It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

# CO-DESIGNING A DIGITAL HEALTH APP TO MANAGE PAIN IN YOUNG CHILDREN WITH CANCER: REPORT FROM THE GENERATIVE DESIGN PHASE OF INTERVENTION DEVELOPMENT

4

5 Lindsay A. Jibb RN PhD<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Surabhi Sivaratnam BHSc<sup>2,3\*</sup>, Elham Hashemi MA<sup>2</sup>, Jennifer N. Stinson RN-EC PhD<sup>1,2</sup>, Paul C. Nathan MD MSc<sup>1,2</sup>, Julie Chartrand RN PhD<sup>4,5</sup>, Nicole M. 6 Alberts PhD<sup>6</sup>, Tatenda Masama BScN<sup>2</sup>, Hannah G. PeaseBA<sup>7</sup>, Lessley B. Torres BA<sup>7,8,9</sup>, Haydee 7 G. Cortes BA<sup>7,8,9</sup>, Mallory Zworth BScN<sup>2</sup>, Susan Kuczynski<sup>10</sup>, Michelle A. Fortier PhD<sup>7,8,9</sup>. 8 9 10 <sup>1</sup>University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada; <sup>2</sup>Hospital for Sick Children, Toronto, Canada; <sup>3</sup>Faculty 11 of Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Canada; <sup>4</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, University 12 of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada; <sup>5</sup>Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario, Ottawa, Canada; 13 <sup>6</sup>Concordia University, Montreal, Canada; <sup>7</sup>University of California Irvine, Irvine, USA; 14 <sup>8</sup>CHOC Children's Hospital, Orange, USA; <sup>9</sup>UCI Center on Stress and Health, Orange, USA; <sup>10</sup>Ontario Parents Advocating for Children with Cancer, Toronto, Canada. 15 16 17 Address correspondence to: 18 Lindsay Jibb Child Health Evaluative Sciences 19 20 Hospital for Sick Children 21 686 Bay Street, M5G 0A4 22 Toronto Canada 23 lindsay.jibb@sickkids.ca 24 416-813-7654 x309160 25 26 \*, These authors contributed equally to this work. 27 28 Author email addresses: Lindsay Jibb lindsay.jibb@sickkids.ca Surabhi Sivaratnam surabhi.sivartnam@sickkids.ca

Elham Hashemi Jennifer Stinson Paul Nathan Julie Chartrand Nicole Alberts Tatenda Masama Hannah Pease Lessley Torres Haydee Cortes Susan Kuczynski Mallory Zworth Michelle Fortier

- lindsay.jibb@sickkids.ca surabhi.sivartnam@sickkids.ca elham.hashemi@sickkids.ca jennifer.stinson@sickkids.ca jaul.nathan@sickkids.ca julie.chartrand@uottawa.ca nicole.alberts@concordia.ca tatenda.masama@sickkids.ca peaseh@uci.edu lessleyt@hs.uci.edu cortesh@hs.uci.edu liasion@opacc.org mallory.zworth@sickkids.ca mfortier@hs.uci.edu
- 29 Data availability statement: Data from this study are available (in accordance with institutional
- 30 policies) from the corresponding author upon request.
- **31 Funding statement:** We acknowledge the financial support of the Rally Foundation for
- 32 Childhood Cancer Research, [19YIN48].

- Conflict of interest disclosure: None to disclose.
- **Ethics approval statement:** This study received ethics approval from the institutional review
- boards at the Hospital for Sick Children (#1000064500) and the University of California, Irvine (#190666).
- **Patient consent statement:** All parent participants provided informed consent to participate
- before any involvement in this study.

#### **Abbreviations:**

- CHOC, Children's Hospital of Orange County
- PPEP, Parental Pain Expression Perceptions
- SickKids, The Hospital for Sick Children
- Short title: Co-design of a parent-led childhood cancer pain app

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

58

#### 59 60

### ABSTRACT

61 Pain is one of the most prevalent and burdensome pediatric cancer symptoms for young children and their families. A significant proportion of pain episodes are experienced in environments 62 63 where management options are limited, including at home, and digital innovations such as apps 64 may have positive impacts on pain outcomes for young children in these environments. Our 65 overall aim is to co-design such an app and the objective of this study was to explore the perceptions of children's parents about app utility, needed system features, and challenges. We 66 67 recruited parents of young children with cancer and multidisciplinary pediatric oncology 68 clinicians from two pediatric cancer care centers to participate in audio-recorded, semi-structured co-design interviews. We conducted interviews until data saturation was reached. Audio-69 70 recordings were then transcribed, coded, and analyzed using thematic analysis. Forty-two 71 participants took part in the process. Participants endorsed the concept of an app as a useful, safe, 72 and convenient way to engage caregivers in managing their young child's pain. The value of the 73 app related to its capacity to provide real-time, multimodal informational and procedural pain 74 support to parents, while also reducing the emotional burden of pain care. Recommendations for 75 intervention design included accessibility-focused features, comprehensive symptom tracking, 76 and embedded scientific- and clinically-sound symptom assessments and management advice. Predicted challenges associated with digital pain management related to potential burden of use 77 78 for parents and clinicians. The insights gathered will inform the design principles of our future 79 childhood cancer pain digital research.

80

# 81

# **AUTHOR SUMMARY**

82 The lack of meaningful involvement of end-users in intervention development has been a key 83 contributor to difficulties in effectively translating research findings into cancer practice and 84 policy. There is a risk that without the active engagement of children with cancer and their 85 families in designing digital health innovations, researchers and clinicians will fall victim to an unfortunate cycle of producing underutilized evidence-resulting in a limited impact on patient 86 outcomes. Pain is a particular problem for young children with cancer and real-time digital 87 88 health interventions may be solutions for accessible, effective, and scalable cancer pain 89 management. We are using an established end user-centered co-design process to engage parents 90 and pediatric oncology clinicians in the development of a cancer pain management app. Our 91 work here summarizes the generative co-design phase of this process and the perceptions of 92 parents and clinicians related to app usefulness and needed system features. 93

- 94
- 95
- 96

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

97

# 98 INTRODUCTION

99

Pain is one of the most prevalent and burdensome pediatric cancer symptoms for children and their families despite the existence of evidence-based treatment guidelines (1,2). The negative consequences of childhood cancer pain are many and include reduced child healthrelated quality of life, increased child and family distress, chronic pain in survivorship and the potential for significant financial costs to healthcare systems and families (3–6). Further, shifts to increasingly outpatient-based cancer care mean that children with cancer are experiencing pain in environments, such as home or school, where treatment options are limited (7).

107 Young children with cancer, including toddlers, preschoolers, and school-aged children, 108 are particularly vulnerable to undermanaged pain due to their limited ability for pain self-report 109 and their reliance on caregivers for pain management and treatment. Current research shows that 110 digital innovations such as real-time smartphone-based pain management support apps may have 111 positive impacts on pain outcomes in adolescents with cancer (5,8–10), but no investigations 112 have been conducted into such tools for managing pain in young children with cancer, especially 113 outside the hospital setting.

To increase the likelihood of successful implementation of digital health interventions within pediatric cancer care, it is vital that the key stakeholders, including parents, other family caregivers and clinicians, are meaningfully integrated in the processes of intervention design, development, and evaluation. Evidence shows that eliciting stakeholder perspectives, including that of parents, on intervention development supports the identification of barriers to use, results

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

in interventions with enhanced perceived effectiveness, and facilitates the successful delivery of
digital health interventions (11–13).

121 The current study is part of a phased approach to the development and evaluation of a 122 digital health app for the parent-led management of young children's cancer pain. Our process 123 employed a co-design framework, which has been successfully used to develop pediatric health 124 innovations (14). This study describes the generative design phase of innovation development 125 wherein the healthcare needs of participants, including latent needs that participants may not be aware of, are explored and revealed. Our future co-design efforts will build on these results 126 127 during the software development and co-evaluation of a high-fidelity app prototype with family 128 caregivers. 129 *Objective* 130 Given the issue of undermanaged pain in young children with cancer and the critical need

to elicit stakeholders input early in the process of successful digital health intervention design, the objective of this study was to explore the perceptions of children's parents and clinicians as they pertain to a the co-design of a parent-led real-time cancer pain management app, including possible utility, recommendations for needed system features, and potential challenges to implementation.

136

#### 137 **RESULTS**

138

139 *Study sample* 

140 A total of 42 participants—21 parents and 21 clinicians—were interviewed between December

141 2019 and September 2020. All eligible participants who were approached agreed to participate.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

142	The mean	(range) tota	l interview	times were 33	(14-67)	) minutes and 33	(22-45	) minutes for
-----	----------	--------------	-------------	---------------	---------	------------------	--------	---------------

- 143 parents and clinicians, respectively. Participant characteristics are shown in Table 1. Most
- parents were within the 30-39 years of age category (n=13, 62%) and mothers (n=17, 81%). The
- 145 mean parent-reported PPEP scores were 33 (SD=10), indicating moderately low child pain
- misconceptions. Clinicians were most often registered nurses (n=9, 43%) and had a mean
- 147 average 10 years of clinical experience.
- 148 Table 1. Participant characteristics

#### 149

Characteristic	n	M(SD)
Pain perception knowledge and attitudes (total PPEP score)		33 (10)
Caregiver type		
Mother	17 (81)	
Father	3 (14)	
Stepmother	1 (5)	
Marital status		
Married	19 (90)	
Divorced	1 (5)	
Single	1 (5)	
Sex		
Female	18 (86)	
Male	3 (14)	
Age range (years)		
20-29	3 (14)	
30-39	13 (62)	
40-49	5 (24)	
Parent-identified race or ethnicity		
White	8 (38)	
Hispanic/Latinx	5 (24)	
Chinese	2 (10)	
South Asian	2 (10)	
Arab	1 (5)	
Armenian	1 (5)	
Black	1 (5)	
Korean	1 (5)	
Highest level of education		
College/University	9 (43)	
Professional School/Graduate Degree	7 (33)	
High School	4 (19)	
Teaching Credential	1 (5)	
Primary language		
English	16 (76)	
Arabic	1 (5)	
Cantonese	1 (5)	
Korean	1 (5)	

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

1 anul         1 (5)           Urdu         1 (5)           Child age (years)         5.3 (2.7)           Child cancer diagnosis         9 (43)           ALL         9 (43)           AML         4 (19)           LCH         2 (10)           Neuroblastoma         2 (10)           APML         1 (5)           Lymphoma         1 (5)           Lymphoma         1 (5)           Osteosarcoma         1 (5)           Time since child diagnosis (years)         0.9 (1.4)           Clinicians         0.9 (1.4)           Profession         1 (5)           Advanced Practice Nurse         5 (24)           Oncologist         1 (5)           Physical Therapist         3 (14)           Psychologist         1 (5)           Registered Nurse         9 (43)           Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex	T1	1 (7)	
Child age (years)         5.3 (2.7)           Child cancer diagnosis         9 (43)           ALL         9 (43)           AML         4 (19)           LCH         2 (10)           Neuroblastoma         2 (10)           APML         1 (5)           Lymphoma         1 (5)           Lymphoma         1 (5)           MYH9 disorder         1 (5)           Osteosarcoma         1 (5)           Osteosarcoma         1 (5)           Obstosarcoma         1 (5)           Profession         9 (14)           Advanced Practice Nurse         9 (43)           Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex         1 (5)           Female         21 (100)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         7 (33)           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education	Tamil	1 (5)	
Child cancer diagnosis $ALL$ 9 (43) $AML$ 4 (19) $LCH$ 2 (10) $Neuroblastoma$ 2 (10) $APML$ 1 (5) $Lymphoma$ 1 (5) $MYH9$ disorder       1 (5) $MYH9$ disorder       1 (5) $MYH9$ disorder       1 (5) $MYH9$ disorder       0.9 (1.4)         Clinicians       9 (43)         Profession       1 (5)         Advanced Practice Nurse       5 (24)         Oncologist       1 (5)         Physical Therapist       3 (14)         Psychologist       1 (5)         Registered Nurse       9 (43)         Social Worker       2 (10)         Sex		1 (5)	5.2 (2.7)
ALL       9 (43) $AML$ 4 (19) $LCH$ 2 (10) $Neuroblastoma$ 2 (10) $APML$ 1 (5) $Lymphoma$ 1 (5) $Lymphoma$ 1 (5) $M'H9$ disorder       1 (5)         Osteosarcoma       1 (5)         Time since child diagnosis (years)       0.9 (1.4) <b>Clinicians</b> 0.9 (1.4)         Profession       5 (24) $Advanced Practice Nurse$ 5 (24) $Oncologist$ 1 (5) $Physical Therapist$ 3 (14) $Psychologist$ 1 (5) $Registered Nurse$ 9 (43) $Social Worker$ 2 (10)         Sex       2 (10) $Female$ 21 (100) $Male$ 0 (0)         Age range (years)       2 (24) $20-29$ 7 (33) $30-39$ 8 (38) $40.49$ 5 (24) $50-59$ 1 (5)         Highest level of education       1 (5)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33) $Doctoral Degree$ 3 (14) <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>5.3 (2.7)</td></t<>			5.3 (2.7)
AML       4 (19) $LCH$ 2 (10)         Neuroblastoma       2 (10) $APMI$ 1 (5) $Lymphoma$ 1 (5) $MYH9$ disorder       1 (5) $Osteosarcoma$ 1 (5) $MYH9$ disorder       1 (5) $Osteosarcoma$ 1 (5) $Time since child diagnosis (years)$ $0.9 (1.4)$ <b>Clinicians</b> 0.9 (1.4)         Profession       1 (5) $Advanced Practice Nurse$ 5 (24)         Oncologist       1 (5) $Physical Therapist$ 3 (14) $Psychologist$ 1 (5) $Registered Nurse$ 9 (43) $Social Worker$ 2 (10)         Sex       2 (10)         Sex       2 (10)         Sex       2 (10) $Aer ange (years)$ 2 (10) $20-29$ 7 (33) $30-39$ 8 (38) $40-49$ 5 (24) $50-59$ 1 (5)         Highest level of education       1 (5)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33) $Doctoral Degree$ 10 (48)		<u> </u>	
LCH         2 (10)           Neuroblastoma         2 (10)           APML         1 (5)           Lymphoma         1 (5)           MYH9 disorder         1 (5)           Osteosarcoma         1 (5)           Time since child diagnosis (years)         0.9 (1.4)           Clinicians         0.9 (1.4)           Profession         1 (5)           Advanced Practice Nurse         5 (24)           Oncologist         1 (5)           Physical Therapist         3 (14)           Psychologist         1 (5)           Registered Nurse         9 (43)           Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex         7 (33)           Female         21 (100)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         2           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education         3           Bachelor's Degree         7 (33)           Master's Degree         7 (33)           Doctoral Degree         3 (14)           Medical Degree         1 (5)			
Neuroblastoma $2(10)$ $APML$ $1(5)$ $Lymphoma$ $1(5)$ $MYH9$ disorder $1(5)$ $Osteosarcoma$ $1(5)$ Time since child diagnosis (years) $0.9 (1.4)$ CliniciansProfession $Advanced Practice Nurse$ $5 (24)$ $Oncologist$ $1 (5)$ $Physical Therapist$ $3 (14)$ $Psychologist$ $1 (5)$ $Registered Nurse$ $9 (43)$ $Social Worker$ $2 (10)$ $Sex$ $remale$ $Female$ $21 (100)$ $Male$ $0 (0)$ $Age$ range (years) $2(24)$ $20-29$ $7 (33)$ $30-39$ $8 (38)$ $40-49$ $5 (24)$ $50-59$ $1 (5)$ Highest level of education $1 (5)$ $Bachelor's Degree$ $7 (33)$ $Master's Degree$ $3 (14)$ $Medical Degree$ $3 (14)$ $Medical Degree$ $3 (14)$ $Medical Degree$ $1 (5)$ Clinical work experience (years) $10(9)$		~ /	
APML1 (5) $Lymphoma$ 1 (5) $MYH9$ disorder1 (5) $Osteosarcoma$ 1 (5)Time since child diagnosis (years)0.9 (1.4)Clinicians0.9 (1.4)Profession1 (5) $Advanced Practice Nurse$ 5 (24) $Oncologist$ 1 (5) $Physical Therapist$ 3 (14) $Psychologist$ 1 (5) $Registered Nurse$ 9 (43) $Social Worker$ 2 (10)Sex1 $Female$ 21 (100) $Male$ 0 (0) $Age range (years)$ 7 (33) $20-29$ 7 (33) $30-39$ 8 (38) $40-49$ 5 (24) $50-59$ 1 (5)Highest level of education1(5) $Master's Degree$ 7 (33) $Master's Degree$ 3 (14) $Medical Degree$ 3 (14) $Medical Degree$ 1 (5)Clinical work experience (years)10(9)			
Lymphoma $1 (5)$ MYH9 disorder $1 (5)$ Osteosarcoma $1 (5)$ Time since child diagnosis (years) $0.9 (1.4)$ Clinicians $0.9 (1.4)$ Profession $1 (5)$ Advanced Practice Nurse $5 (24)$ Oncologist $1 (5)$ Physical Therapist $3 (14)$ Psychologist $1 (5)$ Registered Nurse $9 (43)$ Social Worker $2 (10)$ Sex $7 (33)$ Zo-29 $7 (33)$ $20-29$ $7 (33)$ $30-39$ $8 (38)$ $40-49$ $5 (24)$ $50-59$ $1 (5)$ Highest level of education $7 (33)$ Bachelor's Degree $7 (33)$ Master's Degree $1 (4)$ Medical Degree $3 (14)$ Medical Degree $1 (5)$ Clinical work experience (years) $1 (5)$			
MYH9 disorder1 (5) $MYH9 disorder$ 1 (5)Time since child diagnosis (years)0.9 (1.4)Clinicians $0.9 (1.4)$ Profession $1$ $Advanced Practice Nurse$ 5 (24) $Oncologist$ 1 (5) $Physical Therapist$ 3 (14) $Psychologist$ 1 (5) $Registered Nurse$ 9 (43) $Social Worker$ 2 (10)Sex $1$ $Female$ 21 (100) $Male$ 0 (0) $Age range (years)$ $7 (33)$ $20-29$ $7 (33)$ $30-39$ $8 (38)$ $40-49$ $5 (24)$ $50-59$ 1 (5)Highest level of education $7 (33)$ $Master's Degree$ $10 (48)$ $Doctoral Degree$ $3 (14)$ $Medical Degree$ $1 (5)$ Clinical work experience (years) $1 (5)$		\	
Osteosarcoma $1 (5)$ Time since child diagnosis (years) $0.9 (1.4)$ Clinicians $Profession$ Advanced Practice Nurse $5 (24)$ Oncologist $1 (5)$ Physical Therapist $3 (14)$ Psychologist $1 (5)$ Registered Nurse $9 (43)$ Social Worker $2 (10)$ Sex $Female$ $2 (10)$ $Sex$ $Female$ $21 (100)$ Male $0 (0)$ Age range (years) $7 (33)$ $30-39$ $8 (38)$ $40-49$ $5 (24)$ $50-59$ $1 (5)$ Highest level of education $1 (5)$ Master's Degree $10 (48)$ Doctoral Degree $3 (14)$ Medical Degree $3 (14)$ Medical Degree $1 (5)$ Clinical work experience (years) $10(9)$			
Time since child diagnosis (years) $0.9 (1.4)$ Clinicians $0.9 (1.4)$ Profession $1$ Advanced Practice Nurse $5 (24)$ Oncologist $1 (5)$ Physical Therapist $3 (14)$ Psychologist $1 (5)$ Registered Nurse $9 (43)$ Social Worker $2 (10)$ Sex $2 (10)$ Male $0 (0)$ Age range (years) $20-29$ $20-29$ $7 (33)$ $30-39$ $8 (38)$ $40-49$ $5 (24)$ $50-59$ $1 (5)$ Highest level of education $7 (33)$ Bachelor's Degree $7 (33)$ $Doctoral Degree$ $10 (48)$ Doctoral Degree $3 (14)$ Medical Degree $1 (5)$ Clinical work experience (years) $10(9)$	MYH9 disorder	1 (5)	
Clinicians           Profession           Advanced Practice Nurse         5 (24)           Oncologist         1 (5)           Physical Therapist         3 (14)           Psychologist         1 (5)           Registered Nurse         9 (43)           Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex         2 (100)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         7 (33)           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education         7 (33)           Bachelor's Degree         7 (33)           Master's Degree         10 (48)           Doctoral Degree         3 (14)           Medical Degree         1 (5)           Clinical work experience (years)         10(9)	Osteosarcoma	1 (5)	
Profession           Advanced Practice Nurse         5 (24)           Oncologist         1 (5)           Physical Therapist         3 (14)           Psychologist         1 (5)           Registered Nurse         9 (43)           Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex         2 (10)           Sex         21 (100)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         7 (33)           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education         10 (48)           Doctoral Degree         3 (14)           Medical Degree         1 (5)           Clinical work experience (years)         10(9)			0.9 (1.4)
Advanced Practice Nurse $5 (24)$ Oncologist $1 (5)$ Physical Therapist $3 (14)$ Psychologist $1 (5)$ Registered Nurse $9 (43)$ Social Worker $2 (10)$ Sex $2 (10)$ Sex $21 (100)$ Male $0 (0)$ Age range (years) $7 (33)$ $20-29$ $7 (33)$ $30-39$ $8 (38)$ $40-49$ $5 (24)$ $50-59$ $1 (5)$ Highest level of education $7 (33)$ Bachelor's Degree $7 (33)$ $Doctoral Degree$ $3 (14)$ Medical Degree $1 (5)$ Clinical work experience (years) $10(9)$	Clinicians		
Oncologist         1 (5)           Physical Therapist         3 (14)           Psychologist         1 (5)           Registered Nurse         9 (43)           Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex         21 (100)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         7 (33)           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education         7 (33)           Bachelor's Degree         7 (33)           Master's Degree         10 (48)           Doctoral Degree         3 (14)           Medical Degree         1 (5)           Clinical work experience (years)         10(9)	Profession		
Physical Therapist         3 (14)           Psychologist         1 (5)           Registered Nurse         9 (43)           Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex         2 (10)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         7 (33)           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education         7 (33)           Master's Degree         7 (33)           Master's Degree         10 (48)           Doctoral Degree         3 (14)           Medical Degree         1 (5)           Clinical work experience (years)         10(9)	Advanced Practice Nurse	5 (24)	
Psychologist         1 (5)           Registered Nurse         9 (43)           Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex         21 (100)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         7 (33)           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education         7 (33)           Bachelor's Degree         7 (33)           Master's Degree         10 (48)           Doctoral Degree         3 (14)           Medical Degree         1 (5)           Clinical work experience (years)         10(9)	Oncologist	1 (5)	
Registered Nurse       9 (43)         Social Worker       2 (10)         Sex       21 (100)         Male       0 (0)         Age range (years)       7 (33)         20-29       7 (33)         30-39       8 (38)         40-49       5 (24)         50-59       1 (5)         Highest level of education       7 (33)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33)         Master's Degree       10 (48)         Doctoral Degree       3 (14)         Medical Degree       1 (5)         Clinical work experience (years)       10(9)	Physical Therapist	3 (14)	
Social Worker         2 (10)           Sex         21 (100)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         7 (33)           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education         7 (33) <i>Master's Degree</i> 7 (33) <i>Master's Degree</i> 10 (48)           Doctoral Degree         3 (14)           Medical Degree         1 (5)           Clinical work experience (years)         10(9)	Psychologist	1 (5)	
Sex         21 (100)           Male         0 (0)           Age range (years)         7 (33)           20-29         7 (33)           30-39         8 (38)           40-49         5 (24)           50-59         1 (5)           Highest level of education         7 (33) <i>Bachelor's Degree</i> 7 (33) <i>Master's Degree</i> 10 (48) <i>Doctoral Degree</i> 3 (14) <i>Medical Degree</i> 1 (5)           Clinical work experience (years)         10(9)	Registered Nurse	9 (43)	
Female       21 (100)         Male       0 (0)         Age range (years)       7 (33)         20-29       7 (33)         30-39       8 (38)         40-49       5 (24)         50-59       1 (5)         Highest level of education       7 (33)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33)         Master's Degree       10 (48)         Doctoral Degree       3 (14)         Medical Degree       1 (5)         Clinical work experience (years)       10(9)	Social Worker	2 (10)	
Male       0 (0)         Age range (years)       7 (33)         20-29       7 (33)         30-39       8 (38)         40-49       5 (24)         50-59       1 (5)         Highest level of education       7 (33)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33)         Master's Degree       10 (48)         Doctoral Degree       3 (14)         Medical Degree       1 (5)         Clinical work experience (years)       10(9)	Sex		
Age range (years)       7 (33)         20-29       7 (33)         30-39       8 (38)         40-49       5 (24)         50-59       1 (5)         Highest level of education       7 (33)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33)         Master's Degree       10 (48)         Doctoral Degree       3 (14)         Medical Degree       1 (5)         Clinical work experience (years)       10(9)	Female	21 (100)	
20-29       7 (33)         30-39       8 (38)         40-49       5 (24)         50-59       1 (5)         Highest level of education       7 (33)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33)         Master's Degree       10 (48)         Doctoral Degree       3 (14)         Medical Degree       1 (5)         Clinical work experience (years)       10(9)	Male	0 (0)	
20-29       7 (33)         30-39       8 (38)         40-49       5 (24)         50-59       1 (5)         Highest level of education       7 (33)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33)         Master's Degree       10 (48)         Doctoral Degree       3 (14)         Medical Degree       1 (5)         Clinical work experience (years)       10(9)	Age range (years)		
40-49       5 (24)         50-59       1 (5)         Highest level of education       7 (33)         Bachelor's Degree       7 (33)         Master's Degree       10 (48)         Doctoral Degree       3 (14)         Medical Degree       1 (5)         Clinical work experience (years)       10(9)		7 (33)	
40-49       5 (24)         50-59       1 (5)         Highest level of education       7 (33)         Bachelor's Degree       70 (48)         Doctoral Degree       3 (14)         Medical Degree       10 (5)         Clinical work experience (years)       10(9)	30-39	8 (38)	
50-591 (5)Highest level of education7 (33)Bachelor's Degree7 (33)Master's Degree10 (48)Doctoral Degree3 (14)Medical Degree1 (5)Clinical work experience (years)10(9)	40-49	~ /	
Highest level of educationBachelor's Degree7 (33)Master's Degree10 (48)Doctoral Degree3 (14)Medical Degree1 (5)Clinical work experience (years)10(9)	50-59		
Bachelor's Degree7 (33)Master's Degree10 (48)Doctoral Degree3 (14)Medical Degree1 (5)Clinical work experience (years)10(9)	Highest level of education		
Master's Degree10 (48)Doctoral Degree3 (14)Medical Degree1 (5)Clinical work experience (years)10(9)		7 (33)	
Doctoral Degree3 (14)Medical Degree1 (5)Clinical work experience (years)10(9)			
Medical Degree1 (5)Clinical work experience (years)10(9)	<u>v</u>	· · · ·	
Clinical work experience (years) 10(9)			
		<u> </u>	10(9)

150

# 151 *Thematic analysis*

152 We organized our data into four major themes to describe parent and clinician perceptions of the

153 utility of digital cancer pain intervention, recommendations for intervention components, and

154 potential implementation challenges. **Table 2** shows themes, subthemes, and example narrative

155 quotes.

**Table 2.** Thematic analysis framework

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Theme		Sub-theme	Parent representative quotes	Clinician representative quotes
1	The need for and	Informational and procedural support for parents needed	"If there's a way of teach[ing strategies and timing] to the parents and tell[ing] them that this is something that you could also do to help your son whenever he's home or whenever he's experiencing pain, that would be helpful." (Mother of a 6-year-old)	"I think sometimes when they go home, a think they might struggle with is [deciding] when do I give this morphine? Am I giving too much? Am I giving too little?" (Nurse) "Many times there are pain complaints that can be managed at home before you have to get to that threshold of coming in " (Nurse)
2	value of a digital cancer pain management intervention.	Real-time interdisciplinary pain care needed	"It's nice to feel connected [to the team] when you're at home." (Mother of a 4- year-old)	"[The app should] offer "real time" chat with a medical provider in case [parents] were not sure what to do specifically." (Advanced practice nurse)
		Means to negotiate the emotional burden of pain care on parents needed	"Yeah, and I can't apply that to her sometimes like, I just can't do it. You know she's in pain or she's really sick or she's not in a good mood because of what's, what's happening and I just want something to help me get through this, you know?" (Mother, child age unknown)	"I think that it would be helpful because the parents are so overwhelmed and there's so many things that they try and keep track of. There's meds and chemotherapy and all that, so to have something dedicated to pain where it would also be easy to [track] would be helpful to them" (Nurse)
	Recommendations pertaining to pediatric digital health interventions in general	Usability-related recommendations:(1) accessibility, (2) tracking capacity, and (3) gamification	"Yeah, [gamified] challenges. I love them *laughs* and it makes you, you know, want to [engage] more" (Mother, child age unknown)	"We have a lot of patients that have come from different countries, and I guess it would be difficult for some parents to use an app, especially if it's only provided in English" (Nurse) "We have a lot of patients that for the parents English is a second language. Even some patients, English is a second language for them so I think that's a huge one" (Nurse)
		Credibility-related recommendations: (1)	"I like the idea thatthe nurse can contact [you]	"Pain is subjective so it's hard to know what they're

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

		clinician integration, (2) quality evidence base, (3) personalization, and (4) clinical disclaimer	when it's for the extreme pain. It's a nice feature." (Mother of a 4-year-old)	going to do with that but I think there should always be a disclaimer: "If you feel that you know you could try this, but if you feel the pain is escalating please call 9-1-1 or please take your child to the nearest emergency room" (Social worker)
3	3 <i>Recommendations</i> pertaining to parent- led digital cancer pain management specifically	Detailed patient history	"Weight, heightI would get that downand then the feeding and pain management or the pain history." (Mother of a 2- year-old)	"it would be helpful to know the symptoms. Like, a lot of times when a patient comes in, they don't have symptoms recorded Sometimes they'll say "Yeah they have pain"— sometimes we don't know. It's kind of vague when they tell us when they're feeling the pain, describing the pain, like, what it feels like, is it achy, is it sharp, is it shooting" (Nurse) "things that would cause pain, like their diagnosis, recent surgery or something or chronic history of pain or something that's a little bit" (Nurse)
		Comprehensive pain assessments	"I think it would be helpful to trackwhen [the child] had treatment and associated pain. That could be helpful for collecting data for when these children are experiencing pain. That may be helpful also for researchers to link the pain management and help people better understand the real side effects of [cancer treatment]." (Mother of a 5-year-old)	"It's reall, really hard for young kids, but I think giving more adjectives that parents could use or other ways to describe different types of pain" (Physical therapist)
		Multimodal integrative pain management advice	"Distraction things first. Like massage, hot packs, cold packs, and stuff like that." (Mother, child age unknown)	"there's other pain management strategies that they can use at home that we don't use that much in the hospital, like relaxation and distraction and all that kind of stuff" (Nurse)

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

		Capacity to track pain overtime	"Yeah, to be able to track daily and not have have a place that we can consolidate that data ultimately." (Father of 6- year-old)	"I think it would be useful as a tracking method because there's so many meds, so many chemos, so many appointments, that you kind of get lost in all of it. If there was ever a time that they need to come to [emergency] it would just be a really easy way to be like, "This is when my pain startedThis is what they did." (Nurse)
4		Threshold-setting around when clinician-based support should be initiated	"[When should doctors intervene in parent pain management at home?] Sometimes, but it just depends. Depends on [the] situation, okay?" (Mother, child age unknown)	"I think that's what's hard, because pain is very subjective, andso I think that's where it's hard to pinpoint [when the healthcare team should be alerted]." (Advanced practice nurse)
	Predicted challenges associated with implementing a digital pain management intervention	Introduction of a new burden on parents	No relevant quotes	"But if they never heard of that technique before are they going to be wasting time thinking, "What's that? What does that mean? How do you do that breathing? What does relaxation mean?" Like, right? Is that going to add more stress?" (Social worker)
		Difficultly in integrating into clinician workflows	"And I can't imagine anyone here has an easy or laid-back position. I imagine everybody's role here is pretty impactful and a lot of you are busy most of the time so" (Mother of a 2-year-old)	"I think in an ideal that'd be like a great idea and stuff like that I just don't know who would take on that responsibility, like the best person I can think of would be like [the family's primary] nurse but I also know that they're so busy with other things." (Nurse)
		Potential to results in family hyperawareness of and sensitization to symptoms	No relevant quotes	"I've experienced some parents being hyper vigilant." (Social worker)

157

158 *The need for and value of a digital cancer pain management intervention.* 

Both parents and caregivers considered a pain management app as a useful, safe, and

160 convenient way to empower caregivers to effectively manage their young child's pain in the

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

161 home environment, especially for parents of children newly diagnosed with cancer. Several 162 current deficiencies with at-home pain management for young children were also discussed. 163 Informational and procedural support for parents was needed and valued. Both groups noted that 164 parents already possessed a strong suite of child pain management skills, but a means to support the implementation of this knowledge "would be helpful" (Mother of a 6-year-old). Clinicians 165 166 described current clinical practices of learning about young children's cancer pain as not 167 comprehensive and often reliant on reviews of at-home medication use rather than lived 168 experiences of pain. Procedural support to allow parents "to track when [their child is] having the 169 pain and how long it's been" (Nurse) would provide in-depth information to healthcare teams 170 and facilitate communication between parents and clinicians. Parents and clinicians also 171 perceived pain to be better managed in hospital and described a need for connection to the 172 interdisciplinary team and associated diverse treatment strategies at home. Parents also alluded to 173 the often overwhelming task of managing pain at home stating, "You panic sometimes when 174 your child is sick. You're like, "What's going on? How much [pain medication] do I give? What 175 do I do?" (Mother of a 4-year-old). The numerous other direct and indirect cancer care tasks for 176 which parents assumed responsibility-such as medication administration and appointment 177 tracking—amplified this strain and a tool that could offer emotional support to parents was 178 considered advantageous. 179 Recommendations pertaining to pediatric digital health interventions in general 180 Parents and clinicians made recommendations that might be applied broadly to most

181 parent-led digital health interventions, beyond just apps targeting pediatric cancer pain. These

182 features were suggested to enhance intervention usability, credibility, and resultant effectiveness.

183 Participants particularly noted the need to embed accessibility features in intervention design,

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

184 emphasizing that these "app[s] should be made as easy as possible so that anybody can use" 185 (Mother of a 4-year-old). To improve intervention access for parents, participants recommended 186 that health apps be available in multiple languages, primarily use lay terms for caregivers "who 187 [are] not in the medical field to understand" (Father of a 6-year-old) and include a text-to-audio 188 feature and supplemental information that users could review as needed. Participants also 189 recommended integrating a calendar feature to act as a centralized hub with scheduled 190 medication and medical appointment reminders, and allow for child symptom tracking. Many 191 participants also suggested adding gamified elements such as avatars and pictorial 192 representations. Such gamification was considered to encourage family-oriented digital care by 193 "making it kid friendly" (Stepmother of a 10-year-old) and would encourage child engagement 194 in app-based care alongside their caregiver. Specific recommendations related to the use of 195 avatars were to include features reflective of the parent and child (e.g., diverse skin tones, range 196 of heights and weights, accessibility features such as glasses and prosthetics). 197 Various features that would enhance the credibility of a digital interventions were also 198 highlighted. Clinician integration within digital health interventions was considered important. 199 Considering this integration, participants recommended a software-embedded "threshold for 200 [symptom] follow-up" (Nurse), that if surpassed, would result in notification to the healthcare 201 team. Such notifications were suggested to ensure child safety and to build technologies that 202 enhance, as opposed to replace, care delivered by clinicians. This sharing of app-generated health 203 reports with clinicians was also considered an important means to support symptom management 204 by "sort of opening a door to a conversation that maybe [parents and clinicians] wouldn't have 205 had" (Oncologist). To enhance credibility, participants also strongly recommended that digital 206 interventions be based on sound and up-to-date scientific evidence-based and care

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

recommendations be personalized to users, including by implementing software algorithm-based
personalization. Finally, clear descriptions of the limits of clinical support that could be provided
by a digital health intervention should be embedded. Participants highlighted that such
disclaimers would build trust with the intervention by emphasizing when care outside of that
provided by the app should be sought.

212 Recommendations pertaining to parent-led digital cancer pain management specifically

Participants suggested four categories of priority features for effective caregiver-led
digital pediatric cancer pain management. First, participants suggested the inclusion of a feature
enabling the storage of a child's pain history, medical history, current medications, allergies,
social history, and family history. This information could be updated by both parents and
clinicians and would support the personalization of pain management advice for a child.

218 Second, suggestions were made related to app-based pain assessments. Both parents and 219 clinicians strongly recommended multi-dimensional pain assessment tools embedded in the app 220 to measure pain as a sensory phenomenon (e.g., pain frequency, duration, severity, and cause) 221 and consider the impact of pain on a child's affective state and a child's activities of daily living, 222 including ability to take medications. App-embedded pain assessments should be valid and 223 implemented "in a moment when [pain is] actually happening" (Nurse) for the sake of accuracy. 224 Assessments should also be appropriate to the age, developmental stage, and abilities of the 225 younger child with cancer and should be repeated once a pain management intervention was 226 implemented. Therefore, parent proxy assessments should be embedded for children unable to self-report their pain. Parents also suggested building in capacity to record other aspects of their 227 228 child's physical status that may be related to pain (e.g., bowel movement patterns, nausea and 229 vomiting). Caregivers also discussed the utility of an application that provides developmentally

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

appropriate management advice, specifically citing a need for "proper information for that age
group" (Father of a 5-year-old), whenever pain is reported. Parents felt confident in their abilities
to understand and implement app-based pain management instructions, noting familiarity with
many mobile apps, including health apps, they currently use.

234 Multi-modal physical, psychological, and pharmacological cancer pain management 235 advice was recommended to be provided to parents. App-integrated physical advice included 236 "gentle exercise" (Physical therapist) and stretching. Recommended psychological advice was 237 distraction including "playing" (Father of a 6-year-old), relaxation, and massage, and advice to 238 emotionally support parents in their role as pain caregivers was also encouraged. Parents 239 suggested that the app provide medication advice so long as the information presented was 240 evidenced-based and specific to the context of pediatric cancer. Embedding information on how 241 to manage medication side effects was also suggested.

Fourth, both parents and clinicians expressed a need for a digital intervention to support
the tracking of multidimensional child pain assessment data overtime and provide visual trends
of the data, with the intention of "pick[ing] up patterns" (Oncologist) and supporting familyclinician conversations on pain. Within the app, parents and clinicians also recommended
tracking which pain management strategies were used, and the effectiveness of each strategy. *Predicted challenges associated with implementing a digital pain management intervention*Although participants cited digital health intervention aspects that were considered

beneficial, predicted challenges were also highlighted. Most prominently, participants discussed
potential difficulty in setting a software-embedded pain threshold beyond which healthcare
provider support would be initiated. Participants specifically discussed the subjective nature of
pain and a resultant need to individualize pain thresholds to each child and their family context.

253 Clinicians discussed the potential for the app to add burden for parents who are already strained 254 with caregiving tasks for their child; however, several parents considered use of the app, 255 including once or twice a day, to "be feasible" (Father of a 6-year-old). Clinicians further cited 256 challenges related to how to successfully integrate app-based data monitoring and pain support 257 into their daily workflows. In both cases, participants highlighted that the demonstrated positive 258 impact of the intervention on child pain outcomes must outweigh any burden of use. Participants 259 also worried that frequent pain monitoring facilitated by the app may lead parents and children to 260 become acutely aware and subsequently hypersensitized to pain.

261

#### 262 DISCUSSION

263

264 This study investigated the perspectives of parents of young children with cancer and 265 pediatric cancer care clinicians as they pertain to the design and delivery of digital health 266 interventions targeting childrens' pain. Woven throughout the recommendations were the need 267 for and value of such pain management interventions, especially in light of the limited at-home 268 family-led pain management strategies and the often overwhelming nature of managing pain 269 independently in care settings other than the hospital. Parents and clinicians recommended ways 270 to improve the usability and credibility of such interventions, including the integration of 271 accessibility features and ensuring high-quality pain management content is delivered. 272 Participants recommended needed features for a digital pediatric cancer pain management 273 intervention including embedded multidimensional assessments of pain, multi-modal pain 274 management support, and pain tracking over time. Critical to such assessments was the inclusion 275 of detailed child and family information to support the personalization of provided pain support.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

276 Lastly, stakeholders noted perceived challenges associated with such interventions that should be277 addressed to enhance utility.

Existing literature highlights the critical importance of involving users in the
development and evaluation of apps for specific health conditions, particularly noting the
positive impact on intervention use and effectiveness in achieving an intended health goal (22).
Meaningful stakeholder engagement also enables understanding of the key design features that
will facilitate successful digital interactions, and those features that may limit use (e.g., poor
integration with daily workflows) (22–24).

284 Our study participants reinforced the need for demonstrated usability and credibility 285 within digital health interventions for children, including those targeting young children's cancer 286 pain. Recommendations for accessible language features, the use of lay terms and supplemental 287 health information, and the use of gamification to engage younger users are supported by the 288 existing literature (25,26). Research shows that language barriers in healthcare lead to miscommunication between medical professionals and patients. The implementation of language 289 290 accessibility features improves the quality of healthcare delivery and patient safety (27). App 291 gamification has also been shown to improve the user experience, accessibility, app appeal, user 292 experience, while also having a positive impact on well-being and health outcomes (28).

Our results also show the critical importance of using evidence-based information and clinician involvement in providing app-based health advice to users. These needed app features were endorsed by parents and reflect the findings of a recent systematic review that identified standards for mobile health applications, including that apps should name content authors and their professional qualifications and utilize scientific evidence as the basis for quality content (29). Further, participants in our study recommended the implementation of disclaimers in digital

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

health intervention, again aligning with current health app guidance to disclose possible risks tousers and include warnings that apps are not intended to replace health professional care (29).

301 The need to embed a comprehensive multi-dimensional pain assessment tool and multi-302 modal integrative pain management advice in the app reflects current considerations for the 303 management of cancer-related pain. This recommendation reflects a clinical need to implement a 304 biopsychosocial approach to pain assessment and management, including treating childhood 305 cancer pain with evidence-based pharmacological, psychological, physical, and complementary and alternative medicine techniques (1). Consideration of the time to complete comprehensive 306 307 assessments is also needed as previous research in pediatric cancer pain apps has shown lengthy 308 questionnaires to be a drawback to app use (13).

309 Predicted challenges associated with digital health interventions identified in our study 310 include the potential for the app to burden parents and clinicians. Digital burden has been 311 described previously and studies of high-burden apps often experience high participant attrition 312 rooted in the fundamental challenges of keeping participants engaged in intervention use (30). 313 Difficulties in setting app-based pain thresholds for the initiation of clinician-driven pain 314 management support require the application of a personalized approach to pain care (31) and a 315 need to further tailor co-designed digital interventions to the needs of unique users and contexts. 316 (32)

317 Strengths of our study include the integration of multiple stakeholders' perspectives and 318 our collection of data from two pediatric cancer care centers. Limitations include potential social 319 desirability response bias whereby parents and clinicians may have withheld negative reports 320 about the app concept during interviews with our team and we did obtain the necessary 321 purposive sample. However, participants were informed that all feedback would be valued

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

equally. Additionally, the mode by which we conducted interviews was not standardized due to
the COVID-19 pandemic and we instead held interviews via telephone, online, and in-person.
However, research shows good comparability between the content and depth of interviews
conducted in-person and otherwise (33,34). Finally, we did not conduct participant checking of
either the transcriptions or final thematic analysis.

327 This study provides recommendations from key stakeholders on the design and delivery 328 of digital pediatric cancer pain interventions, which can be readily used by parents, clinicians, 329 engineers, and researchers participating in intervention development. Further, several 330 recommendations gleaned from this process are directly applicable to the design of many 331 pediatric digital health interventions—including those beyond childhood cancer pain. We 332 recommend that future investigators engaged in developing health apps implement a co-design 333 approach within their work. Such participation can reveal critical requirements for intervention design that result in relevance of app content and enhanced clinical effectiveness. The 334 335 recommendations gathered in the present study will become the design principles of our future 336 childhood cancer pain digital research.

337

#### 338 MATERIALS AND METHODS

339

Our reporting is in accordance with the Consolidated Criteria for Reporting Qualitative Research
(COREQ) (15) and Guidance for Reporting Involvement of Patients and the Public—Short Form
(GRIPP2-SF) (16).

343 Study Approach, Setting and Participants

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

344 We used an inductive, qualitative descriptive approach for healthcare research (17), 345 consistent with our goal to understand stakeholder's pain app perceptions and requirements. We 346 recruited participants from the Hospital for Sick Children (SickKids) in Toronto, Ontario, 347 Canada and the Children's Hospital of Orange County (CHOC) in Orange, California, United 348 States. We enrolled English-speaking parents who were the primary caregiver of a child (2-11 349 years) receiving treatment for any cancer diagnosis and who spent at least 25% of their cancer-350 care treatment time outside of the hospital and who had pain of any intensity in the preceding 351 week. Child pain was determined by caregiver proxy-report. English-speaking multidisciplinary 352 clinicians were included if they worked within the hematology/oncology program at either 353 hospital and provided direct pain-related care to children spending at least 25% of their time 354 during cancer treatment at home. We employed a purposive maximum variation sampling 355 strategy with the aim of including parents who varied in age, sex, ethnicity, and their child's 356 diagnosis, and clinicians who varied by healthcare profession.

357 Data Collection

Following ethics board approval at both sites, we obtained informed consent from participants. Participants were asked to complete demographic questionnaires and parents completed a Parental Pain Expression Perceptions (PPEP). The PPEP is a valid and reliable 9item Likert-type scale-based questionnaire that assesses parents' knowledge and attitudes about pain expression in children, where higher scores represent greater misconceptions about pain expression (18).

Individual in-hospital, telephone, or online face-to-face semi-structured interviews were conducted by trained research team members (AC, HGP, LBT) with no previous relationship to participants. Our interview guide was based on the currently developed Pain Squad+ pain

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

367 management app for adolescents with cancer (19) and a study of salient home-based pediatric 368 cancer care issues (20). We audio-recorded all interviews and handwritten field-notes were 369 taken. We conducted interviews concurrent with our analyses until themes relevant to the study's 370 aim reached saturation. 371 Data Analysis 372 Interview audio-recordings were transcribed into electronic documents and uploaded to 373 NVivo software version 11.4.0. Using an inductive approach, transcripts were coded with 374 reference to field-notes by four independent research assistants (SS, KH, TM, and MZ). 375 Following the method of Braun and Clarke (21), we read through the dataset multiple times and 376 discussed its features as a group before creating several coding categories. Coding proceeded 377 using a statement-by-statement approach and codes were organized into themes and subthemes. 378 The creation of themes was an iterative process where themes were continuously reviewed and 379 compared against the narrative exemplars until a final thematic framework was established. The 380 research team (SS, KH, TM, and LJ) met multiple times to ensure themes were accurately 381 reflective of participant narratives, and consensus building exercises were used to refine themes 382 and subthemes where needed.

383

#### 384 Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our parent and clinician participants for kindly taking the time to share their experiences and perceptions related to the design and development of a future app. We would also like to thank Alyssandra Chee-a-tow for her invaluable assistance with interviewing.

389

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

### 390 References

- 391 1. Loeffen EAH, Mulder RL, Font-Gonzalez A, Leroy PLJM, Dick BD, Taddio A, et al.
- Reducing pain and distress related to needle procedures in children with cancer: A clinical
- 393 practice guideline. European Journal of Cancer. 2020 May 1;131:53–67.
- 2. Loeffen EAH, Kremer LCM, Wetering MD van de, Mulder RL, Font-Gonzalez A, Dupuis LL,
  et al. Reducing pain in children with cancer: Methodology for the development of a clinical
  practice guideline. Pediatric Blood & Cancer. 2019 Mar 7;46(3):e27698.
- 397 3. Schulte FSM, Patton M, Alberts NM, Kunin-Batson A, Olson-Bullis BA, Forbes C, et al. Pain
  398 in long-term survivors of childhood cancer: A systematic review of the current state of
  399 knowledge and a call to action from the Children's Oncology Group. Cancer. 2021;127(1):35–
  400 44.
- 401 4. Tutelman PR, Chambers CT, Urquhart R, Fernandez CV, Heathcote LC, Noel M, et al. When
- 402 "a headache is not just a headache": A qualitative examination of parent and child experiences of
- 403 pain after childhood cancer. Psycho Oncol. 2019 Jul 5;28(9):1901–9.
- 5. Stinson JN, Jibb LA, Nguyen C, Nathan PC, Maloney AM, Dupuis LL, et al. Construct
- 405 validity and reliability of a real-time multidimensional smartphone app to assess pain in children
  406 and adolescents with cancer. Pain. 2015 Dec;156(12):2607–15.
- 6. Barbera L, Taylor C, Dudgeon D. Why do patients with cancer visit the emergency
  department near the end of life? Canadian Medical Association Journal. 2010 Apr 5;182(6):563–
  8.
- 410 7. Fortier MA, Wahi A, Bruce C, Maurer EL, Stevenson R. Pain management at home in
- 411 children with cancer: a daily diary study. Pediatric Blood & Cancer. 2014 Jun;61(6):1029–33.
- 8. Jibb LA, Stevens BJ, Nathan PC, Seto E, Cafazzo JA, Johnston DL, et al. Implementation and
  preliminary effectiveness of a real-time pain management smartphone app for adolescents with
- 414 cancer: a multicenter pilot clinical study. Pediatric Blood & Cancer. 2017 Oct;64(10):e26554.
- 415 9. Tiozzo E, Fondi S, Biagioli V, Piccinelli E, Alibrandi F, Gawronski O, et al. Electronic
- 416 Assessment and Tracking of Pain at Home: A Prospective Study in Children With Hematologic
- 417 or Solid Tumors. J Pediatr Oncol Nurs. 2021;38(2):82–93.
- 418 10. Fortier MA, Chung WW, Martinez A, Gago-Masague S, Sender L. Pain buddy: A novel use
  419 of m-health in the management of children's cancer pain. Computers in Biology and Medicine.
  420 2016 Sep 1:76:202–14.
- 421 11. Greenhalgh T, Hinton L, Finlay T, Macfarlane A, Fahy N, Clyde B, et al. Frameworks for
  422 supporting patient and public involvement in research: Systematic review and co-design pilot.
- 423 Heal Expectations Int J Public Participation Heal Care Heal Policy. 2019;22(4):785–801.

It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

424 12. Teychenne M, Apostolopoulos M, Ball K, Olander EK, Opie RS, Rosenbaum S, et al. Key

stakeholder perspectives on the development and real-world implementation of a home-based

426 physical activity program for mothers at risk of postnatal depression: a qualitative study. Bmc

427 Public Health. 2021;21(1):361.

428 13. Jibb LA, Stevens BJ, Nathan PC, Seto E, Cafazzo JA, Johnston DL, et al. Perceptions of
429 adolescents with cancer related to a pain management app and its evaluation: qualitative study

430 nested within a multicenter pilot feasibility study. JMIR mhealth and uhealth. 2018 Apr

431 6;6(4):e80.

432 14. Bird M, McGillion M, Chambers EM, Dix J, Fajardo CJ, Gilmour M, et al. A generative co433 design framework for healthcare innovation: development and application of an end-user
434 engagement framework. Res Involv Engagem. 2021;7(1):12.

- 435 15. Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research
- 436 (COREO): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. International Journal for Quality
- 437 in Health Care. 2007 Dec;19(6):349–57.
- 438 16. Staniszewska S, Brett J, Simera I, Seers K, Mockford C, Goodlad S, et al. GRIPP2 reporting
- 439 checklists: tools to improve reporting of patient and public involvement in research. British
- 440 Medical Journal. 2017 Aug 2;358:j3453.
- 441 17. Bradshaw C, Atkinson S, Doody O. Employing a Qualitative Description Approach in Health
  442 Care Research. Global Qual Nurs Res. 2017;4:233393617742282.

18. Zisk RY, Grey M, MacLaren JE, Kain ZN. Exploring Sociodemographic and Personality
Characteristic Predictors of Parental Pain Perceptions. Anesthesia and analgesia. 2007 Apr

445 1;104(4):790–8.

446 19. Jibb LA, Stevens BJ, Nathan PC, Seto E, Cafazzo JA, Stinson JN. A smartphone-based pain
447 management app for adolescents with cancer: establishing system requirements and a pain care
448 algorithm based on literature review, interviews, and consensus. JMIR Research Protocols.
449 2014;3(1):e15.

- 20. Jibb LA, Chartrand J, Masama T, Johnston DL. Home-Based Pediatric Cancer Care:
  Perspectives and Improvement Suggestions From Children, Family Caregivers, and Clinicians.
  Jco Oncol Pract. 2021;17(6):e827–39.
- 453 21. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in
  454 Psychology. 2006 Jan;3(2):77–101.

455 22. Powell L, Joddrell P, Parker J. Involving Users in the Evaluation of Apps for Specific Health
456 Conditions. Stud Health Technol. 2017;242:646–53.

- 457 23. Floch J, Zettl A, Fricke L, Weisser T, Grut L, Vilarinho T, et al. User Needs in the
- 458 Development of a Health App Ecosystem for Self-Management of Cystic Fibrosis: User-
- 459 Centered Development Approach. Jmir Mhealth Uhealth. 2018;6(5):e113.
- 460 24. Rodriguez DV, Lawrence K, Luu S, Yu JL, Feldthouse DM, Gonzalez J, et al. Development
- 461 of a computer-aided text message platform for user engagement with a digital Diabetes
- 462 Prevention Program: a case study. J Am Medical Informatics Assoc Jamia. 2021;29(1):155–62.
- 463 25. Muñoz AO, Camacho E, Torous J. Marketplace and Literature Review of Spanish Language
  464 Mental Health Apps. Frontiers Digital Heal. 2021;3:615366.
- 465 26. Fijačko N, Gosak L, Cilar L, Novšak A, Creber RM, Skok P, et al. The Effects of
- Gamification and Oral Self-Care on Oral Hygiene in Children: Systematic Search in App Stores
  and Evaluation of Apps. Jmir Mhealth Uhealth. 2020;8(7):e16365.
- 468 27. Gerchow L, Burka LR, Miner S, Squires A. Language Barriers Between Nurses and Patients:
  469 A Scoping Review. Patient Educ Couns. 2020;104(3):534–53.
- 470 28. Johnson D, Deterding S, Kuhn KA, Staneva A, Stoyanov S, Hides L. Gamification for health
  471 and wellbeing: A systematic review of the literature. Internet Interventions. 2016;6:89–106.
- 472 29. Llorens-Vernet P, Miró J. Standards for Mobile Health–Related Apps: Systematic Review
  473 and Development of a Guide. Jmir Mhealth Uhealth. 2020;8(3):e13057.
- 474 30. Amagai S, Pila S, Kaat AJ, Nowinski CJ, Gershon RC. Challenges in Participant
- 475 Engagement and Retention Using Mobile Health Apps: Literature Review. J Med Internet Res.
  476 2022;24(4):e35120.
- 477 31. Cohen SP, Vase LV, Hooten W. Chronic pain: an update on burden, best practices, and new
  478 advances. Lancet. 2021 May; 397(10289):2082-2097.
- 479 32. Arigo D, Suls J. Smartphone apps providing social comparison for health behavior change: a
  480 need for better tailoring to person and context. Mhealth. 2018 Oct; 4: 46.
- 33. Woodyatt CR, Finneran CA, Stephenson R. In-Person Versus Online Focus Group
  Discussions: A Comparative Analysis of Data Quality. Qual Health Res. 2016;26(6):741–9.
- 483 34. Sturges JE, Hanrahan KJ. Comparing Telephone and Face-to-Face Qualitative Interviewing:
- a Research Note. Qualitative Research. 2004 Apr 1;4(1):107–18.

485