Fathers' and Mothers' Support Needs and Support Experiences after Rapid Genome Sequencing

Authors

Helen Dolling[1 2 3], Sophie Rowitch[1], Malachy Bromham[1], Stephanie Archer[2 4], Sara O'Curry[5 6], David H. Rowitch[3 5], F. Lucy Raymond[5 8], Claire Hughes[1 2], Kate Baker[5 7 8 9]

Affiliations

1. Centre for Child, Adolescent, and Family Research, University of Cambridge, UK.
2. Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge, UK.
3. Department of Paediatrics, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK.
4. Department of Public Health & Primary Care, University of Cambridge, UK.
5. Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK
6. Paediatric Psychological Medicine Services, Cambridgeshire and Peterborough NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, UK.
7. MRC Cognition & Brain Sciences Unit, University of Cambridge, UK.
8. Department of Genomic Medicine, University of Cambridge, UK.
9. Department of Pathology, University of Cambridge, UK.

Corresponding author

Helen Dolling

Centre for Child, Adolescent, and Family Research,

Department of Psychology, University of Cambridge,

Free School Lane,

Cambridge, CB2 3RQ, UK

E: hd300@cam.ac.uk

M: +44 (0)7779747516

ABSTRACT

As early rapid genomic sequencing (rGS) is adopted in paediatric medicine, there is an urgency to understand and address family support needs. This mixed methods study (*Peregrin**) examined the experiences of mothers and fathers, 1–5 years after receiving trio rGS results for their child with a severe early-onset condition. Quantitative measures assessed parental well-being, life satisfaction, and family impact, comparing results to non-clinical population data, between mothers and fathers, and according to child's diagnostic outcome. Semi-structured interviews explored parents' satisfaction with support, engagement with support networks, and unmet needs. Mothers exhibited elevated anxiety and depression relative to population norms, and there was a lack of strong correlation in well-being metrics within couples. Parents of children with a genomic diagnosis reported poorer well-being, explained by greater medical complexity. Insufficient support was more frequently reported by those whose child had received a genomic diagnosis (36%) compared to those without (6%). Families drew on a range of formal and informal support sources, including condition-specific groups, though these were accessed by a minority of fathers. These findings highlight persistent and evolving support needs in families affected by complex childhood health conditions, which persist after rGS. Parents' support needs are highly individual, vary over time and across children's illness trajectory. There remain important gaps between parental needs and support, impacting on family well-being.

Keywords: NICU, PICU, rapid genome sequencing; support; parental psychosocial outcomes

INTRODUCTION

Genomic testing is becoming more frequently available, with potential for rapid turnaround times from symptom onset to diagnosis. With technological advancements and cost reduction, more families are receiving diagnoses of rare or ultra-rare conditions early in their child's life (1). Many of these conditions can be life-threatening or life-limiting, and while early genomic testing and diagnosis can have important clinical and personal benefits (2,3), diagnosis can also cause anxiety, distress, uncertainty and upheaval in the family (4,5)**.** Detailed studies of parental supportive care needs in the context of paediatric rare diseases remain scarce (6).

Having a child admitted to a neonatal or paediatric intensive care unit (NICU/PICU) with an unexpected severe illness can be a traumatic experience, with long-term implications for both children and parents (7,8). Studies exploring why some families adjust and adapt, while others struggle to maintain family functioning, have identified a range of risk and protective factors. These include problem-solving and coping styles, family relationships, socioeconomic status and resource availability (9,10). Caregiver well-being is also influenced by the complexity of a child's condition, cognitive-behavioural impacts and adaptive functioning (11–13).

Support is consistently identified as a protective factor for family adjustment and, as a modifiable factor, provides a natural focus for interventions to reduce parenting stress (14). Support is a multidimensional construct that includes emotional, informational and instrumental elements and encompasses both actual and perceived support (15). Adopting Cohen's widely used definition of support as "*a social network's provision of psychological and material resources intended to benefit an individual's ability to cope with stress*" (16), we applied a multi-layered approach that incorporated both functional (i.e. perceived

availability of support) and structural (i.e. extent, diversity and frequency of interactions) components.

As trio genomic testing becomes more common, it is important to understand the perspectives of caregivers regarding the need for and availability of support. The transition to parenthood, irrespective of a child's health, is often accompanied by reductions in parental relationship quality and mutual support (17,18). Parents also differ in their responses to childhood illness, with mothers reporting higher levels of anxiety, depression and stress symptoms than fathers (19,20). Previous research on stress, coping, and the role of support has raised questions about possible gender and cultural differences in values and norms (21,22). Disease rarity may also constrain the availability of support and amplify the psychosocial impact of childhood-onset rare disease on both parents (23).

To address these issues, the Peregrin* (Parental Experiences of Rapid Early Genomic Results in Infancy) study followed-up a cohort of mothers and fathers whose children had received rGS in the context of early-onset illness. The first study objective was to evaluate parents' psychosocial needs, using validated questionnaires. We compared parental well-being, life satisfaction and family impact with non-clinical population data, between mothers and fathers, and between diagnostic groups (presence or absence of a genomic diagnosis). The second study objective was to explore parents' support experiences through qualitative interviews, focusing on their perceptions and sources of support and parental attitudes to support groups. By integrating these objectives and approaches, unmet support needs can be identified, and recommendations can be drawn.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

This article reports a subset of data from the Peregrin* study, a follow-up with the parents of infants and children who had received rapid trio genome sequencing (rGS) within the Next Generation Children project (NGC) (24,25). Parents were eligible for the Peregrin* study if they had participated in NGC and they were a mother or father of (a) an infant (≤2 years at rGS) regardless of whether a genomic diagnosis had been received; or (b) a child (>2 years at rGS) with an early-onset condition who had received a genomic diagnosis. Parents whose child met the above criteria and had died at least 12 months previously were also eligible. Parents of children >2 years at rGS without a genomic diagnosis were excluded because the experiences of this group are represented within the existing literature on diagnostic odyssey (26,27).

Recruitment followed a cluster stratification approach (28), with the child's age as the stratification variable and Diagnosis/No Diagnosis as cluster boundaries (where 'Diagnosis' refers to genomic diagnosis and 'No Diagnosis' to clinical diagnosis). The study aimed to recruit 30 families per cluster to enable subgroup analyses and capture diverse experiences. Parents were contacted by the NIHR Bioresource via a personalized email and letter, followed by a phone call within two weeks. Invitations were sent in batches, prioritizing older children. Each participant received a £15 gift card upon study completion.

Questionnaire and interview measures

Parents completed questionnaires online via Qualtrics™. Supplementary Table 1 lists questionnaire measures, internal validity metrics and scoring information. Individual in-depth interviews were conducted via Zoom Video Communications (https://zoom.us/) with 91 parents by the primary researcher (H.D.) and recorded for transcription and analysis. A semi-

structured interview guide was applied to elicit information about support (Supplementary Table 2).

Questionnaire analyses

Statistical analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics (version 28.0). Where permitted by the scoring manual, we used mean imputation to estimate missing values. Where imputation was not appropriate, pairwise deletion was applied, indicated by the number of individuals included in each reported analysis. Distributions were explored for each variable, and parametric tests were appropriate.

Peregrin* group scores on outcome measures were compared with UK population norms (29,30). Where no UK cohort data had been published, other appropriate non-clinical samples were utilized (31,32). Effect sizes were calculated as the difference between the Peregrin* sample mean and the comparison sample mean, divided by the pooled standard deviation (33). Diagnosis and No Diagnosis sub-groups were compared using independent samples t-tests. To explore similarities and differences in mothers' and fathers' well-being, within-couple analyses were carried out. Pearson correlations were used to compute bivariate associations and paired-samples t-tests or chi-squared (McNemar's) were used to compare within-couple differences in means, for continuous and ordinal variables respectively. Bonferroni corrections were applied for multiple testing.

Interview Analyses

Interviews were transcribed verbatim and 68% were checked for accuracy by research assistants. Analyses were conducted in NVivo (Version 12) and in Microsoft Excel, using inductive and deductive content analysis (CA) (34,35), and framework analysis (FA) (36). Responses to support questions were coded line-by-line across all transcripts, using a codebook for support sources and levels, and a framework for support group use. Both were

developed from the existing literature and from inductively derived themes from the transcripts. Transcripts were double coded, and discrepancies resolved by consensus. All citations have been anonymized and lightly edited for clarity.

Support levels were categorized with four response options: "no support," "minimal," "sufficient," or "high level." Responses were dichotomized (none/minimal cf. sufficient/high) for comparison between Diagnosis/No Diagnosis and Fathers/Mothers. Broader responses were analysed thematically. Parental engagement with support groups was categorized based on overall use, current use, group type (e.g., condition-specific social media group, peer messaging group, rare disease charity) and perceived benefits and drawbacks. Single episodes of support group contact, independent online information-seeking, and unspecified support sources were excluded (37).

RESULTS

Cohort characteristics

Participants were 96 parents (32 couples; 32 parents participating alone), of 67 affected children representing 63 families (including 6 parents of 4 deceased children and 4 sibling pairs). 91 parents participated in an interview; 5 parents completed questionnaires only. Parental self-reported characteristics (gender, current age, ethnicity, marital status, education, employment, physical and mental health) are described in Supplementary Table 3. Fathers' (n = 37) mean age at interview was 41.0 years (*SD* = 5.6, range 31 - 53); mothers' (*n* = 56) mean age at interview was 38.7 years (*SD* = 5.4, range 29 – 55).

Time since trio rGS testing ranged from 1 to 5 years (mode 3) and 57% of the families had received a genomic diagnosis by the time of their participation in Peregrin* study. Children were aged between 2-15 years (mode 4) at the time of parent interviews (excluding 4 deceased children) and included 30 male and 33 female children. All children lived at

home, with a cohort mean of 2.14 (range 1-5) children per household. The children's clinical conditions and genetic diagnoses were heterogeneous and often rare or ultra-rare. The five most frequently affected body systems were nervous system (n=41), digestive and respiratory systems (n=35 each), cardiovascular system (n = 34) and growth (n = 27), i.e. many children had multi-system disorders. Children's Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQL) was significantly impaired relative to general population norms for overall impact, physical functioning and psychosocial functioning (Supplementary Table 4).

Questionnaire results – evaluating parents' needs

Family well-being and parents' mental health - comparison to general population norms

Table 1 compares the Peregrin* parents' well-being indices with UK population norms (or equivalent non-clinical samples). Significant differences were observed in the PedsQL™ Family Impact Module (PedsQL™ 2.0 FIM) total scale and parent HRQL subscales (emotional, social, cognitive functioning), communication, worry, and daily activities (33). However, no significant differences emerged for parents' physical functioning, family functioning total score, or family relationship scores. Life satisfaction scores remained within the average to high range, and did not differ from population norms (32,38). Table 2 reports the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS) (39) comparisons - mothers reported significantly higher levels of anxiety (d = -0.34) and depression (d = -0.28) compared to UK norms, while fathers did not.

Table 1. Family Well-Being: Comparison of Peregrin* Cohort to Population Norms

Scale	**Population Norms *M (SD)* N variable**	**Total Cohort *M (SD)* N variable**	**Difference**	**Effect Size**
Family Impact[1]	Non-clinical *N in italics*[a]	**FIM** N = 86	FIM	FIM
Total Impact	70.8 (14.5) *726*	61.7 (20.8)	9.1	0.60 ***
Parent HRQL	69.4 (15.5) *809*	64.5 (20.7)	4.9	0.30 *
Physical	64.9 (17.4) *901*	64.7 (22.3)	0.2	0.01

Emotional	67.6 (17.9) *897*	62.2 (23.9)	5.4	0.29 *
Social	74.4 (19.1) *896*	62.7 (26.2)	11.7	0.59 ***
Cognitive	73.5 (18.6) *871*	67.9 (22.1)	5.6	0.30 *
Communication	81.9 (17.7) *894*	57.4 (26.9)	24.5	1.31 ***
Worry	78.1 (20.1) *876*	50.6 (27.9)	27.5	1.32 ***
Family Functioning	65.5 (18.5) *870*	63.6 (25.3)	1.9	0.10
Daily Activities	63.2 (22.5) *901*	51.0 (27.9)	12.2	0.53 ***
Family Relationships	67.0 (19.4) *881*	71.2 (23.2)	-4.2	-0.21
Subjective Well-Being[2]	23.46 (6.86) [4]	SWLS N = 94 24.5 (6.4)	SWLS -1.04	SWLS -0.15

*** p < 0.0001; ** p <.001; * p < .05. Effect sizes are designated as small (d ~ 0.2), medium (d ~ 0.5), or large (d ~0.8 or more).

Note: Higher values equal better health-related quality of life, family functioning, and higher subjective wellbeing. FIM = Family Impact Module; HRQL = health-related quality of life; SWLS = Satisfaction with Life Scale. [1]Data from Medrano et al., 2013. [2]Data from Siedlecki et al., 2008.

[a] Ages 18-39 (*N* = 200) are reported to match the mean ages in the Peregrin* sample of 32.9 for mothers (range 29-55) and 35.7 for fathers (31-53); the mean and standard deviation for ages 40-59 are 22.37 (*7.29*) (*N* = 310).

Table 2. Parents' Mental Health: Comparison of Peregrin* Cohort to Population Norms

HADS	**UK Normative Data**[b]		**Peregrin*** ***N* = 94**		**Difference**		**Effect Size**	
	M (*SD*)		*M* (*SD*)					
Anxiety	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
	6.78 (4.23)	5.51 (4.04)	8.21 (4.33)	5.78 (4.26)	-1.43	-0.27	-0.34 *	-0.07
Depression	4.12 (3.78)	3.83 (3.74)	5.19 (4.17)	4.28 (3.23)	-1.07	-0.45	-0.28 *	-0.12

* p < .05

Note: Higher values equal increased anxiety and depression on HADS. HADS = Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Anxiety and Depression subscales (7 questions each) are scored from 0-21. Cronbach's α for Anxiety = 0.85, α for Depression = 0.82. Data are from Breeman et al., 2015.

[b] The UK Population Norms for age range 25-65: Anxiety, Female *N* = 3,491; Male *N* = 2,698. Depression, Female *N* = 3,503; Male *N* = 2,695.

Family well-being and parents' mental health – associations with diagnostic group

Parents in the Diagnosis group reported significantly higher total family impact and expressed more worry compared with the No Diagnosis group (Supplementary Tables 5 and 6). The two groups also differed significantly on Total Family Function, reflecting an impact on Daily Activities to a greater extent than on Family Relationships. There were no significant mean group differences in anxiety, depression, or life satisfaction.

Children in the Diagnosis group were reported to have significantly lower HRQL compared to the No Diagnosis group on the developmentally appropriate Paediatric Quality of Life Inventory (PedsQL™ V4.0 Generic Core Scales) (Total $t(84) = 5.12$, $p < .001$, one-sided), prompting us to re-examine well-being differences between parent groups (FIM total scores). *Post hoc* one-way analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) showed no significant difference between parent groups ($F_{1, 83} = 3.74$, $p = .057$) but a significant covariate effect for the child's PedsQL™ ($F_{1, 83} = 80.72$, $p <.001$). This indicates that differences in parents' psychosocial functioning may be explained by the complexity of children's conditions, rather than the presence or receipt of a genomic diagnosis per say.

Family well-being and parents' mental health – comparisons between fathers and mothers and associations within couples

Within-couple comparisons (Supplementary Table 7) confirmed that mothers reported significantly higher anxiety symptoms than fathers. Mothers did not report significantly higher depression levels, but did report more emotional difficulties on the FIM Emotional Functioning subscale. Mothers also reported greater worry regarding their child's medical treatments, side effects, social isolation and lack of understanding from others, broader family impact, and future. No significant differences between mothers and fathers emerged in Social Functioning or Communication about their child's health and family situation, though mothers exhibited greater variability in social functioning than fathers.

Bivariate analysis of maternal and paternal variables showed a moderate within-couple association for Worry (Supplementary Table 7), but not for parents' HRQL scores, mental health symptoms and total family impact scores. Instead, individual FIM scores correlated strongly with each parent's own HRQL ($r_{(30)}$ = .949, .960, p < .001 for mothers and fathers, respectively). These findings highlight the individual nature of physical and mental health, and appraisal of family impact, for each parent.

Interview results – understanding parents' support

Sources of Support

Participants defined support in their own terms (Table 3) and named varied sources of primary support. Figure 1 presents the five most prevalent sources, inspired by Gise et al. (40). In total, 19 categories of support were identified (Supplementary Figure 1). Parents with adequate support cited emotional, informational, instrumental, esteem, and companionate support from both formal sources (e.g., hospital staff, counsellors, GPs, schools, hospices) and informal networks (e.g., spouse, parents, friends, colleagues). Some parents relied on a few key sources or were self-sufficient, knowing where to seek help when needed.

Partners and family were similarly important to both mothers and fathers, while healthcare professionals were a more frequent support source for mothers than for fathers. Many parents reported a lack of emotional support from their extended family. In particular, grandparents were often perceived as either unable to understand their situation, emotionally distant, or in need of protection from distress. Some parents also lacked emotional support from their spouse/partner due to differing coping styles or fear of burdening an already overwhelmed partner.

For fathers, friends and the workplace were key sources of emotional and social support, providing opportunities for venting, distraction, and self-mastery. Some employers

offered flexible working arrangements, which helped to reduce stress related to childcare, medical appointments and financial pressures, while a few provided counselling services. In contrast, only 5.4% of mothers cited work as a source of support, possibly reflecting lower workforce participation (69.5% vs. 100%) and higher part-time employment rates (65.9% vs. 5.5%). Mothers valued friends and peer parents for emotional, informational, and practical support, though many lacked time or energy for socializing, and some lost friendships due to differing parenting experiences. For some, peers (parents of children with the same condition or other health conditions/disabilities) became new closest friends.

Comparing Diagnosis and No Diagnosis groups, the most common support sources were similar: partner/spouse (71% vs. 80%), family (71% vs. 80%), friends (45% vs. 51%), and healthcare professionals (43% vs. 23%). The fifth most common support type differed, with mental health support (18%) in the Diagnosis group and self-reliance (23%) in the No Diagnosis group.

Table 3. Summary of Key Qualitative Findings on Parental Perceptions of Support

Main findings	Illustrative quotes
Parents' and child's support needs and support provision changed over time	*"Uh, sufficient now, definitely. Like now I've got the 12 hours and now he's at school - the special school - yeah, I'll get a break."* [INT32, M*]* *"Yeah, I'd say it's sufficient support, only because at the moment it's all in medical terms."* [INT27, M] *"Well, at the minute there's no support, no. Well, in a sense we don't have any support from the system as such, or from managers, or from the doctors. There's no support in terms of the mental [health] support."* [INT15, F] *"I suppose we're just perhaps [at] a bit of a crossroads of what the… how the support that we've got around us… is it going to be adequate enough to get [affected son] to the next phase of his life? which is sort of going into secondary school and things like that. Yeah, I think there's always room to add more support."* [INT25, M]
Parents utilised a variety of sources of support	*"We know that we can contact the hospital if we need anything, and we'll get a response. We've got school that we can call on. We've got parents."* [INT8, M]

Parents' willingness, need, or capacity to seek or accept support differ – but parents expected support to be offered to all individuals regardless	*"I've got a high level of support. It's whether I ask for it is the big question."* [INT87, M] *"I find it very difficult having to be reliant on so many people. I really, really dislike it, like really dislike. I hate being dependent on other people, and I've never had to be, and I really hate it. I mean, I'm at the mercy of so many people!"* [INT62, M] *"I feel that I personally I'm a person I like to find out as much information as I can. So, I do a lot of reading […] At times it feels isolating and it's overwhelming […] And so, I think I've sought some solace in being able to reach out and get a hold of doctor [specialist in son's rare condition] and his team, they're very responsive via e-mail. […]and I feel going forward that that's going to be a really useful avenue to keep on with because I feel like those guys are [in] a better place to answer some of these difficult questions."* [INT28, M] *"I never was given information about the support groups, so I wouldn't even know where to start looking."* [INT77, M*]* *"What could make it better is to guide us as parents on the various steps, things that you should do: like the DLA, the EHCP, which is a jungle in itself. And in the beginning, even simple things like: how do you request prescription medication? We had no idea about anything."* [INT52, M]
Parenting a child with CMC was experienced as a lonely journey without "right" support	*"I think it was just about connecting with other families who have gone through similar things. I think at the time I was feeling a bit alone, like all my friends' children were healthy and yet hadn't… didn't know anyone who had a similar experience."* [INT83, M]
Getting or finding support was a "battle" for several families	*"It is down to us to do - to fight the fight, if you like. […] in terms of physiotherapy and medical research, there is minimal support."* [INT7, M]

Note: CMC = child(ren) with medical complexity; INT followed by a number = interviewee number; M = Mother, F = father.

Figure 1. Fathers' and mothers' five main sources of support.

Note: Abbreviations F = Father, M = Mother, HCP = Healthcare Professionals



Figure 2. Fathers' and Mothers' Five Main Sources of Support.

Note: Abbreviations F = Father, M = Mother, HCP = Healthcare Professionals

Level of Support

Most parents (74.7%) reported "sufficient" or "high" levels of support, while 25.3% reported "no" or "minimal" support (illustrative quotes, Supplementary Table 8). Parents of children with a genomic diagnosis were much more likely to report insufficient support (36%) compared to those without a genomic diagnosis (6%). The differences between fathers' (31%) and mothers' (21%) levels of support were small.

Parents reported "no" or "minimal" support when multiple support needs were unmet, their needs were acute, or available provisions failed to meet expectations. Several parents reported "battling" or "fighting" for certain kinds of support. When their specific support needs were unmet, parents were more likely to report experiencing parenting as a lonely journey. Key elements of insufficient support included: (i) Lack of practical home-based support, often due to distant or elderly family members, or lack of information about social

care options. (ii) Feeling emotionally unsupported by healthcare providers, including GPs or consultants, and (iii) Experiencing long wait times for mental health assessments or family counselling due to lack of psychological service provision. (iv) Limited organizational (formal) support and service co-ordination, requiring significant effort to obtain necessary health and educational services for their child. (iv) Unmet informational, emotional, or esteem support needs, with uncertainty about where to seek help, reluctance to burden others, or a preference for self-reliance. Some reported adequate medical support for the child but unmet parental support needs, or changes in support over time. Despite considerable individual and gender differences in parents' willingness, need, or capacity to seek or accept support, parents expected support to be offered to *all* mothers and fathers.

Parental Engagement with Support Groups

Key illustrative quotes are presented in Supplementary Table 9. Parents accessed diverse support groups, including online condition-specific and general (inter)national organizations for rare diseases, disability-related networks, and in-person specialist baby/toddler groups. Online platforms, particularly Facebook groups, were the most frequently used, offering flexibility and accessibility, although availability varied by condition, prompting some parents to create new groups, tailored to their child's diagnosis. Mothers engaged in support groups more than twice as often as fathers (78.2% vs. 34.3%). However, both parents acknowledged the value of such groups, often supporting other individuals/families themselves. In most couples, at least one parent participated, allowing the other to benefit indirectly.

Parents identified both benefits and challenges to support group involvement. Membership facilitated shared experiences and offered guidance on managing the child's condition. Emotional and informational support helped to reduce parental isolation and fostered a sense of belonging, especially when emotional support from family and friends

was lacking. Practical advice focused on therapies, diet, applying for disability benefits, schooling, equipment, disability access in social spaces, and travel. However, support groups were described as a "double-edged sword," providing valuable resources but also heightening anxiety about the child's future. They were unsuitable for parents who described themselves temperamentally "unsociable". Additionally, not all parents identified as support group users, preferring to use terminology such as "parent forums" or "networks" instead. Some parents disengaged due to emotional distress, lack of shared experiences, or changing needs over time.

Parents' engagement with groups fluctuated / evolved: some parents withdrew after initial participation (13/55, 23.6%), while others joined after an adjustment period of months to years, as their needs changed. Reasons for disengagement included returning to work and time constraints, variability within condition-specific groups causing distress, and lack of shared experiences. Some parents were excluded due to eligibility criteria (e.g., bereavement groups for foetal vs. infant loss). Others found peer support relationships unfulfilling, outgrew the need for support, or encountered group discontinuation.

After hospital discharge, many parents found it difficult to access peer support and missed out on early socializing and intervention opportunities. Barriers included lack of information or absence of suitable groups, time constraints, work commitments, or a preference for alternative support sources such as health professionals, family or friends. Noticeable differences in one's child's development within the non-specialist (mainstream) baby/toddler groups, and the lack of father-specific support groups further hindered participation.

DISCUSSION

The Peregrin* study identified vulnerability and variability in well-being and quality of life among parents of children who had received early rGS - the well-being of the cohort was compromised, and support needs were not fully met. Parents faced barriers to support, reinforcing the need for timely, inclusive, accessible and varied resources for parents of children with complex medical conditions (41). Contrasts in needs emerged between diagnostic groups, with parents of children with rare genetic, medically-complex conditions especially at risk of emotional distress. A third of these parents reported minimal or no support, contrasting with the expectation that obtaining a genetic diagnosis will enhance access to support (and improve well-being). This is consistent with previous findings that parents caring for children with complex conditions frequently experience caregiver stress due to emotional, social and financial pressures, but often lack the right support at the time of highest need (6,42). Highlighting this mismatch between the needs of most-impacted families and low support availability calls for a holistic and dynamic approach, ensuring sustained family support that addresses both child-focused medical care and parental well-being.

An important element of this study was the comparison between mothers' and fathers' needs and support experiences. Consistent with previous studies (43), mothers in this study reported above general population levels of anxiety, worry and emotional difficulties, whereas this was not seen at group level for fathers. Within-couple analysis indicated independent mental health symptom scores between parents, emphasizing the need for individualized psychological interventions for parents. Fathers, similar to those of typically developing children, described stress rather than mental health difficulties and often questioned their entitlement for professional support, prioritizing the needs of their partner (44). The differences between mothers' and fathers' adjustment and adaptation deserve careful consideration in future research (19).

Parents defined support based on their specific needs and assessed its adequacy in relation to their child, themselves, and their families. Both formal and informal support networks were described as crucial in fostering a sense of belonging and facilitating shared experiences among families. As observed previously in families managing medical complexity and genetic conditions (40,45,46) perceived (functional) and actual (structural) parental support changed over time. Informational and emotional support was most critical during the diagnostic phase and at key transitions, while instrumental (e.g., respite care) and social support became essential for long-term family well-being. Despite observable gender differences in support utilization, there was considerable overlap, with some mothers and fathers engaging in social networks typically associated with the opposite gender.

Family and partners were primary support sources for both mothers and fathers, indicating the need to foster strong family relationships, particularly when under strain from a child's diagnosis. However, marital status alone is an unreliable proxy for social support (47). Parents who are heavily dependent on partners may require professional intervention when relationship strain or mental health concerns arise. While many parents reported satisfactory social functioning, a considerable minority experienced isolation and difficulties securing support. Parents with high self-reliance often viewed seeking support as a weakness, despite experiencing isolation and insufficient emotional connection. Primary caregivers would benefit from tailored interventions to maintain friendships and mitigate social isolation, especially during diagnosis and transitional periods (42,48).

It has previously been reported that an early rare disease diagnosis can facilitate access to condition-specific support groups (6), yet this study found that healthcare professionals often provided inconsistent and insufficient support-related information. Many parents did not engage with support groups, emphasizing the need for alternative sources of informational, practical and emotional support. Some families preferred guidance from

trusted healthcare providers rather than charitable organizations or peer networks. Additionally, not all social support was perceived as beneficial. Support groups could be distressing for parents confronted with potential deterioration or loss and were considered unsuitable by parents who described themselves as '*unsociable*' or '*self-reliant*', or who preferred their child's condition not to dominate their spare time and life experience. These findings suggest that while support groups benefit many, they should be supplementary rather than the primary mode of support. Bolstering partner and family relationships should be a priority in support provision, while healthcare, social care, and education professionals, as well as work and friends, also contribute to meeting families' long-term needs (46).

The Peregrin* cohort represents the first large group of UK-based, acutely ill, infants and children to receive early rGS in hospital settings, benefiting from this technology via translational research before NHS implementation. However, the complexity and heterogeneity of conditions diagnosed within the group may limit generalizability to less severe or more common genetic conditions. The study's cross-sectional design precluded assessment of temporal changes, with potential biases of retrospective reporting, in the context of evolving adjustment. Despite a diverse cohort and data from both mothers and fathers, sample size limits quantitative analyses. There are also limitations of demographic representation - a high proportion of parents had degree-level education and were either married or cohabiting, and participants were recruited from a tertiary university hospital, potentially differing in access to healthcare and social services. Further longitudinal research is needed to examine changes in parental support needs following a child's diagnosis of a rare genomic condition, across their child's illness trajectory, and at key transition periods. Studies should also investigate resilience and burnout in parents who exhibit high independence but face caregiving stress (49).

Based on the current findings, healthcare professionals can improve their support of parental well-being in several ways. First, practitioners can recognize the differential impacts of a child's diagnosis on individual parents and validate each parent's unique experience and role within their family. Second, self-reliant and highly independent parents may benefit from normalizing support-seeking behaviours and sharing of research evidence linking support with improved well-being. Alternative terminology to "support" (e.g., networks, resources, or forums) may increase engagement (of fathers in particular), without affecting parental self-esteem. Third, support assessments and practical referrals should be integrated and their importance reinforced, benefiting families most in need of and least able to access support. Lastly, psychological support should be a core component of initial diagnostic and long-term care for families who are managing complex medical and genetic conditions. Our findings highlight the diversity of parental support preferences and the importance of offering flexible, timely, and tailored support options at the time of genomic testing and across the child's illness trajectory, to accommodate families' evolving needs and circumstances.

Data Availability

Deidentified data are available upon request. Data requests should be addressed to the corresponding author.

Acknowledgements

We thank NIHR BioResource volunteers for their participation, and gratefully acknowledge NIHR BioResource centres, NHS Trusts and staff for their contribution. We thank the National Institute for Health Research, NHS Blood and Transplant, and Health Data Research UK as part of the Digital Innovation Hub Programme. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

We thank Madeline Connell, Charlotte Burdge, and Kate Poulter for data cleaning.

Funding Statement

Supported by NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre (BRC), the Rosetrees and the Isaac Newton Trusts, and Cambridge Reproduction SRI Incubator Fund.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: H.D., K.B., C.H.; Data Curation and Project Administration: H.D.; Funding Acquisition: H.D., L.R., D.H.R., C.H., K.B.; Formal Analysis: H.D., S.R., M.B.; Resources: H.D., S.R., M.B., L.R.; Supervision: C.H., K.B., S.O.C., S.A.; Writing-original draft: H.D., K.B., C.H., S.O.C.; Writing-review and editing: H.D., K.B., C.H., L.R., S.O.C., D.H.R., S.A., S.R., M.B.

Ethics Declaration

This Peregrin* follow-up study with the parents from the Next Generation Children project (NGC) was approved by the local research ethics committee (REC reference: 21/EE/0154, HVS/2020/3264, IRAS: 300380), by the NIHR Bioresource (NBR133), and by the Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust institutional review board (A095947). NGC was a translational research study conducted in the East of England between 2016 and 2020, evaluating rapid trio genome sequencing (rGS) in acute paediatric settings (24,25), which included consent for long-term follow-up under Cambridge South Research Ethics Committee approval 13/EE/0325. Written electronic informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to study commencement and archived. All data was de-identified. The study adhered to the principles set out in the Declaration of Helsinki.

Competing Interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

References

1. Kingsmore SF, Nofsinger R, Ellsworth K. Rapid genomic sequencing for genetic disease diagnosis and therapy in intensive care units: a review. NPJ Genom Med. 2024 Feb 27;9(1):17.
2. Stark Z, Ellard S. Rapid genomic testing for critically ill children: time to become standard of care? Eur J Hum Genet. 2022 Feb 8;30(2):142–9.
3. Hayeems RZ, Luca S, Assamad D, Bhatt A, Ungar WJ. Utility of Genetic Testing from the Perspective of Parents/Caregivers: A Scoping Review. Children. 2021 Mar 27;8(4):259.
4. Berrios C, Koertje C, Noel-MacDonnell J, Soden S, Lantos J. Parents of newborns in the NICU enrolled in genome sequencing research: hopeful, but not naïve. Genet Med. 2020 Feb 1;22(2):416–22.
5. Pereira S, Smith HS, Frankel LA, Christensen KD, Islam R, et al. Psychosocial effect of newborn genomic sequencing on families in the babyseq project: a randomized clinical trial. JAMA Pediatr. 2021;175:1132–41.
6. Pelentsov LJ, Laws TA, Esterman AJ. The supportive care needs of parents caring for a child with a rare disease: A scoping review. Disabil Health J. 2015 Oct 1;8(4):475–91.
7. Wyatt T, Shreffler KM, Ciciolla L. Neonatal intensive care unit admission and maternal postpartum depression. J Reprod Infant Psychol. 2019 May 27;37(3):267–76.
8. Quadir A, Festa M, Gilchrist M, Thompson K, Pride N, Basu S. Long-term follow-up in pediatric intensive care-a narrative review. Front Pediatr. 2024;12:1430581.
9. Hilliard ME, McQuaid EL, Nabors L, Hood KK. Resilience in Youth and Families Living With Pediatric Health and Developmental Conditions: Introduction to the Special Issue on Resilience. J Pediatr Psychol. 2015 Oct 27;40(9):835–9.

10. McConnell D, Savage A, Breitkreuz R. Resilience in families raising children with disabilities and behavior problems. Res Dev Disabil. 2014 Apr;35(4):833–48.
11. Raina P, O'Donnell M, Schwellnus H, Rosenbaum P, King G, Brehaut J, et al. Caregiving process and caregiver burden: Conceptual models to guide research and practice. BMC Pediatr. 2004 Jan 14;4(1):1.
12. Grunberg VA, Geller PA, Bonacquisti A, Patterson CA. NICU infant health severity and family outcomes: a systematic review of assessments and findings in psychosocial research. J Perinatol. 2019;39(2):156–72.
13. Mann K, Alvey JC, Marty C, Murphy NA. Health-Related Quality of Life and Family Functioning of Parents of Children with Medical Complexity. Curr Phys Med Rehabil Rep. 2019 Mar 25;7(1):23–9.
14. Fang Y, Luo J, Boele M, Windhorst D, van Grieken A, Raat H. Parent, child, and situational factors associated with parenting stress: a systematic review. Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2022 Jul 25;1:1–19.
15. Wethington E, Kessler RC. Perceived Support, Received Support, and Adjustment to Stressful Life Events. 1986;27(1):78–89.
16. Cohen S. Social relationships and health. Am Psychol. 2004 Nov;59(8):676–84.
17. Belsky J, Rovine M. Patterns of Marital Change across the Transition to Parenthood: Pregnancy to Three Years Postpartum. J Marriage Fam. 1990 Feb;52(1):5.
18. Volling BL, Yu T, Gonzalez R, Tengelitsch E, Stevenson MM. Maternal and paternal trajectories of depressive symptoms predict family risk and children's emotional and behavioral problems after the birth of a sibling. Dev Psychopathol. 2019 Oct 5;31(4):1307–24.

19. Wade CM, Matthews J, Forbes F, Vertkas L, Burn M, Cann WG. Focus on Fathers: Exploring the parenting experiences of fathers using a large population-level sample. Child Youth Care Forum. 2023 Aug 1;52(4):801–28.

20. Van Oers HA, Haverman L, Limperg PF, van Dijk-Lokkart EM, Maurice-Stam H, Grootenhuis MA. Anxiety and Depression in Mothers and Fathers of a Chronically Ill Child. Matern Child Health J. 2014 Oct 4;18(8):1993–2002.

21. Uhing A, Williams JS, Garacci E, Egede LE. Gender differences in the relationship between social support and strain and mortality among a national sample of adults. J Behav Med. 2021;44(5):673–81.

22. Burleson BR. The experience and effects of emotional support: What the study of cultural and gender differences can tell us about close relationships, emotion, and interpersonal communication. Pers Relatsh. 2003 Mar 12;10(1):1–23.

23. Atkins JC, Padgett CR. Living with a Rare Disease: Psychosocial Impacts for Parents and Family Members – a Systematic Review. J Child Fam Stud. 2024 Feb 1;33(2):617–36.

24. French CE, Delon I, Dolling H, Sanchis-Juan A, Shamardina O, Mégy K, et al. Whole genome sequencing reveals that genetic conditions are frequent in intensively ill children. Intensive Care Med. 2019 May 1;45(5):627–36.

25. French CE, Dolling H, Mégy K, Sanchis-Juan A, Kumar A, Delon I, et al. Refinements and considerations for trio whole-genome sequence analysis when investigating Mendelian diseases presenting in early childhood. Hum Genet Genomics Adv. 2022 Jul 25;3(3):100113.

26. Carmichael N, Tsipis J, Windmueller G, Mandel L, Estrella E. “Is it Going to Hurt?”: The Impact of the Diagnostic Odyssey on Children and Their Families. J Genet Couns. 2015 Apr 4;24(2):325–35.

27. Bauskis A, Strange C, Molster C, Fisher C. The diagnostic odyssey: insights from parents of children living with an undiagnosed condition. Orphanet J Rare Dis. 2022 Dec 18;17(1):233.
28. Thompson SK. Stratified adaptive cluster sampling. Biometrika. 1991;78(2):389–97.
29. Upton P, Eiser C, Cheung I, Hutchings HA, Jenney M, Maddocks A, et al. Measurement properties of the UK-English version of the Pediatric Quality of Life InventoryTM 4.0 (PedsQLTM) generic core scales. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2005 Dec 1;3(1):22.
30. Breeman S, Cotton S, Fielding S, Jones GT. Normative data for the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Qual Life Res. 2015 Feb 27;24(2):391–8.
31. Medrano GR, Berlin KS, Davies WH. Utility of the PedsQLTM family impact module: Assessing the psychometric properties in a community sample. Qual Life Res. 2013 Dec;22(10):2899–907.
32. Siedlecki KL, Tucker-Drob EM, Oishi S, Salthouse TA. Life satisfaction across adulthood: different determinants at different ages? J Posit Psychol. 2008 Jul;3(3):153–64.
33. Varni JW, Sherman SA, Burwinkle TM, Dickinson PE, Dixon P. The PedsQLTM Family Impact Module: Preliminary reliability and validity. Health Qual Life Outcomes. 2004 Sep 27;2(1):55.
34. Forman J, Damschroder L. Qualitative Content Analysis. In: Advances in Bioethics. 2007;11:39–62.
35. Graneheim UH, Lundman B. Qualitative content analysis in nursing research: Concepts, procedures and measures to achieve trustworthiness. Nurse Educ Today. 2004 Feb;24(2):105–12.

36. Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. BMC Med Res Methodol. 2013 Sep 18;13(1):117.

37. Sapiets SJ, Hastings RP, Stanford C, Totsika V. Families' Access to Early Intervention and Supports for Children With Developmental Disabilities. J Early Interv. 2023 Jun 8;45(2):103–21.

38. Diener E, Inglehart R, Tay L. Theory and Validity of Life Satisfaction Scales. Soc Indic Res. 2013 Jul 13;112(3):497–527.

39. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. Acta Psychiatr Scand. 1983;67(6):361–70.

40. Gise J, Cohen LL. Social Support in Parents of Children with Cancer: A Systematic Review. J Pediatr Psychol. 2022 Oct 13;47(3):292–305.

41. Sapiets SJ, Hastings RP, Totsika V. Predictors of Access to Early Support in Families of Children with Suspected or Diagnosed Developmental Disabilities in the United Kingdom. J Autism Dev Disord. 2024 Apr 4;54(4):1628–41.

42. Edelstein H, Schippke J, Sheffe S, Kingsnorth S. Children with medical complexity: a scoping review of interventions to support caregiver stress. Child Care Health Dev. 2017 May 29;43(3):323–33.

43. Cohn LN, Pechlivanoglou P, Lee Y, Mahant S, Orkin J, Marson A, et al. Health Outcomes of Parents of Children with Chronic Illness: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. J Pediatr. 2020 Mar 1;218:166-177.e2.

44. Darwin Z, Galdas P, Hinchliff S, Littlewood E, McMillan D, McGowan L, et al. Fathers' views and experiences of their own mental health during pregnancy and the first postnatal year: a qualitative interview study of men participating in the UK Born

and Bred in Yorkshire (BaBY) cohort. BMC Pregnancy Childbirth. 2017 Jan 26;17(1):45.

45. Bradshaw S, Bem D, Shaw K, Taylor B, Chiswell C, Salama M, et al. Improving health, wellbeing and parenting skills in parents of children with special health care needs and medical complexity - a scoping review. BMC Pediatr. 2019 Aug 30;19(1):301.
46. Plumridge G, Metcalfe A, Coad J, Gill P. The role of support groups in facilitating families in coping with a genetic condition and in discussion of genetic risk information. Health Expectations. 2012 Sep 17;15(3):255–66.
47. Perelli-Harris B, Hoherz S, Lappegård T, Evans A. Mind the "Happiness" Gap: The Relationship Between Cohabitation, Marriage, and Subjective Well-being in the United Kingdom, Australia, Germany, and Norway. Demography. 2019 Aug 15;56(4):1219–46.
48. Mead N, Lester H, Chew-Graham C, Gask L, Bower P. Effects of befriending on depressive symptoms and distress: systematic review and meta-analysis. Br J Psychiatry. 2010 Feb 2;196(2):96–101.
49. Faw MH. Supporting the supporter. J Soc Pers Relat. 2018 Feb 1;35(2):202–23.