56 Infection is a major cause of childhood deaths in the UK and globally, particularly in the under 5 year
57 age group. The most recent analysis of child mortality data (from 2013-15) in England and Wales
58 found that infection was associated with 20% of all childhood deaths (1). Child Death Reviews (CDR),
59 which aim to identify modifiable factors in any child's death, are reported by Local Safeguarding
60 Children's Boards and have been collated into annual reports for England by NHS Digital since 2018
61 and previously by the Department for Education (2). In the year ending March 2019, modifiable
62 factors were identified in 30% of all child deaths (compared to 24% in 2016 (3)) and 38% of deaths
63 from infection (4), suggesting that more can be done to prevent these deaths.

64 Emergency admissions and emergency department (ED) visits have continually increased over the
65 last 20 years. Between 1999 and 2010 emergency admissions increased particularly for under 5 year
66 olds (<1 year by 52%, aged 1–4 years by 25%) and acute infections (by 30%) (5). This trend continued
67 between 2007 and 2017 with a 1.6%/year increase in ED visits for all children and 3.9%/year for
68 infants (6). In one Midlands region in the UK, 28,929 children (27.9% of all admissions) were
69 admitted with infectious illness between 2011-2014, the largest group of emergency hospital
70 admissions by International Classification of Diseases (ICD) coding (7). There is no single code

71 available to indicate serious infectious illness (SII) – the focus of this paper – making it difficult to
72 determine the exact pattern of attendance or admissions for children diagnosed with a SII.

73 More problematic is determining how many children’s serious illness could have been recognised
74 sooner in primary care. These cases where the seriousness of these children’s illnesses was missed
75 should be reported as patient safety incidents through the National Reporting and Learning System
76 (NRLS); however, there are few reports submitted to the NRLS from primary care leading to limited
77 learning about influences on pre-hospital care. These systems depend on recorded data;
78 consequently, human factors are rarely captured. Notably, families’ perspectives are absent from
79 the data collected and parents report difficulties in securing the engagement of health services in
80 learning from their children’s deaths (www.mothersinstinct.co.uk).

81 The aim of our study was to retrospectively identify organizational and environmental factors and
82 individual child, family and professional factors affecting timing of admission to hospital for children
83 under 5 years of age with serious infectious illness (SII) in two counties in the United Kingdom. Our
84 research questions were:


- 85 1. What, if any, social and/or personal child and family characteristics influence the journeys of
86 children with serious infectious illness from home to hospital admission?
- 87 2. What, if any, modifiable organizational, environmental and individual human factors within
88 health services affect the timing of the journeys of children with serious infectious illness
89 from home to hospital admission?

90 **Methodological approach**

91 Working with parents we co-designed a modified grounded theory (8, 9) explanatory, mixed-
92 methods study (See Fig 1). Each step influenced the next and vice versa until a core category and
93 theory which explained the findings was identified. At this stage the emerging theory was compared

94 with existing knowledge to explore how extant evidence fitted and to identify new knowledge. This
95 process generated our emergent theory and our findings.

96 *Figure 1 Explanatory mixed methods modified grounded theory design*



97
98

99

100 Method

101 Two study areas were selected for the project representing a population served by a District General
102 Hospital (DGH) and a Teaching (Tertiary) Hospital (TH). These two areas included patterns of service
103 provision and population demographics similar to that in England as a whole. Ethics approval was
104 granted by East Midlands – Nottingham 1 Research Ethics Committee (17/EM/0334) on 8th
105 November 2017.

106 Our first step was to gather available documentary evidence in each of the two study areas to
107 provide the context for the research. The aim of this stage was to:

- 108 • identify known modifiable organizational, environmental and human factors from reports
109 concerned with child deaths;
- 110 • gather data on patterns of service use from Hospital Episode Statistics (HES) data and
111 ambulance service data for the preceding two years; and
- 112 • map the services available to children.

113 No information was available to the study team concerning learning from child death reviews in
114 either area, consequently we were not able to analyse our data for any related information. Urgent

115 and emergency care services were identified in each study area from health service webpages.
116 Coding used to categorise ambulance service use for children with acute infections was identified in
117 collaboration with ambulance service staff so that the number of calls in each area could be
118 identified for these children for the years 2015/16 and 2016/17. A researcher (KWD) worked with
119 Principal Investigators (PIs) for each area to identify relevant HES coding for children presenting to
120 hospital with a serious infectious illness so that data from the two hospitals could be compared.
121 These codes are based on diagnostic classifications and record an episode of continuous care,
122 consequently the data does not identify the numbers of children but does provide data on the level
123 of activity in each hospital. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics to identify any differences
124 between the two study areas. For further information on the documentary analysis please see S1
125 Fig.

126 Our next steps were to undertake data collection in two stages. Stage 1 involved in-depth interviews
127 with families whose child had recently been treated for a SII in one of the two hospitals in our study
128 area and the health professionals involved in their pre-hospital admission journeys. Stage 2 involved
129 focus groups with parents (recruited nationally) and professionals (recruited in the area surrounding
130 the two study sites) who had experience of child(ren) with SII between 2011 and 2018. Parents
131 recruited to the focus groups provided data concerning their memories of these traumatic events
132 and how these longer term memories had influenced their future health service use. HPs in Stage 2
133 were all in clinical practice at the time so had recent and longer term experiences to share.

134 These stages aimed to provide a comprehensive examination of the journey children with a SII
135 travelled from falling ill at home to being admitted to hospital. We included families with children
136 under 5 years of age who had had a SII, excluding neonates less than 28 days of age, post-neonatal
137 babies who had never left hospital, children who died at home, children in receipt of palliative care
138 or whose death was expected prior to the infection and children living outside either hospitals'
139 catchment areas. We were unable to identify a pre-existing definition for SII to adopt for our study.

140 Consequently, based on expert opinion of clinicians in the study team (DR, EC, PP), within this study
141 we considered children to have had a serious infectious illness if they had received care on a
142 paediatric intensive care (PICU) or high dependency unit (HDU) for a minimum of 48 hours with a
143 diagnosis of infection. Our methods and approaches were guided by our parent collaborators.

144 **Recruitment**

145 In Stage 1, families were recruited between January and 2018 and Oct 2019 and March 2019 in the
146 hospital setting by clinical research nurses once their child was improving and had been transferred
147 from PICU/HDU to a children's ward: three from the DGH and nine from the TH. These families were
148 followed up by phone at home after discharge from hospital, by member of the research team (SN,
149 KWD). Informed consent was obtained face-to-face at the beginning of the interviews. All the family
150 member participants were parents or primary carers of the children concerned. Throughout this
151 paper the term parent is used to refer to all of the parent and carer participants. During the
152 interview, parents were asked for permission to contact the health professionals involved in their
153 child's care. These professionals were then contacted by a researcher (KWD), given information
154 about the project and invited to take part in the project.

155 Parent participants in Stage 2 were recruited through a local parent panel, by word of mouth and
156 Facebook and through our charity partners between May and October 2019. Posters and leaflets for
157 GP practices disseminated through primary care networks generated no interest. Health professional
158 participants were recruited by members of the research team (DR, KWD, PP) and the local clinical
159 research network by email and word of mouth.

160 **Data collection**

161 The first stage of data collection involved retrospective in-depth interviews with parents of children
162 under 5 years whose child had been discharged from hospital within the last 4 weeks following

163 treatment for a serious infectious illness (SN, KWD). These audio-recorded in-depth interviews were
164 conducted in the family home. Parents were asked to *'Tell me the story of your child's illness from*
165 *the time you first noticed something was wrong up until they were admitted to hospital?'* followed
166 by neutral prompts to help them tell us more about their experiences.

167 We then interviewed HPs who had been involved in these children's pre-hospital journeys. All the
168 HPs were interviewed by KWD in person within a quiet room in their workplace. Each HP was asked
169 to *'Tell me the story of the child's illness during the time they were in your care'* followed by neutral
170 prompts to generate further detail.


171 The second stage of data collection involved three focus groups with parents whose child had had a
172 SII between 2011 and 2018 from across the UK in locations away from health services. A further
173 three focus groups were held in hospital seminar rooms with HPs from the area surrounding the
174 study sites who had experience of caring for such children in first contact services during the same
175 time period. Each focus group was audio-recorded and facilitated by two people from the research
176 team (KWD, SN, TB) and on one occasion a clinical research nurse from the TH. Parent focus groups
177 were asked the starter question: *'Thinking back about your child's illness, what helped or prevented*
178 *you getting them admitted to hospital quickly?'* Health professional focus groups were asked a
179 similar starter question: *'What do you think are the key factors influencing the timing of admission to*
180 *hospital for children with serious infectious illness?'* These questions were followed by a series of
181 questions that had arisen from analysis of the Stage 1 data creating a semi-structured discussion.

182 **Data analysis**

183 Data were analysed inductively (no a priori coding) using the constant comparative method (10),
184 including line by line coding facilitated through the use of QSR NVivo 11 and drawing timeline
185 diagrams depicting each child's pathway to hospital admission (SN, LB). Data from our documentary
186 analysis were combined with the analysis of the interview and focus group data – in Glaserian


187 grounded theory both qualitative and quantitative data can be used to develop theory reflecting
188 Glaser's mantra '*all is data*' (11 p145). Glaser's 6 Cs coding frame (8) facilitated the identification of,
189 and interrelationships between, factors influencing children's pathways. In common with most
190 grounded theory research projects, we did not identify any covariances (when two variables change
191 at the same time), making ours a 5 Cs model of Context, Conditions/Antecedents, Causes,
192 Contingencies/Influencing variables and Consequences, all of which related to A, the Core category
193 (Fig 2).

Figure 2 5C's coding family adapted from Glaser's 6Cs



194
195 A core category is central to the data, accounting for a large proportion of the variation in behaviour
196 as all the other categories are related to it within, what is now, the identified theory (8, 10). Once
197 the emerging theory had been identified, its fit with existing knowledge (12), including our
198 systematic literature review (13), was explored. Saturation was considered to have been achieved as
199 '*the theory is abstract and linked to the literature, the findings are generalizable to new incidents,*
200 *and the findings surprise and delight the reader.*' (14). The outcome of this final process is the theory
201 represented in Fig 3 '*Navigating uncertain illness trajectories: relationships between categories*'.

Figure 3 Navigating uncertain illness trajectories: relationships between categories



202

203 Findings

204 Study participants

205 A total of 70 individual participants were recruited to the project between January 2018 and October
 206 2019. In Stage 1 twelve families (a total of 22 parents), three from the DGH and nine from the TH
 207 (Table 1), and 14 health professionals (Table 2) were recruited.

208 **Table 1 Stage 1 Characteristics of parent/carer participants and their affected child**
 209 **(N=22~)**

Characteristic	Number of parents (%)	Characteristic	Number of parents (%)
Age		Relationship to the child	
25-29 years	3 (13%)	Parent: Mother	11 (50%)
30-39 years	10 (44%)	Parent: Father	8 (36%)
40-49 years	0	Other family carer	3 (14%)
50-59 years	1 (4%)		
60+ years	3 (13%)		
Gender		Income	
Female	12 (52%)	Less than 10,000	3 (13%)
Male	9 (39%)	10,000-19,999	5 (22%)
Ethnicity		20,000-29,999	4 (17%)

White British	12 (52%)	30,000-39,999	5 (22%)
Indian	6 (26%)	40,000-49,999	0
Employment		50,000-59,999	2 (9%)
Employed (part or full time)	8 (35%)	60,000-79,999	2 (9%)
Unemployed or retired	3 (13%)	80,000-99,999	1 (4%)
Caring for family at home	5 (22%)	100,000+	3 (13%)
Age of affected child*		Diagnoses of affected child*&**	
Under 6 months	1 (8%)	Acute Respiratory	12 (52%)
6-12 months	2 (17%)	Acute exacerbation of recurrent respiratory	5 (22%)
13-23 months	2 (17%)	Acute disseminated encephalomyelitis (ADEM)	1 (4%)
2-4 years old	7 (58%)	Tonsillitis	1 (4%)
		Sepsis and Septicaemia	2 (9%)
~Although 22 parents/carers completed the questionnaire, questions were not compulsory and therefore each question was not always completed by 100% of parents.			
*Based on the number of families (N=12) engaged in Stage 1, not on the total number of parents (N=22) participating in Stage 1.			
**Many children had multiple diagnoses.			

210

211

212

213 **Table 2 Stage 1 Characteristics of Health professional (HP) participants (N=14~)**

Characteristic	Number of HPs (%)	Characteristic	Number of HPs (%)
Age		Service type**	
21-29 years	5 (36%)	Ambulance Service	6 (43%),
30-39 years	5 (36%)	Emergency Care	8 (57%)
40-49 years	1 (7%)	Other***	2 (14%)
50-59 years	3 (21%)	Job title	
Gender		Emergency Medical Technician	3 (21%)
Female	9 (64%)	Emergency Medical Dispatcher	1 (7%)
Male	4 (29%)	Emergency Medical Consultant	1 (7%)
Ethnicity		Emergency Care Assistant	1 (7%)
White British	11 (79%)	Emergency Care Nurse	2 (14%)
Indian	1 (7%)	Junior Doctor	1 (7%)
Other*	2 (14%)	Paramedic	3 (21%)
Employment		Health Advisor	2 (14%)
Employed (full time)	14 (100%)		
~Although 14 health professionals completed the questionnaire, questions were not compulsory and therefore each question was not always completed by 100% of professionals.			
*Welsh, White other unspecified			
**Some staff work across multiple services			
***Emergency Service - Air Ambulance, Paediatric Ward			

214

215 In Stage 2, a total of 18 parents (Table 3) and 16 HPs (Table 4) were recruited. Health professionals
 216 were from our study area, but as local recruitment of parents generated only two participants, we
 217 recruited nationally through our charity partners for the parent focus groups. Six parents were
 218 unable to attend the focus groups, opting to take part in individual telephone or email interviews.

219 **Table 3 Stage 2 Characteristics of parent participants (N=18~)**

Characteristic	Number of parents (%)	Characteristic	Number of parents (%)
Age		Relationship to the child	
30-39 years	11 (61%)	Parent: Mother	15 (83%),
40-49 years	5 (28%)	Parent: Father	2 (11%)
Gender		Income	
Female	14 (78%)	Less than 10,000	2 (11%)
Male	2 (11%)	10,000-19,999	3 (17%)
Ethnicity		20,000-29,999	0
White British	12 (67%)	30,000-39,999	0
White other*	3 (17%)	40,000-49,999	1 (6%)
Employment Status		50,000-59,999	1 (6%)
Employed (part or full time)	12 (67%)	60,000-79,999	3 (17%)
Unemployed	1 (6%)	80,000-99,999	4 (22%)
Caring for family at home	3 (17%)	100,000+	2 (17%)
Age of affected child**		Diagnoses of affected child**&***	
Under 6 months	6 (38%)	Acute Respiratory	1 (6%)
6-12 months	4 (25%)	Sepsis and Septicaemia	6 (38%)
13-23 months	2 (12%)	Meningitis	14 (88%)
2-4 years old	4 (25%)		

~Although 18 parents completed the questionnaire, questions were not compulsory and therefore each question was not always completed by 100% of parents.

*European, Scottish, Other unspecified.

**Based on the number of families (N=16) engaged in Stage 2, not on the total number of parents (N=18) engaged in Stage 2.

***Many children have multiple diagnoses.

220

221

222 **Table 4 Stage 2 Characteristics of health professional (HP) participants (N=16~)**

Characteristic	Number of HPs (%)	Characteristic	Number of HPs (%)
Age		Service type	
21-29 years	2 (13%)	General Practice	5 (32%)
30-39 years	6 (38%)	Emergency Care	5 (32%)
40-49 years	4 (25%)	Ambulance Service	2 (13%)
50-59 years	4 (25%)	Other**	4 (25%)
Gender		Job title	
Female	9 (56%)	General Practitioner	5 (32%)
Male	5 (32%)	Paediatric Emergency Medical Consultant	4 (25%)
Ethnicity		Emergency Care Children's Nurse	1 (6%)
White British	10 (63%)	Community Children's Nurse	1 (6%)
South Asian*	3 (19%)	Paramedic	2 (13%)
African	1 (6%)	Other***	3 (19%)
Other*	2 (13%)		
Employment			
Employed (full time)	12 (75%)		
Employed (part time)	4 (25%)		

~Although 16 health professionals completed the questionnaire, questions were not compulsory and therefore each question was not always completed by 100% of professionals.
 *Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi
 ** NHS111, Community
 ***Community Pharmacist, Dental Hygienist Oral Health Lead, Health Advisor

223 **Navigating uncertain illness trajectories for young children**
 224 **with serious infectious illness: The emergent theory.**

225 From the onset of the illness, uncertainty ran throughout parents' and health care professionals'
 226 stories of navigating social expectations and hierarchies and health services to enable these children
 227 to access appropriate treatment in a timely manner. Parents reported trying to navigate multiple
 228 pathways though complex services whilst also having to overcome perceived criticism of their
 229 behaviour and decision making. Health care professionals also reported the need to navigate
 230 complex health services and social hierarchies between professional groups. This uncertainty in
 231 many cases delayed help seeking or referral. If the NHS is conceptualised as a safety net designed to
 232 promote health and prevent avoidable morbidity and mortality, most of the children in this study
 233 have fallen, at least in part, through this safety net.

234 The interrelated sub-categories that make up the emergent theory are presented below with a 'C'
 235 used to highlight which of Glaser's 6 Cs these represent. Categories are presented beginning with

236 ‘The Illness’, the Cause category in grounded theory terms, followed by ‘Navigating uncertain illness
 237 trajectories’, the Core category to which all the other categories relate, then ‘The family and the
 238 health services Context’ within which these trajectories took place, the ‘Social expectations and
 239 social hierarchies’, the antecedents or Conditions, the ‘Influencing variables or Contingencies’
 240 affecting these trajectories and finally the ‘Consequences’ of these complex illness trajectories.

241 Throughout the presentation of the findings, participants are referred to using unique codes (see
 242 Box 1).

243 **Box 1 Participant codes**

Research stage	Type of participant	Code	Additional information
Stage 1	Parents	Study site followed by P for parent and family number (e.g. TH,P01).	Teaching Hospital = TH; District General Hospital = DGH
	Health professionals	HP followed by a number and service identifier such as NHS111/GP/Amb.tech/ED nurse/999 call handler (e.g. HP01, NHS111).	NHS 111 (NHS24 in Scotland) is a non-emergency medical helpline free to use in the UK. GP is the accepted abbreviation for general practitioners – family doctors in the UK. Amb.tech is short for ambulance technician – they work with paramedics on ambulances but have less training. 999 is the telephone number for the UK’s emergency service.
Stage 2	Parents	P for Parents, FG for focus group, FG number (e.g. FG1), M for Mother or F for Father followed by respondent number (e.g. P,FG2,M7). Parents who contributed by telephone are identified as P,FGT. Parents who contributed by email as P,FGE (e.g. P,FGT,M1 or P,FGE,M2).	Three parent focus groups P,FG1 P,FG2 P,FG3
	Health professionals	Location of the focus group i.e. TH or DGH followed by HP,FG and the number of the focus group (e.g. TH,HP,FG2).	Individuals are identified by appending their service identified as for Stage 1.

244

245 **The illness: the Cause and beginning of the illness trajectory**

246 The beginning of all the children’s journeys was the onset of illness. Of the 28 children whose
 247 parents shared illness trajectories with researchers, 10 children from Stage 1 were reported to have

248 a respiratory illness, one had tonsillitis and one had acute disseminated encephalomyelitis (ADEM)
249 (see Table 5).

250 In Stage 2, 14 children were reported to have meningitis (five also had sepsis), one had urinary sepsis
251 and one had bronchiolitis (see Table 6). The high number of children with meningitis in Stage 2
252 reflects the success of recruitment through our charity partner, Meningitis Now.

253 The duration of the illness prior to admission to hospital varied from 12 hours to 12 days in Stage 1
254 and from 12 hours to more than 2 weeks in stage 2 illustrating the individual and unpredictable
255 trajectory of each child's illness.

256

257 **Table 5 Stage 1 Characteristics of each family and affected child**

258 TH Teaching hospital; DGH District general hospital; NP Nurse Practitioner; CAU Child Assessment Unit.

Stage 1 Case	Family members interviewed	Age band of affected child	Household composition	Pre-existing conditions (yes/no)	Diagnosis for this illness	Duration of this illness prior to admission	Services accessed pre-hospital and admitting unit
THP04	Mother	13-23 months	Two parents	Yes	?Bronchiolitis	3 + days	GP, CAU, Ambulance, ED, HDU
THP05	Father	Under 6 months	Two parents; 6 other adults and their 4 children	Unknown	RSV Bronchiolitis and Influenza A	Approx. 7 days	GP x3, EDx2, CAU, PICU
THP08	Mother and Father	2-4 year old	Two parents, grandparent and one young sibling.	Yes	?Chest infection	Approx. 6 days	GP, Ambulance, ED, PICU
THP10	Mother and Father	2-4 year old	Two parents and one younger sibling.	Yes	?Asthma attack and chest infection	1.5 days	NP at GP surgery, Ambulance, ED, PICU
THP12	Mother	2-4 year old	Two parents and two older siblings.	Yes	Asthma attack and chest infection	Approx. 12 hours	NP at GP surgery x2, ED, HDU
THP18	Mother, two other family carers	2-4 year old	Two parents, one younger and one older sibling.	No	'Chest infection and later pneumonia, fluid around the lung and Strep A blood infection'	2.5 days	NHS 111, Ambulance, ED, HDU/PICU
THP21	Mother and Father	2-4 year old	Two parents and two older siblings.	Unknown	ADEM - Acute disseminated encephalomyelitis	6 days	GP x2, ED x2, Walk-in Centre, ED, HDU/PICU
THP22	Mother and Father	2-4 year old	Two parents	Yes	Tonsillitis with obstruction	7 days	Walk-in Centre, locum GP, NHS 111, Ambulance, ED, PICU
THP27	Mother and one other family carer	6-12 months	Two parents and one older sibling.	Yes	Bronchiolitis (recurrence) with obstruction	10 days	Ambulance, ED, PICU
DGHP01	Mother and Father	13-23 months	Two parents.	No	Collapsed lung and sepsis	12 days	GP x3, NHS 111, ED, HDU
DGHP02	Mother and Father	6-12 months	Two parents and one older sibling.	No	Collapsed lung secondary to ?chest infection/ pneumonia	Approx. 8 days	GP x2, NHS 111, Ambulance, ED, HDU
DGHP03	Mother and Father	2-4 year old	Two parents.	No	Pneumonia	7 days	GP, NHS 111, Ambulance, 999, ED, HDU/PICU

259

260 **Table 6 Stage 2 Characteristics of each family and affected child**

261 P,FG1 = Parent Focus group 1, August 2019; P,FG2 = Parent Focus group 2, October 2019; P,FG3 = Parent Focus group 3, ,
 262 October 2019; P,FGT = Parent Focus group alternative telephone interview: October 2019; P,FGE = Parent focus group
 263 alternative email interview: October 2019; M = Mother F = Father followed by the number of the participant e.g. M1

Stage 2 Case	Family members interviewed	Age band of affected child	Household composition	Pre-existing conditions (yes/no)	Diagnosis for this illness	Sequelae of the illness	Duration of this illness prior to admission	Services accessed pre-hospital and admitting unit
P,FG1,M1	Mother	6-12 months	Two parents and two children.	Yes	Bronchiolitis	Unknown	Unknown	ED, HDU
P,FG1,M2	Mother	6-12 months	One parent and four children.	No	Meningitis and sepsis	Right below elbow amputee. Acquired brain injury. Stomach damage causing food sensitivities. Growth plate damage	4 days	NHS111, Ambulance, ED, Ward
P,FG2,M1	Mother	2-4 year old	Two parents and six children.	Unknown	Meningitis	No bone growth in both legs due to sepsis. Now having treatment (lengthening and correcting the shape of the legs)	3 days	GP, 999, ambulance, 'Hospital'
P,FG2,M2	Mother	6-12 months	Two parents and three children.	Unknown	Meningococcal septicaemia	Unknown	24 hours	GP, ED, PICU
P,FG2,M3&F4	Mother and Father	Under 6 months	Two parents and two children.	Unknown	Late onset group B streptococcus meningitis	Child died	24 hours	GP, 999, ED, 'Hospital'
P,FG2,M5&F6	Mother and Father	2-4 year old	Two parents and two children.	Unknown	Meningitis B	Child died	< 24 hours	999, ED, PICU
P,FG2,M7	Mother	2-4 year old	Two parents and one child.	Unknown	Meningitis	Child died	3 days	ED, 'Hospital'
P,FG3,M1	Mother	2-4 year old	Two parents and two children.	Unknown	Meningococcal disease	Unknown	24 hours	GP, NHS111, Ambulance, ED, PICU
P,FG3,M2	Mother	6-12 months		Yes	Pneumococcal meningitis	Child died	2 weeks +	GPx4, ED, Adult HDU
P,FG3,M3	Mother	6-12 months	Two parents and two children.	Unknown	Pneumococcal meningitis	Unknown	2 weeks +	Walk-in centre, GP, ED, 'Hospital'
P,FGT,M1	Mother	13-23 months		Unknown	Bacterial meningitis and septicaemia	Unknown	2 days	OOHS GP, EDx2, 'Hospital'
P,FGT,M2	Mother	Under 6 months	Two parents and two children.	Unknown	Viral meningitis	Unknown	12 hours	NHS24, OOHS Nurse, Ambulance, ED, 'Hospital'
P,FGT,M3	Mother	Under 6 months	Two parents and one child.	Unknown	Meningitis	Unknown	12 hours	GP, ED, 'Hospital'
P,FGT,M4	Mother	Under 6 months	Three adults and one child	Unknown	Meningitis and sepsis	Unknown	<24 hours	NHS111, Urgent Care Centre, 'Hospital'
P,FGE,M1	Mother	Under 6 months	Two adults and four children.	Unknown	Urinary sepsis	Unknown	6 days	HV, NHS24 x2, OOHS GP, GP, ED, 'Hospital'
P,FGE,M2	Mother	Under 6 months	Two adults and three children.	Unknown	Meningitis and septicaemia	Growth plates affected result in leg length discrepancy	<24 hours	GP, GP OOHS, Cottage Hospital, Ambulance, PICU

264
 265 N.B. 'Hospital' is given as the admitting unit where no information was provided about the unit to which the
 266 child was admitted.

267 Navigating uncertain illness trajectories

268 Defining the illness and its severity during the illness trajectory

269 Throughout the illness trajectory, parents had to make sense of the illness and its severity. Parents'
270 ability to define the illness and judge its seriousness was affected by tiredness, distractions of family
271 life, past experience, knowledge of symptoms/illness and not wanting it to be serious as the *'thought*
272 *of it being something more is unbearable'* (P,FG2,M5). In the later stages of the trajectory towards
273 hospital admission, parents perceived that the illness had progressed from minor to very obviously
274 real and serious, often reported in this study as recognising *significant* differences from normal or
275 that something was obviously *'not right..... he didn't look right* (DGH,P01,M); *'she's not right'*
276 (P,FG2,M3). Before this point lay uncertainty about the legitimacy of seeking help; it is in this
277 uncertain part of the illness trajectory that there are opportunities for parents to access earlier
278 treatment. For some children whose illness progresses rapidly this window of time is very short.

279 Some symptoms of serious illness were not recognised by parents and, in a few instances, by health
280 professionals (Box 2). The significance of wording and phrases used by parents to describe what was
281 worrying them about their unwell child, such as *'not quite herself'* (P,FG2,M3) and *'not there behind*
282 *the eyes'* (P,FG2,M7), were reported by some parents to be missed by HPs. The lack of recognition of
283 these phrases illustrates the difficulties parents had in communicating their concerns about their
284 child's illness in terms of symptoms that were recognised by HPs. For example, one mother
285 explained:

286 *"That's where I struggle I think, to be able to explain why I know he's not right, but I get that a lot. I*
287 *think I seem to just - it's just in me and I can't explain it. The amount of times I've said to him*
288 *[Father], 'He's just not right, something's not right but I don't know what it is'"* (DGH,P01,M).

289

290 **Box 2 Missed symptoms of serious illness**

Symptoms not recognised by parents	Symptoms not recognised by health professionals
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> 'Bruising', 'love bite', purple mark <input type="checkbox"/> Temp over 38°C in young baby <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of urine <input type="checkbox"/> Grunting <input type="checkbox"/> Head/back pain <input type="checkbox"/> Mottled skin <input type="checkbox"/> Sucking in under the ribs <input type="checkbox"/> Fast breathing <input type="checkbox"/> Funny cry <input type="checkbox"/> Staring <input type="checkbox"/> Stiffness <input type="checkbox"/> Non-response to paracetamol 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Purple mark (NHS 24 call handler) <input type="checkbox"/> Temp over 38°C in young baby (Out-of-hours service (OOHS GP)) <input type="checkbox"/> Lack of urine (OOHS GP) <input type="checkbox"/> Grunting (ED doctor)

291

292 **Parent help seeking during the illness trajectory**

293 Parents made between one and six contacts with health services during their child's illness trajectory
 294 (see Tables 7-10). Use of the out of hours service (OOHS) was rarely reported. Various factors were
 295 reported by parents to affect children's trajectories: access to GP appointments – *"it's quite hard to
 296 get an appointment"* (DGH,P02,F), transport – *"We're stuck, especially with no car"* (TH,P10,F) and
 297 proximity to services – *"it is not far. That's why I chose it [Urgent Care Centre]"* (TH,P21,F).
 298 Psychosocial factors affecting parents' decision making about seeking help for their child are
 299 explored in Influencing Variables below.

300

301

302

303 **Table 7 Stage1 Illness trajectories**

304 TH Teaching hospital, DGH District general hospital, CAU Child Assessment Unit, NP Nurse Practitioner

Family identifier	Age band of child	Duration of this illness pre-admission	Diagnosis for this illness	Illness trajectory
THP04	13-23 months	3 + days	?Bronchiolitis	Struggling with her breathing, rash as well, to GP Wednesday, sent to CAU, in CAU for 6 hours, doctors debated keeping her in, discharged home with leaflet 'and told to look out for any recession', Friday morning vomited after breakfast, struggling to breathe, called ambulance, admitted to HDU
THP05	Under 6 months	Approx. 7 days	RSV Bronchiolitis and Influenza A	Coughing for a week, choking during coughing bouts, visited GP three times, cough worsening and going blue for 5 days, then ED, no coughing during consultation so discharged home, ED again, coughing episode witnesses so sent to CAU, admitted to PICU (no timeframe information).
THP08*	2-4 year old	Approx. 6 days	?Chest infection	Friday completed course of antibiotics, Mother away from home post surgery so cared for by Father (first time on his own), well until Sunday morning, Father detected high temp. gave Calprofen, called Mother, Mother visited Sunday evening, holds him, he is floppy, going grey around eyes and mouth, called ambulance Sunday evening, admitted to PICU.
THP10	2-4 year old	1.5 days	?Asthma attack and chest infection	Monday first ill, coughing and wheezing throughout the night, given inhalers, Mother didn't want to wake Father so waited for surgery to open next day, Tuesday saw GP NP who gave nebuliser, called ambulance, admitted to PICU.
THP12	2-4 year old	Approx. 12 hours	Asthma attack and chest infection	Thursday morning high temp and slight wheeze, saw GP NP who advised 'give him his pump', more wheezy by midday so took him back to see NP early afternoon, told to carry on as before, by 5pm 'gasping' and pushing very hard to breathe whilst sleeping, waited for Father to come back from work, then to pack bags including food for Mother as it was Ramadan, picked up other children from after school club, taken to ED that evening by car, admitted to HDU
THP18	2-4 year old	2.5 days	Chest infection and later pneumonia, fluid around the lung and Strep A blood infection	Family had all had 'it' in the preceding two weeks. Thursday first ill with temp, responsive to paracetamol, vomited in bed that evening, Friday slept on and off 'really, really hot', cared for by grandmother so Mother could Christmas shop, no bounce back on paracetamol, had wet herself when she woke, Grandmother advised seeking GP, Mother said she had but didn't, Father went to work Christmas party and stayed at his parents', Saturday morning lips 'all white', thought it was dehydration, called NHS111, ambulance sent, ED, ED consultant 'on the fence' about her until chest X-ray results, admitted to HDU/PICU
THP21	2-4 year old	6 days	ADEM - Acute disseminated encephalomyeli	Language difficulties. Sunday first ill with D&V and temp a bit high, Monday GP, Tuesday GP, told it was flu', Wednesday ED with Father 6-7 hours told

			tis	it was viral and sent home, getting worse and nose bleed, Thursday ED with teenage daughter to translate, taken less seriously than when Father took her so sent home, Friday not drinking or eating and floppy so evening to walk-in centre as it was close to them, took blood, told 'low blood count' sent to hospital 'Just go now', admitted to HDU/PICU.
THP22*	2-4 year old	7 days	Tonsillitis with obstruction	Sunday cough, temperature responsive to paracetamol, walk-in centre red throat and given antibiotics, Wednesday no improvement > locum GP changed antibiotics, seemed to get a bit better until Saturday evening when she woke from sleep blue around lips and eyes, really struggling to breathe, called NHS111 who sent ambulance, resuscitated in ED, PICU
THP27*	6-12 month old	10 days	Bronchiolitis (recurrence) with obstruction	Previous admissions with bronchiolitis, worse for him because he had tracheobronchomalacia. Worried about being judged by HCPs as paranoid parent. Friday first ill for this episode of illness. Much worse Wednesday and Thursday. Saturday seemed better. Late Sunday night/Monday morning Mother went to his room to find him really distressed, he gasped and stopped breathing. 1am Monday morning resuscitated at home by Mother, called ambulance, ED, PICU.
DGHP01"	13-23 months	12 days	Collapsed lung and sepsis	Previous visits to ED with chickenpox, infection and high temp after immunisations. GP for antibiotics twice in preceding weeks, then Tuesday/Wednesday picked up a cold from playgroup, Wednesday following week GP tonsillitis and given antibiotics, felt reassured, Mother sent Father videos of him during the day, breathing quite hard, temperature hard to manage, relayed calling due to prior criticism from nurse, Friday night not eating or drinking or weeing so NHS 111 wanting OOHS GP, NHS 111 wanted to send ambulance but parents chose to take him in their care to ED, HDU
DGHP02	6-12 months	Approx. 8 days	Partially collapsed lung secondary to ?chest infection/pneumonia	A bit wheeze all week, then Monday a bit wheezy at nursery, Monday evening GP nothing to worry about, come back if it gets worse, Tuesday night woke from sleep really struggling, asked grandmother advised to seek help, sucking in at the ribs so called NHS 111 who sent ambulance, given nebuliser, taken to ED, HDU
DGHP03	2-4 year old	7 days	Pneumonia	Monday sent home from nursery with temp., Tuesday GP to satisfy nursery, lots of people ill, reassured by having seen the GP, Saturday coughing at night, NHS 111 about midnight, Ambulance – sent away, Sunday phoned for appointment, GP appointment 2.30pm given antibiotics, evening not keeping fluids down, unable to stop coughing, called 999, advised to go to ED in their own car for speed, HDU/PICU

305

*Lots of prior hospital admissions.

" Lots of prior visits to ED.

306 **Table 8 Stage 2 Illness trajectories**

307 P,FG2 = Parent Focus group 1, August 2019; P,FG2 = Parent Focus group 2, October 2019; P,FG3 = Parent Focus
 308 group 3, October 2019; P,FGT = Parent Focus group alternative telephone interview, October 2019; P,FGE =
 309 Parent focus group alternative email interview, October 2019; M = Mother F = Father followed by the number
 310 of the participant e.g. M1

Stage 2 Case	Age band of child	Duration of this illness pre-admission	Diagnosis for this illness	Illness trajectory
P,FG1,M1	6-12 months	Not known	Bronchiolitis	Previous experience of NHS 111 sending ambulance when it was not warranted put them off calling them and delayed help seeking. Mother's Day, Mother out with friends, Father phoned to say breathing really bad, instructed Father to give inhaler, Mother came home and saw she was gasping for breath > to ED in their car > Adult resusc > Paediatric HDU
P,FG1,M2	6-12 months	4 days	Meningitis and sepsis	Bit of a temp for 4 days, gradually increasing > floppy, 'ash grey', tensing, vomiting, high temp. over 41 on paracetamol Friday night > Phoned NHS 111 (didn't want to call 999 unnecessarily) > ambulance to ED 8pm at a weekend > ward at 1am for 27 hours > discharged but Mother refused to leave, Mother took photos to track visible changes in him and made notes > deteriorated, hand went black within 45 minutes > HDU > transferred to teaching hospital, legs black > right arm amputated, stroke.
P,FG2,M1	2-4 year old	3 days	Meningitis	Ill for 2 days in December, woke at midnight with high temp. unresponsive to paracetamol > ibuprofen, shaking > 6am whimpering, mottled skin, sunken eyes > watched TV, sore head > paracetamol worked > ate breakfast, napped, 'love bite' on his arm > glass test > checked symptoms on google > phoned GP who said 'you decide' whether to call 999 > called 999 > collapsed > phone grandad while waiting > fast response car, semi-conscious, given ABs > hospital.
P,FG2,M2	6-12 months	24 hours	Meningococcal septicaemia	Woke crying, high temp., came down in response to paracetamol, diarrhoea, slept with Mother, woke in the morning with funny breathing, very still > rang GP, no urgent appointments > took child to GP demanding to be seen > GP told them to go straight to ED > PICU
P,FG2, M3&F4	Under 6 months	24 hours	Late onset group B streptococcus meningitis	Had a cold > GP as not 'quite herself', Mother worked there and GP trusted her judgement and didn't examine her > early hours of the morning Mother 'jolted awake' as she hadn't woken for a feed, floppy > rang 999 > hospital > died
P,FG2, M5&F6	2-4 year old	< 24 hours	Meningitis B	Came home from nursery saying back hurts (there were lots of coughs and colds about), went to bed as normal, sick in the night, up with her 5.30am, 'bruise' on her eyebrow, vomiting, very quiet, bath, spot on leg, just lying there, 'knew something bad was wrong' > 999 > ED leg purple > PICU > died 13 days later
P,FG2,M7	2-4 year old	3 days	Meningitis	Ill for 2 days, had a nap on the sofa, tried to wake him, eyes not right 'it was like he wasn't there behind his eyes' > neighbour for help > hospital, unconscious > resusc > died within a day.
P,FG3,M1	2-4 year	24 hours	Meningococcal	Nursery Mon am, pm sofa day, then vomiting, rang GP

	old		disease	– no appointments, high temp. in the evening, shaky and hallucinating, phoned 111 as husband thought need an ambulance, NHS 111 sent ambulance > ED, purple blotching on chest, rapidly spreading > ICU > transferred to London hospital
P,FG3,M2	6-12 months	2 weeks +	Pneumococcal meningitis	Ear infection, 3 lots of antibiotics, back to GP Friday 4pm, saw different doctor > ED Saturday as she was staring and stiff > Adult HDU > transferred to London hospital > brain dead Sunday > died .
P,FG3,M3	6-12 months	2 weeks +	Pneumococcal meningitis	Ill on and off for 2 weeks > walk-in centre > sent home, suddenly very, very sick at night, spine and head hurt > saw GP 9am, told ' <i>nothing that sinister</i> ' but Mother asked if he should go to ED, GP response ' <i>I guess</i> ' > ED, deteriorated within an hour > in hospital for 10 days.
P,FGT,M1	13-23 months	2 days	Bacterial meningitis and septicaemia	Weekend. Woke in the night on Friday, vomited, high temp.. A bit unwell Saturday had a couple of spots > glass test, ' <i>kind of disappeared</i> ', temp 39.7 > rang OOHS GP > saw GP almost immediately, temp over 40 >referred to hospital >discharged, told ' <i>it's probably just chickenpox</i> ', given advice sheet on caring for a child with a fever. Perked up, ate and drank, played with her sister. Vomited Saturday night, high temp.. Sunday morning floppy and not very responsive. Waited until Sunday early evening before taking her back to the hospital. Had a couple more spots. Admitted. Recorded diary of events during hospital stay.
P,FGT,M2	Under 6 months	12 hours	Viral meningitis	Bank holiday Monday. Day out on the beach. Irritable, thought it was the hot weather. On return home, sniffly and high temp. > checked NHS website >phone NHS 24 > OOHS Nurse Practitioner noticed distressed on handling and mottled legs> Ambulance > admitted. Mother had no idea that it was serious.
P,FGT,M3	Under 6 months	12 hours	Meningitis	Grizzly and crying unusual for him one morning. Temp 38 > given paracetamol > temp continued to rise to 40, not feeding > asked grandmother, asked online groups, googled > rang GP > advised to ring 999 > grandmother drove them instead. Had a ' <i>small rash</i> ', blanched with glass test. Didn't want to waste NHS time in an overburdened system.
P,FGT,M4	Under 6 months	<24 hours	Meningitis and sepsis	Had gastroenteritis 10 days before. Wednesday poorly, crying on and off all day, overnight unsettled, feeding very little, large vomit after a feed, temp 39.2, grey/yellow colour > NHS 111 > OOHS appointment > phoned by Urgent care centre at hospital to come straight there instead, temp 39.9 & vomited > admitted.
P,FGE,M1	Under 6 months	6 days	Urinary sepsis	Initially snuffly on Wednesday/Thursday, Friday saw HV who noted she was unwell but not concerned, 11pm woke with temperature > Called NHS 24, ' <i>just a cold</i> ' > googled, read NICE guidelines, Saturday not feeding, temp. over 39, lack of urine > NHS 24 > OOHS GP, not concerned, Sunday temp spikes, fretful not feeding, Sunday night breathing fast, funny cry, Monday pm floppy and lethargic ' <i>she looks like she is dead</i> ', almost grey, temp 41 > GP > hospital. NB Delayed help seeking after Saturday consultation

				due to criticism, false reassurance ' <i>It's just a cold</i> '.
P,FGE,M2	Under 6 months	<24 hours	Meningitis and septicaemia	Just after Christmas, snow. High temperature > phoned GP, advised to give paracetamol and ibuprofen, monitor for new symptoms/worsening, if yes, ring surgery. Middle of the night, strange whinge, diarrhoea and a purple mark on his belly>checked for symptoms of meningitis online >rang GP OOHS > cottage hospital in the snow, OA lips turning blue, pale, heavy breathing, given Abs, oxygen >called ambulance >hospital >retrieval unit>children's hospital PICU. NB ' <i>Unable to word it out (meningitis) to my husband or anyone on the phone</i> '

311

312 **Table 9 Stage 1 Children's help seeking on their illness trajectory to hospital admission**

313 Please note that these are not presented in the order in which parents made contact with these services.

314 THP = parent recruited in the Teaching Hospital; DGHP = parent recruited in the District General Hospital

Stage 1 Case	Duration of illness	Social network	Primary care	Urgent care / walk-in centre	NHS 111	OOHS	999/ Ambulance	A&E/CAU	Pre-admission contacts with health services
THP04	3 + days		●				●	● ●	4
THP05	Approx. 7 days	●	● ● ●					● ● ●	6
THP08	Approx. 6 days		●				●	●	3
THP10	1.5 days		●				●	●	3
THP12	Approx. 12 hours		● ●					●	3
THP18	2.5 days	●			●		●	●	3
THP21	6 days	● ●	● ● ●	●				● ● ●	6
THP22	7 days		●	●	●		●	●	5
THP27	10 days						●	●	2
	12 days		● ● ●		●			●	5
DGHP01									
DGHP02	Approx. 8 days	●	● ●		●		●	●	5
DGHP03	7 days		●		●		● ●	●	5

315

316 **Table 10 Stage 2 Children's help seeking on their illness trajectory to hospital admission**

317 Please note that these are not presented in the order in which parents made contact with these services.

319 P,FG2 = Parent Focus group 1, August 2019; P,FG2 = Parent Focus group 2, October 2019; P,FG3 = Parent Focus group 3, October 2019; P,FGT = Parent Focus group alternative telephone interview, October 2019; P,FG4 =

320

321 Parent focus group alternative email interview, October 2019; M = Mother F = Father followed by the number
 322 of the participant e.g. M1

Stage 2 Case	Duration of illness	Social network	Primary care	Urgent care / walk-in centre	NHS 111/ NHS24	OOHS	999/ Ambulance	A&E/CAU	Pre-admission contacts with health services
P,FG1,M1	Not in the data	●						●	1
P,FG1,M2	4 days				●			●	3
P,FG2,M1	3 days		●				●	●	3
P,FG2,M2	24 hours		●					●	2
P,FG2,M3&F4	24 hours		●				●	●	3
P,FG2,M5&F6	< 24 hours						●	●	2
P,FG2,M7	3 days	●						●	1
P,FG3,M1	24 hours				●		●	●	3
P,FG3,M2	2 weeks +		●					●	2
P,FG3,M3	2 weeks +		●	●				●	3
P,FGT,M1	2 days					●		● ●	3
P,FGT,M2	12 hours				●	●	●	●	4
P,FGT,M3	12 hours	●	●					●	2
P,FGT,M4	<24 hours			●	●				2
P,FGE,M1	6 days		● ●		● ●	●		●	6
P,FGE,M2	<24 hours		●			●	●		3

323


324 The children’s trajectories were often complex, particularly when the child was ill for longer before

325 admission. Fig 4 presents an example of one child’s trajectory showing the timeline and the number

326 of health service contacts.

327 **Figure 4 One child’s trajectory from onset of illness to district general hospital admission**


328 2-4 year old living with both parents, no sibling, pneumonia



329 As in this child's case, children were likely to have been seen in primary care more than once and/or
 330 to have used emergency care and been sent home, only to present again at a later stage in the
 331 illness. Fig 5 shows the pathways of service use with thicker arrows for more common illness
 332 trajectories.

333

Figure 5 Pathways to hospital admission



334

335

336 The family and the health services: Context

337 The family is the immediate context and the starting point for a child's illness trajectory. Typically,
338 families were busy and reported juggling multiple work and family agendas (See Tables 5 and 6 for
339 characteristics of the families in the study). Parents' reports showed how the nature of family life
340 could delay help seeking especially if a parent was on their own with their child/children. Delays
341 encompassed, for example, waiting until the morning "*she was quite bad that night but I thought 'I'll*
342 *take her in the morning'*" (TH,P10,M) and juggling other commitments "*I had to get the other kids to*
343 *school'*" (P,FG1,M2) or diverting to pick up another child from childcare "*We took him straight to the*
344 *A&E, but half past six because my children were at evening classes so we picked them up on the way'*"
345 (TH,P12). Few parents reported seeking help/advice from people in their family and wider social
346 network instead managing the illness within the immediate family unit.

347 Health services were the other main component offering context for these children's illness
348 trajectories. Urgent and primary care services differed between geographical areas, providing the
349 landscape of services within which parents were making decisions about seeking help. The TH area
350 had six urgent care centres and one children's ED while the DGH area had one urgent care centre

351 and a children's area in a general ED. Urgent Care Centres varied, some were Walk-In centres, whilst
352 others require appointments to be booked through NHS111. These variable patterns of health
353 service provision were reflected in the patterns of health service use identified in our analysis of HES
354 data, with lower rates of ED attendance in areas provided with more urgent care centres. GPs, in the
355 focus groups, reported that practices in primary care have variable telephone triage and
356 appointment systems and, if the system is time ordered such as a sit and wait system, this may
357 generate significant delay before a child is seen and assessed.

358 This complexity of services led to confusion and a lack of consistent advice. Both parents and HPs
359 reported that they do not always know where to seek help for the level of illness. One HP (who was
360 also a parent) discussed the complexity of services:

361 *"I had a leaflet through. It was about 10 pages from the Local Authority and it was "Choose well"*
362 *and it was an 8 colour-coded scale and some examples of the different things you could do, from*
363 *going to see a pharmacist to calling 999 and I am thinking, "I'm a [health professional] consultant*
364 *and I'm confused!" (TH,HP,FG1).*

365 Typically, HPs reported that they thought this complexity was a result of risk averse health cultures
366 and algorithms that refer large numbers of children to hospital.

367 **Social expectations and social hierarchies: the antecedents.**

368 Two broad categories of antecedents were identified: social expectations and social hierarchies.

369 **Social expectations**

370 Parents report moral responsibilities to protect their child *and* use services only when necessary, by
371 doing the '*right thing*' (P,FG2,M3) for their child whilst also not misusing or overusing services "*I*
372 *didn't want to go to hospital and just trouble them for no reason"* (TH,P12). Of course, these twin
373 responsibilities are sometimes in conflict and can cause dilemmas when parents are unsure about

374 the severity of illness of their child and consequently, whether it warrants health service use, for
375 example:

376 *“So I still kick myself and say I should have just called an ambulance and took her there and then. I
377 feel so silly that I waited ‘til 4pm for the GP appointment”* (P,FG3,M2).

378 This mother’s decision making appears to have been shaped by her perception of the social rules for
379 service use as she was not aware that her child was seriously ill, illustrating the dilemma parents face
380 of needing to balance their child’s needs with conforming to social rules and expectations.

381

382 HPs differed from parents as they reported a moral responsibility to accurately assess and treat the
383 child whilst also controlling demand for services. One GP talked about the often higher demand
384 from first time parents and his strategy to reduce these parents’ demand in the future explaining
385 *“that’s how you educate them, knowing that if you give them 2 or 3 consultations this time, you are
386 likely to reduce the consultations in the long run”* (TH,HP,FG1).

387

388 **Social hierarchies**

389 Parents’ stories illustrated their perceived powerlessness when trying to seek help for their child,
390 illustrating a social hierarchy within which health professionals hold the power. This powerlessness
391 was seen in parents’ distress when they were unable to secure help for their child, for example:

392 *“I wasn’t listened to, I wasn’t listened to at all. It was not my son, that was not my son’s typical
393 behaviour; that was not what he normally looked like. It just wasn’t him, and there was something
394 wrong. It didn’t matter how much I tried to convey that”* (P,FG2,M2)

395 Power was evident in HPs’ accounts of managing demand and in gatekeeper roles. Professionals
396 hold privileged knowledge, on which parents rely, even in this era of the internet, while parents
397 reported that their expert knowledge of their child was ignored; one health professional also noted
398 that parental expertise could be ignored as explained below in Consequences.

399 **InfluenCing variables or Contingencies**

400 Degree of uncertainty, knowledge and experience, temporal factors, number of children presenting
401 to services and relational continuity were identified as influencing variables on the child's illness
402 trajectory from parents' decision making about seeking help to interactions between parents and
403 health professionals.

404 **Uncertainty**

405 Several forms of uncertainty were reported by parents: diagnostic, symptom, trajectory and
406 symbolic. Diagnostic uncertainty, not *being "sure what was wrong with her all the way, to be fair"*
407 (TH,P10,F), was frequently reported by parents and sometimes by HPs. Parents specifically reported
408 symptom uncertainty, not knowing what symptoms to expect or which ones indicate serious illness.

409 Trajectory uncertainty, not knowing the course of the illness, was implicit in parents and
410 professionals' accounts. One parent's account illustrated both HPs' uncertainty and, later in the
411 same interview, her own uncertainty about the likely trajectory of her daughter's illness:

412 *"..after about a third opinion [from doctors in ED] they decided that they weren't worried and that it*
413 *was viral and that she could come home but keep an eye on her"* (TH,P04,M).

414 And later in the same interview:

415 *"Because the doctor had already said she could get worse before she gets better but just watch for*
416 *her breathing. And she did get worse, a lot worse before getting any better, and then worse again*
417 *so it's knowing what's that cut-off before you think, 'Is this the turning point? Is this the peak of the*
418 *illness where she's going to be better tomorrow?"* (TH,P04,M).

419 Symbolic uncertainty (how behaviour will be viewed by others) was most often represented in
420 parents' accounts of worry about re-consulting such as *"I wanted a second opinion. Because I don't*
421 *want to do anything that's going to cause --- when I go to hospital and it's nothing"* (TH,P12, M).

422 Knowledge and experience

423 Parents' knowledge or lack of knowledge of their child's illness, experience of illness and of
424 interactions with health services, including learning about symptoms, "*we knew about the sucking in*
425 *at the ribs from times we had been [to GP]"* (DGH,P02), influenced their decision making. HPs also
426 reported that parents' experience of different health services abroad influenced where parents
427 sought help. For example one HP stated: "*a lot of Polish people tend to go to A&E instead of going to*
428 *the GP"* (TH,HP,FG2), as this is how they expect services to work from their knowledge of services in
429 their country of origin.

430 HPs' knowledge influenced their ability to identify signs of SII. Where HPs had little child specific
431 education, they relied on personal, often parenting, experience, such as "*My crew mate that I work*
432 *with full-time has got 4 children, so I just let her deal with it"* (TH,HP,FG1) or algorithms which did
433 not always address the specific situation, "*we don't really have pathways for babies"* (HP01-
434 NHS111).

435 Temporal factors

436 Time of day/week, family life and social events influenced where and when parents sought help.
437 Services are structured differently overnight and at the weekend, for example, some parents waited
438 until their doctor's surgery opened in the morning, and at weekends some were limited to phoning
439 NHS111/NHS24 or the 999 ambulance service. One father explained:

440 "*Well, we decided that we'd try and get him to the out-of-hours GP but you can't access - we wanted*
441 *to take him to the Urgent Care Centre at X but - we'd looked on the internet and you can't access*
442 *that until you've spoken to 111"* (DGH,P01,F).

443 Patterns of family life were another influence, for example, if one parent was at work or a social
444 event the other waited for their return before seeking help:

445 *"I didn't want to go to hospital and just trouble them for no reason. So I wanted a second opinion so*
446 *when my husband came back from work, my son was sleeping and I asked him, 'Look at our son and*
447 *what do you think?' He goes, 'I think we should take him straight to hospital'" (TH,P12,M).*

448 Parents' working patterns were perceived by HPs to be responsible for predictable peaks in
449 presentations to emergency care.

450 **Number of children presenting to services**

451 All HP participants talked about the difficulties of the number of children presenting to services
452 (rarely framed as too few staff to meet the needs of the children). This high demand for services was
453 described as creating "noise" (TH,HP,FG1) making it hard to identify the few seriously ill children
454 amongst the increasingly large number of attendees. One ED doctor summed up the situation "we
455 *have made the haystack bigger. There is still only one needle but the haystack is enormous"*
456 (TH,HP,FG1). Another effect of this 'noise' was that it created an expected pattern that every child
457 has a minor illness and is "*just another one of them*" (HP09 Amb.tech) and unless symptoms
458 obviously indicate more serious illness professionals are likely to 'recognise' the pattern as one of
459 minor illness.

460 **Relational continuity**

461 Continuity of relationship between the family and their GP or primary care Nurse Practitioner was
462 reported to help HPs recognise differences from the child's normal:

463 *"I took her down to our local GP and they agreed with me, because they've seen E a few times, that*
464 *she wasn't herself"* (TH,P04).

465 However, limited continuity meant that HPs had no pictorial memory of the child or of their usual
466 health status. Consequently, professionals were reliant on access to records of past consultations
467 and the parent's accounts of their child's illness. GPs reported that managing 'demand' has reduced

468 relational continuity noting that relational continuity *“is important but it is very difficult, especially*
469 *working GPs now”* (DGH,HPFG,GP). This was justified with reference to the value of *“fresh eyes on*
470 *the problem”* (DGH,HPFG,GP). This GP identified a possible benefit to not having seen the child
471 before.

472 **Consequences**

473 **Powerlessness and loss of control**


474 Parents experience a loss of control of their child’s health before they seek help: *“I’m the Mum, I*
475 *should be able to make my child better, but I couldn’t”* (P,FG3,M1) and sometimes during help
476 seeking when it was *“just nerve wracking because I felt like I could see a decline in my son and I*
477 *didn’t want to phone [NHS 111] back because I didn’t want to tie up the phone line.’* (P,FG1,M2) in
478 case NHS 111 or a doctor called back while she was on phone. Unequal power between parents and
479 HPs increased parents’ powerlessness and their struggle to be heard. One of the five ED doctors in
480 the study explained that *“I don’t think you should necessarily be influenced that much by what they*
481 *[parents] say”* (TH,HP,FG2-ED Doctor). Some parents thought their difficulties in being heard were
482 related to being labelled as *“panicky first-time parents”* (DGH,P01), or to difficulties describing
483 symptoms.

484 Parents reported having to provide incontrovertible evidence of their child’s symptoms, in order to
485 feel ‘heard’ by professionals. One parent explained *“my son had another bad episode of coughing*
486 *and choking unable to breath and when one of the senior nurses saw him, she panicked and called*
487 *for help and rushed him into a room.....”* (TH,P05), before their concerns were taken seriously, after
488 which *“they then watched him closely”* (TH,P05). An example of a trajectory, illustrating these
489 difficulties, is presented in Fig 6.

490

491 **Figure 6 One child's trajectory from onset of illness to teaching hospital admission**

492 **Under 6 months in a family with four other children, RSV bronchiolitis and influenza A**



493

494 Another family, seeking help by phone, resorted to holding the phone to their child so that the call
495 handler could hear the sounds the parents were trying to describe, noting, "it's like, 'is she making a
496 noise?' 'Yes, she's doing this' [I] Put them on speaker" (TH,P22). One mother took photographs of her
497 son while they were waiting in the emergency department so that she could show how he had
498 changed during the time they were waiting in the department:

499 "I'd be taking pictures because I kept noticing new things. And I said to them, 'Look, this is what he
500 looked like at 8 o'clock when we came in, and this is him now.' And they were like - yes okay, he's

501 *looking a little bit peaky; we'll keep you in. Perhaps he just needs some fluids. So that's when they'd*
502 *taken us to the ward, but that had been a fight already"* (P,FG1,M2).

503 Desperation was evident in the accounts of parents whose concerns were not addressed:

504 *"There were no paediatric staff around so the first nurse we saw said, 'Why have you come here*
505 *today? What's wrong?' I said, 'Just look at her'. I wanted to scream, 'Look at her'. So she was*
506 *brought straight in to the examination. It was a Junior Doctor and he was looking at her and saying,*
507 *'So what's the problem?' We were like, 'Well she's lethargic, she hasn't eaten and drunk, this is her*
508 *third lot of antibiotics, she's not making any vocal noises, she's staring'. My husband said, 'Maybe*
509 *she's just tired', and I looked at him. The Doctor was like, 'Yes, maybe she's just a bit tired, maybe she*
510 *just needs rest'. At this stage I was ready to scream the place down"* (P,FG3,M2).

511 **Perceived criticism and delayed help seeking**

512 Parents who had experienced criticism for using services early in their child's illness, delayed seeking
513 help to avoid further criticism from those professionals perceived to be in positions of power. This
514 parental dyad (DGH,P01) shared their experiences of criticism and how it has affected later decision
515 making:

516 *Father: I think we were trying to avoid going to A&E because we'd had a negative experience before*
517 *where we'd taken him to hospital. you took him down to ED but the nurse said basically there's*
518 *nothing wrong with him, you've wasted our time and -*

519 *Mother: She [the ED Nurse] said that A&E is emergency only and it's not just to be used really. And it*
520 *just made me feel really rubbish and I just - I didn't want to say, I didn't - maybe I should have but I*
521 *didn't say, 'I'm a nurse and I wouldn't have brought him in if I wasn't concerned'.*

522 *But she was very dismissive. And even as a nurse myself it did make me feel like this. I felt really*
523 *stupid almost and she was just really dismissive.... it put me off.*

524 Experiences of criticism appeared to reduce parents' self-efficacy with parents reporting that it
525 made them doubt their ability to assess their child as they *"don't know what's right any more"*
526 (THP27) adding to uncertainty and loss of control. Parents' reluctance to re-consult was also
527 influenced by HP's reassurance that nothing was seriously wrong with their child, for example,
528 *"being sent back home by the GP made us think we are supposed to deem this normal"* (TH,P05).

529 A sense of courage was evident in accounts from parents who persisted in raising concerns
530 underpinned by their fear for their child's life, often in the face of criticism and disbelief. Sometimes
531 it took a deterioration in their child's condition to legitimise their concerns. Persisting in this way
532 was reported to be an added stressor on top of their worries about their child.

533 *"You feel like you are gearing up for battle every time. If you've got an issue with something it's like*
534 *the gloves have to come out and you have to be like, 'I'm going to fight', and that's the only way that*
535 *you seem to get anywhere with anything"* (P,FG1,M2).

536 Courageousness was also present in HPs' accounts when they acted as advocates for a child in the
537 face of criticism from colleagues for example ambulance staff not wanting to be criticised for taking
538 non-urgent cases to hospital. This fear of criticism clearly illustrates the power of social hierarchies.
539 In our data these social hierarchies affected not only the parents but also HPs in a lower hierarchical
540 position.

541 **'Layers of risk' and risk management**

542 In primary care, GPs referred to *"layers of risk"* (TH,HP,FG1,GP) inherent within each step of the
543 primary care system. These steps encompassed the time *"from the parent calling or not calling, or*
544 *calling too late, to receptionists passing information immediately or too late or putting it down as a*
545 *routine call to the clinician"* (TH,HP,FG1,GP) to the consultation itself. All these steps could
546 contribute to delay in access to medical assessment. HPs felt that managing these layers of risk via

547 risk averse organisational systems (for example NHS111 algorithms) had increased the burden on
548 services.

549 *“It’s well recognised that, for children, 111 is a flawed system. It was designed to be a system that*
550 *was safe and it delivers on that, by definition of bringing everybody to a health care provider it’s*
551 *safe”* (TH,HP,FG2,Amb.tech).

552 HPs reported managing the risks inherent in uncertain illness trajectories by providing safety-netting
553 advice to families in the form of information concerning what to look out for and when to re-consult,
554 sometimes in printed form but more often verbal advice. Parents sometimes referred to being given
555 disease specific information but most often recalled safety netting advice as *“if she gets worse bring*
556 *her back”* (P,FG2,M1), but questioning *“what is ‘worse’?”* (P,FG2,M3); this added to uncertainty and,
557 despite the best intentions of safety netting practices, not reducing the risk of missing serious illness.

558 Discussion

559 We set out to retrospectively identify organizational and environmental factors and individual child,
560 family and professional factors affecting timing of admission to hospital for children under 5 years of
561 age with SII. Understanding factors in children’s journeys to hospital which contribute to avoidable
562 deaths is now (in 2020/21) even more important given the constraints on families and health
563 services during the Covid-19 pandemic. Using a modified grounded theory approach generated the
564 emergent explanatory theory presented above. The core category ‘navigating uncertain illness
565 trajectories’ is the psychosocial process, essential to Glaserian grounded theory (8, 10), to which all
566 the other categories relate. Navigating is defined as ‘finding one’s way through, along, over or
567 across something’ (15).

568 Pervading our findings were the social structures, social hierarchies and social expectations, which
569 shaped an individuals’ behaviour. These social structures appear to have a more powerful impact on

570 children's illness trajectories from falling ill at home to being admitted to hospital for treatment than
571 any individual characteristic. Children who were ill for longer before being hospitalised were likely to
572 have more complex trajectories. Social hierarchies and social expectations are the social antecedents
573 that pre-exist in society and consequently shape these uncertain illness trajectories.

574 Social hierarchies present a social structure within which people have more or less power depending
575 on their perceived social value in a given setting (16). The power imbalance between professionals in
576 different hierarchical positions is well known (17) as is the powerlessness of parents in the parent-
577 health professional relationship (18). The unequal power created by these social hierarchies was
578 evident in parents and HPs' accounts of their interactions in this, and prior, research in this area (19),
579 making it difficult for parents to raise concerns about their child.

580 Social expectations are the written and unwritten rules of social life that we learn from our social
581 interactions and that inform how we perceive we are expected to behave (20-22), consequently
582 influencing parents' decision making about when to seek help. Social expectations are often
583 considered to be the moral rules for everyday life. Acting outside of these moral rules requires
584 courage as illustrated in parents' accounts of persisting in raising concerns, because perceived
585 transgression may result in those actions being criticised (23). Such criticism was reported to delay
586 help seeking to avoid further criticism from those in positions of power (24-30). Parents want to
587 manage the impression they make on others as morally good parents and as good citizens who use
588 services appropriately, reflecting prior research (13, 24, 26, 29-31).

589 Parents and HPs' moral frameworks differ (32), as seen in our findings where parents are trying to do
590 the right thing for their child and use services in accordance with social expectations and HPs are
591 focussed on accurately assessing and treating the child whilst also controlling demand for services.
592 Balancing the child's needs with conforming to expectations concerning service use reflects earlier
593 research (33). However, social rules are often unclear and mixed/conflicting messages occur,
594 creating uncertainty for parents and sometimes for professionals.

595 Influencing factors identified in our findings include these uncertainties which led either to parents'
596 repeated help seeking or to delay in seeking help. Previous parental research identified all the forms
597 of uncertainty identified here (34-36). Uncertainty led HPs to provide safety netting advice, originally
598 conceived, as also reported here, as a way to manage the clinical risk associated with uncertainties
599 around the diagnosis or anticipated illness trajectory (37). However, this safety netting advice has
600 been found to be very variable in content and delivery (38). Parents reported that the mode of
601 delivery was usually verbal, although it is known that up to 80% of verbal information is not retained
602 (39). While some parents reported being given precise information about symptoms, such as
603 "*sucking in at the ribs*", others reported simply being told to come back if "*it gets worse*" or "*if you*
604 *are worried*" – neither instruction was sufficiently detailed to enable parents to know when was
605 worse enough or how much more worried they needed to be (given that they were already worried
606 enough to seek help). Knowledge and experience influenced parents' decision making as seen in
607 other research (13, 19, 33). Research has found that safety netting information needs to provide
608 information on how to assess the severity of symptoms for all the child's symptoms, supported by
609 information on how to care for the child and in written or recorded format (28, 40, 41). Temporal
610 factors were also identified as influencing children's trajectories, previously described as socio-
611 temporal factors (30) or timing-related factors (13), reflecting the interrelationships between time
612 and the social environment of family life, working patterns and variation in how services were
613 provided. The high demand for services reported was perceived to create an expected pattern that
614 every child has a minor illness, increasing the likelihood that HPs will 'recognise' the pattern as one
615 of minor illness. This is a form of recognition primed decision making (42) which has been described
616 in general practice as a rapid intuitive system (43).

617 Organisational and environmental factors were also identified, ranging from parents' difficulties
618 securing an appointment, to transport and proximity to services, reflecting other research (13, 25,
619 44-46). Services were complex, fragmented and inconsistent in provision from place to place and
620 over time. HPs reported that they thought this complexity was a result of risk averse health service

621 cultures and algorithms that refer large numbers of children to hospital. Demand for services in
622 primary care was reported to reduce relational continuity, which has been associated with a greater
623 risk of emergency department use and hospitalization in children (47). A 2016 Royal College of
624 General Practice report states that '*Patients who receive continuity of care in general practice have*
625 *better health outcomes, higher satisfaction rates and the healthcare they receive is more cost*
626 *effective*' whilst also reporting an increasing number of patients being unable to see their preferred
627 GP (48).

628 Delay in accessing treatment for serious infectious illness has been associated with worse outcomes
629 (49-51) and although the numbers of children involved in this study are too small to demonstrate
630 such an association, the emergent theory does identify how such delays in accessing treatment
631 happen, providing directions for future service developments and research.

632 **Strengths and limitations**

633 This is the first study in the UK, to our knowledge, to take a 360 degree approach (which included
634 parents and professionals) to exploring the child's pre-hospital illness trajectory from becoming ill at
635 home to being admitted to hospital with a serious infectious illness. The use of a modified grounded
636 theory approach enabled the research team to generate an explanatory theory which integrates
637 findings from across a diverse sample representing a range of different children's trajectories and of
638 health professionals and services. The resulting theory has identified key factors which influence the
639 timing of children's access to treatment for SII.

640 Unfortunately, it was not possible to make comparisons between the trajectories of children
641 accessing the TH with those accessing the DGH in the study as so few families were recruited from
642 the DGH site. This was unsurprising as the ambulance and HES data both showed much less activity
643 at the DGH compared to the TH. Far fewer children were admitted to HDU at the DGH site during the
644 recruitment period than expected. In addition, recruitment of first contact health professionals to

645 focus groups working in the area around the DGH was also low. As a result, comparisons could not
646 be made between parents and/or health professionals' experiences.

647 We originally intended that all participants would be recruited from the two identified study sites so
648 that comparisons could be drawn between the children's illness trajectories and the landscape of
649 local services. Although we did recruit from our two study sites for Stage 1, in Stage 2 we were
650 unable to recruit sufficient parents in these areas, instead recruiting nationally through our charity
651 partners.

652 The intention of Stage 1 was to gather data from parents of children who had recently been
653 hospitalised for a SII and from the health professionals involved in their care. However, the time
654 delays involved made it challenging to gather data whilst events were still fresh in the HPs minds. No
655 GPs were willing to take part in Stage 1. Fortunately, we were aware that some HPs might not want
656 to discuss individual cases and had built in Stage 2 focus groups within which HPs were happy to
657 discuss the experiences of caring for children with SII in general.

658 Choosing to take a 360 degree approach, exploring the whole of the child's pre-admission illness
659 trajectory, meant that we were conducting research across multiple organisational boundaries
660 within the NHS. Children's illness trajectories brought them into contact with six different services in
661 two different counties. Access to these services needed to be negotiated separately. In addition, we
662 worked with four charities and one parent support group. One of the strengths of this project is that
663 the steering group reflected this complexity and we worked together to solve the issues, pooling our
664 knowledge and expertise to keep the project on track.

665 **Conclusions**

666 The children's illness trajectories were often complex, particularly when a child was ill for more than
667 48 hours prior to admission. Most parents reported accessing, or trying to access, primary care early
668 in their child's illness trajectory. Missed opportunities for earlier treatment were identified between

669 these early primary care consultations and the development of severe illness. In this period of
670 uncertainty, parents and professionals described difficulties in recognising signs of serious illness.
671 Parents reported being uncertain of what symptoms to look out for as signs of deterioration and,
672 consequently, when to seek help, relying instead on significant change from their child's normal
673 before seeking help again. Medical staff sometimes reported finding it difficult to identify the
674 seriously ill child; this was made more difficult as the lack of relational continuity impedes
675 recognition of the degree of difference from normal.

676 Once parents present with their child to secondary care, they experience difficulties in
677 communicating their concerns to HPs and in being heard against a background of high levels of
678 demand in a hierarchical system where professionals hold all the power. Unequal power is also
679 reflected in parents' reported experiences of criticism at *every* stage of the trajectory, which they
680 tried to avoid by delaying seeking help until their child's illness could not be disputed.

681 The overriding message from HPs concerned the impact of high levels of demand for children with
682 low levels of illness. This demand, they thought, had increased as a direct result of overloaded
683 primary care, complexity of services, a risk-averse culture and health systems such as NHS111 which
684 have "*increased the size of the haystack*" making it difficult to identify the few children with serious
685 illness.

686 Most of the children in this study fell, at least in part, through the NHS safety-net, despite the risk
687 averse culture of services. In fact, this very risk averse system has created so much demand that it
688 makes it harder for professionals to identify the more seriously ill children from amongst the rest.
689 Although admonishments to use services appropriately do not appear to have reduced the overall
690 demand for services, such messages have resulted in increased parental uncertainty and anxiety
691 about re-consultation and consequently delaying seeking help until their child was very obviously
692 sufficiently seriously ill to validate re-presenting for care.

693 This mixed-methods project is the theory development stage required before a complex
694 interventions study (52-54), to reduce modifiable factors that impact on children's journeys from
695 becoming ill to hospital admission with SII, can be designed. The findings presented here indicate the
696 need for interventions to increase parents and professionals' ability to recognise signs of serious
697 illness, improve communication between parents and professionals in consultations and improve
698 relational continuity. The findings also indicate a need for system level changes to safely reduce risk
699 averse systems which increase demand for urgent and emergency care services at low levels of
700 illness.

701 **Acknowledgements**

702 The project team would like to thank all our participants, especially the parents who shared their
703 experiences with us, Kim Woodbridge-Dodd for her work as the researcher on the project prior to
704 her retirement, our Charity partners: Meningitis Now, Meningitis Research Foundation, UK Sepsis
705 Trust, Encephalitis UK, all the organisations who facilitated recruitment (including Mother's Instinct,
706 NHS 111 providers DHU, East Midlands Ambulance Service) and Dr Amardeep Heer for initially
707 hosting the project and for providing primary care advice.

708 **Funding**

709 This paper presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research
710 (NIHR) under its Research for Patient Benefit (RfPB) Programme (Grant Reference Number PB-PG-
711 0416-20011). The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR
712 or the Department of Health and Social Care.

713 **Data Sharing**

714 Due to the sensitive nature of the research, we are unable to share the entire data set for the study
715 and we do not have consent from parent participants to do so. Data extracts included in the paper

716 were carefully chosen to preserve participants anonymity and to conform with the participants
717 consent.

718 **References**

- 719 1. Ferreras-Antolín L, Oligbu G, Okike IO, Ladhani S. Infection is associated with one in five
720 childhood deaths in England and Wales: analysis of national death registrations data, 2013–15.
721 Archives of Disease in Childhood. 2020;105(9):857-63.
- 722 2. Wolfe I, Macfarlane A, Donkin A, Marmot M, Viner RM. Why children die: death in infants,
723 children and young people in the UK Part A. London: Royal College Of Paediatrics and Child Health,
724 National Children’s Bureau & British Association for Child and Adolescent Public Health; 2014.
- 725 3. Department for Education. Statistical First Release. Child Death Reviews – Year ending
726 March 2016. London: Department for Education; 2016.
- 727 4. Community and Mental Health Team NHS Digital. Child death reviews: year ending 31 March
728 2019. Analysis from the Local Safeguarding Children Boards (LSCB1) Child Death Review Data
729 Collection. The Health and Social Care Information Centre, NHS Digital.; 2019 17th September 2019.
- 730 5. Gill PJ, Goldacre MJ, Mant D, Heneghan C, Thomson A, Seagroatt V, et al. Increase in
731 emergency admissions to hospital for children aged under 15 in England, 1999-2010: national
732 database analysis. Archives of Disease in Childhood. 2013;On line first(February 11, 2013).
- 733 6. Ruzangi J, Blair M, Cecil E, Greenfield G, Bottle A, Hargreaves DS, et al. Trends in healthcare
734 use in children aged less than 15 years: a population-based cohort study in England from 2007 to
735 2017. BMJ Open. 2020;10(5):e033761.
- 736 7. Gill S. Where do East Midlands’ Children and Young People get admitted and for what?
737 Paediatric Inpatients and Health Care Provider Destination in The East Midlands: 2011 to 2014. Draft
738 report. Knowledge and Intelligence Service, East Midlands in partnership with East Midlands Women
739 and Children’s Network,; 2015.

- 740 8. Glaser B. Theoretical Sensitivity. *Advances in the Methodology of Grounded Theory*. Mill
741 Valley, California: Sociology Press; 1978.
- 742 9. Glaser B, Strauss A. *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*.
743 New York: Aldine De Gruyter. ISBN 0-202-30260-1; 1967.
- 744 10. Glaser B. *Emergence vs Forcing. Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley, California:
745 Sociology Press; 1992.
- 746 11. Glaser B. *The Grounded Theory Perspective: Conceptualization Constrasted with*
747 *Description*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press; 2001.
- 748 12. Glaser B. *Doing Grounded Theory: Issues and Discussions*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press;
749 1998.
- 750 13. Carter B, Roland D, Bray L, Harris J, Pandey P, Fox J, et al. A systematic review of the
751 organizational, environmental, professional and child and family factors influencing the timing of
752 admission to hospital for children with serious infectious illness. *PLOS ONE*. 2020;15(7):e0236013.
- 753 14. Morse JM. "Data Were Saturated . . . ". *Qualitative Health Research*. 2015;25(5):587-8.
- 754 15. Robinson M. *Chambers 21st Century Dictionary*. Edinburgh: Chambers; 1996.
- 755 16. Magee JC, Galinsky AD. *Social Hierarchy: The Self-Reinforcing Nature of Power and Status*.
756 *Academy of Management Annals*. 2008;2(1):351-98.
- 757 17. Crowe S, Clarke N, Brugha R. 'You do not cross them': Hierarchy and emotion in doctors'
758 narratives of power relations in specialist training. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2017;186:70-7.
- 759 18. Aarthun A, Akerjordet K. Parent participation in decision-making in health-care services for
760 children: an integrative review. *Journal of Nursing Management*. 2014;22(2):177-91.
- 761 19. Neill SJ, Coyne I. The Role of Felt or Enacted Criticism in Parents' Decision Making in Differing
762 Contexts and Communities: Toward a Formal Grounded Theory. *Journal of Family Nursing*. 2018.
- 763 20. Denzin NK. Rules of conduct and the study of deviant behavior: Some notes on the social
764 relationship. In: McCall GJ, McCall MM, Denzin NK, Suttles GD, Kurth SB, editors. *Social*
765 *Relationships*. Chicago. Aldine Publishing 1970.

- 766 21. Goffman E. The Nature of Deference and Demeanor. In: Goffman E, editor. Interaction Ritual
767 Essays on Face to Face Behaviour. Harmondsworth: Penguin; 1972a.
- 768 22. Stokes T, Dixon-Woods M, Williams S. Breaking the ceremonial order: patients' and doctors'
769 accounts of removal from a general practitioner's list. *Sociology of Health & Illness*. 2006;28(5):611-
770 36.
- 771 23. Goffman E. Interaction Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour. Harmondsworth: Penguin;
772 1972.
- 773 24. Hugenholtz M, Bröer C, van Daalen R. Apprehensive parents: a qualitative study of parents
774 seeking immediate primary care for their children. *British Journal of General Practice*.
775 2009;59(560):173-9.
- 776 25. Francis N, Crocker J, Gamper A, Brookes-Howell L, Powell C, Butler C. Missed opportunities
777 for earlier treatment? A qualitative interview study with parents of children admitted to hospital
778 with serious respiratory tract infections. *Arch Dis Child*. 2011;96(2):154 - 9.
- 779 26. Ingram J, Cabral C, Hay A, Lucas P, Horwood J, team T. Parents' information needs, self-
780 efficacy and influences on consulting for childhood respiratory tract infections: a qualitative study.
781 *BMC Family Practice*. 2013;14(1):106.
- 782 27. Neill S, Cowley S, Williams C. The role of felt or enacted criticism in understanding parent's
783 help seeking in acute childhood illness at home: A grounded theory study. *International journal of*
784 *nursing studies*. 2013;50(6):757-67.
- 785 28. Jones C, Neill S, Lakhanpaul M, Roland D, Singlehurst-Mooney H, Thompson M. Information
786 needs of parents for acute childhood illness: determining 'what, how, where and when' of safety
787 netting using a qualitative exploration with parents and clinicians. *BMJ Open*. 2014;4(1).
- 788 29. Jones CHD, Ward A, Hodkinson PW, Reid SJ, Wallis LA, Harrison S, et al. Caregivers'
789 Experiences of Pathways to Care for Seriously Ill Children in Cape Town, South Africa: A Qualitative
790 Investigation. *PLoS ONE*. 2016;11(3):e0151606.

- 791 30. Turnbull J, Pope C, Prichard J, McKenna G, Rogers A. A conceptual model of urgent care
792 sense-making and help-seeking: a qualitative interview study of urgent care users in England. *BMC*
793 *Health Services Research*. 2019;19(1):e481.
- 794 31. Neill S, Jones C, Lakhanpaul M, Roland D, Thompson M. Parents' help-seeking behaviours
795 during acute childhood illness at home: A contribution to explanatory theory. *Journal of Child Health*
796 *Care*. 2016;20:77-86.
- 797 32. Ehrich K. Reconceptualizing 'inappropriateness': researching multiple moral positions in
798 demand for primary healthcare. *Health: An Interdisciplinary Journal for the Social Study of Health,*
799 *Illness and Medicine*. 2003;7(1):109-26.
- 800 33. Neill S. Containing acute childhood illness within family life: a substantive grounded theory.
801 *Journal of Child Health Care*. 2010;14(4):327-44.
- 802 34. Stewart JL, Mishel MH. Uncertainty in Childhood Illness: A Synthesis of the Parent and Child
803 Literature. *Scholarly Inquiry for Nursing Practice*. 2000;14(4):299-319.
- 804 35. Neill S. Family Management of Acute Childhood Illness at Home: A Grounded Theory Study
805 [Doctoral]. London: King's College London; 2008.
- 806 36. Ueki S, Takao K, Komai K, Fujiwara C, Ohashi K. Maternal Uncertainty about Infants'
807 Hospitalization for Acute Childhood Illness: A Qualitative Study. *Open Journal of Nursing*.
808 2017;7(6):645-56.
- 809 37. Almond S, Mant D, Thompson M. Diagnostic safety-netting. *British Journal of General*
810 *Practice*. 2009;59(Nov):872-4.
- 811 38. Jones C, Neill S, Lakhanpaul M, Roland D, Singlehurst-Mooney H, Thompson M. The safety
812 netting behaviour of first contact clinicians: a qualitative study. *BMC Family Practice*. 2013;14(1):140.
- 813 39. Sandberg EH, Sharma R, Sandberg WS. Deficits in Retention for Verbally Presented Medical
814 Information. *Anesthesiology*. 2012;117(4):772-9 [10.1097/ALN.0b013e31826a4b02](https://doi.org/10.1097/ALN.0b013e31826a4b02).

- 815 40. Neill S, Jones C, Lakhanpaul M, Roland D, Thompson M, the ASK SNIFF research team.
816 Parent's information seeking in acute childhood illness: what helps and what hinders decision
817 making? *Health Expectations*. 2014:Online first October 20, 2014.
- 818 41. Neill S, Roland D, Jones C, Thompson M, Lakhanpaul M. Information resources to aid
819 parental decision-making on when to seek medical care for their acutely sick child: a narrative
820 systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(12):DOI 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008280.
- 821 42. Klein G. Naturalistic Decision Making. *Human Factors*. 2008;50(3):456-60.
- 822 43. Balla JI, Heneghan C, Glasziou P, Thompson M, Balla ME. A model for reflection for good
823 clinical practice. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice*. 2009;15(6):964-9.
- 824 44. Young N. The pre-hospital experiences of Samoan families who have had a child admitted to
825 hospital with pneumonia: a qualitative investigation. *Pacific Health Dialog*. 2001;8(1):20-8.
- 826 45. Crocker JC, Evans MR, Powell CVE, Hood K, Butler CC. Why some children hospitalized for
827 pneumonia do not consult with a general practitioner before the day of hospitalization. *European*
828 *Journal of General Practice*. 2013;19(4):213-20.
- 829 46. Hodkinson P, Argent A, Wallis L, Reid S, Perera R, Harrison S, et al. Pathways to Care for
830 Critically Ill or Injured Children: A Cohort Study from First Presentation to Healthcare Services
831 through to Admission to Intensive Care or Death. *PLoS ONE*. 2016;11(1):e0145473.
- 832 47. Christakis DA, Mell L, Koepsell TD, Zimmerman FJ, Connell FA. Association of Lower
833 Continuity of Care With Greater Risk of Emergency Department Use and Hospitalization in Children.
834 *Pediatrics*. 2001;107(3):524-9.
- 835 48. Baker M, Jeffers H. Continuity of care in modern day general practice. *Royal College of*
836 *General Practitioners*; 2016.
- 837 49. Nadel S, Britto J, Booy R, Maconochie I, Habibi P, Levin M. Avoidable deficiencies in the
838 delivery of health care to children with meningococcal disease. *Journal of accident & emergency*
839 *medicine*. 1998;15(5):298-303.

- 840 50. McIntyre PB, MacIntyre CR, Gilmour R, Wang H. A population based study of the impact of
841 corticosteroid therapy and delayed diagnosis on the outcome of childhood pneumococcal
842 meningitis. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2005;90(4):391-6.
- 843 51. Okike IO, Ladhani SN, Anthony M, Ninis N, Heath PT. Assessment of healthcare delivery in
844 the early management of bacterial meningitis in UK young infants: an observational study. *BMJ*
845 *Open*. 2017;7(8):e015700.
- 846 52. Medical Research Council (MRC). *A Framework for Development and Evaluation of RCTs for*
847 *Complex Interventions to Improve Health*. London: Medical Research Council; 2000.
- 848 53. Medical Research Council (MRC). *Developing and evaluating complex interventions: new*
849 *guidance*. London: Medical Research Council; 2008.
- 850 54. O'Cathain A, Croot L, Duncan E, Rousseau N, Sworn K, Turner KM, et al. Guidance on how to
851 develop complex interventions to improve health and healthcare. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(8):e029954.
- 852