

# High Technology Environment and intermittent KC procedure Results on Psychological Variables

Maria A Tallandini & Lucia Genesoni

University of Triest. Italy, and University College London UK

There is a direct link between:  
infant's neuropsychological development

and

the infant's very early experiences within  
primary environment.



The development of the brain systems involved in cognitive processes depend upon the dynamic interaction between genetic factors and environmental influences (Grossmann & Johnson, 2007; Friederici, 2006; Grossmann, Churchill, McKinney, Kodish, Otte, & Greenough, 2003).

## The environmental factors and early experiences play a crucial role in early developmental years in

- **coordinating the timing and patterns of gene expression**, which determines initial brain architecture **during the prenatal and the early postnatal periods** (Fox, Levitt & Nelson, 2010; Hertzman, 2000; Meaney, 2010; Shonkoff, 2010; Shonkoff, Boyce, & McEwen, 2009).
- **the development of basic cognitive processes** (Grossmann et al., 2003; Knudsen, 2004; Pascual Leone & Johnson, 2005).



**Preterm infants are exposed to a very different initial post-natal environment, at a much earlier stage of growth compared to full term infants. This can place them at higher risk of maladaptive development.**

- **Initial experiences are biologically embedded in the infant's early development, having a long-term impact on the mastery of cognitive, language and social skills (Shonkoff, 2010).**
- **These interactions, in some cases, begin as early as the prenatal period (Davis & Sandman, 2010; D'Onofrio et al., 2010).**

## Preterm infant population

the infant at birth presents a different biological stage of development compared to the full term infant.

perinatal environmental stimulation plays an essential role for the child's growth and development.




Environmental influences include :

the type and the modality of stimulations that the infant receives

the inter-relational experiences of the infant with his/her social realm.

**Developmental processes are understood in the context of evolving biological systems as they interact with the social realm** (Grossmann & Johnson, 2007; Sameroff, 2010; Schore, 2010; Shonkoff, 2010).

### CRITICAL PERIODS IN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT\*



IX INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF  
KANGAROO MOTHER CARE  
AHMEDABAD, INDIA 22<sup>ND</sup> TO 25<sup>TH</sup>  
NOVEMBER 2012

## The structure of the brain architecture is established in the prenatal period

From last trimester of pregnancy, the brain is in a critical period of accelerated growth, because of myelination, reorganisation of synapses and the programmed death of cells  
It requires

At a biological level  
a sufficient amount of nutrients (Levitsky & Strupp, 1995). ;

At a psychological level  
regulated interpersonal experiences ( for maturation at a structural and functional level (Fox et al., 2010) ) which are the basis for receiving, interpreting, and acting on information originating in the external world (Hammock & Levitt, 2006).

The refinement in the neural circuits that mediate sensory, emotional and social behaviours are driven by the infant's early experiences within the primal environment, such as the quality of interaction with the caregivers (Feldman & Knudsen, 1998).



Early experiences  
nurturing, stable, and  
predictable, promote healthy brain  
development

Early experiences fraught with  
threat, uncertainty, neglect or  
abuse, can disrupt developing brain  
circuitry,

Experience-dependent mechanisms of brain network formation and maturation may be responsible for such changes when children are placed in a positive or adversely stimulating environment (Fox et al., 2010).

*Enrichment* may lead to a restoration of typical development.

*Negative experiences* produce a greater level of vulnerability in the child's physical and mental health.



Gestation : 24 weeks

IX INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF  
KANGAROO MOTHER CARE  
AHMEDABAD, INDIA 22<sup>ND</sup> TO 25<sup>TH</sup>  
NOVEMBER 2012

- Motor developmental delays are well documented in preterm children
- Language delay is also a well documented problem that occurs on a higher rate in preterm children compared to full term children.
  - All preverbal social skills, such as the ability to share attention to an object with another person (i.e., triadic interaction), are suggested to reflect part of the processes through which children learn language 9 (De Schuymera, De Groote, Beyersc, Strianod, Roeyersa, 2011)

# RESEARCH IN UK 2006-2011

This research has been funded by BLISS- The premature Baby Charity

IX INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF  
KANGAROO MOTHER CARE  
AHMEDABAD, INDIA 22<sup>ND</sup> TO 25<sup>TH</sup>  
NOVEMBER 2012

# Research Aim

**To compare the psychological aspects of the effects of premature birth - with and without intermittent KC - with respect to mothers and infants**

This research has examined the long term effects, one year, of an early intervention for preterm infants and their parents, which provides skin-to-skin contact in the form of Kangaroo Care (KC) procedure during the infant's hospitalization in high-tech NICUs. The implications of this procedure were explored, looking at:

- 1) parental psychological distress,
- 2) parental attachment to and representation of their own infant,
- 3) mother-preterm infant dyadic interaction,
- 4) infant development
- 4) infants' proximal environment

## Research design:

Pre-post longitudinal clinical control study:

Intermittent Kangaroo Care compared  
to  
standard-of-care therapy .

6 time points data collection during the first  
year of the infant's life (Corrected Age).

**Control Group**

**N = 34**

**KC sample**

**N = 56**

**Intervention KC N=33**

Mean = 2038.34 min  
range 840-5625

**Limited KC N=23**

Mean = 513.47 min  
range 160-820

**Total: 90 dyads**



KC



**Incubator care**

**Mother visits the child at least once a day**

**Skin-to-skin contact at least one hour per day**

**Skin-to-skin contact for at least 14 days**

## **TRADITIONAL CARE**

**Incubator care with conventional nursing care**

**Parents invited to visit and touch the child, but no skin-to-skin contact.**

IX INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF  
KANGAROO MOTHER CARE

AHMEDABAD, INDIA 22<sup>ND</sup> TO 25<sup>TH</sup>  
NOVEMBER 2012

# KC Initiated between 28° -26 weeks GA (Mean = 32 weeks GA)

## KC Intervention Group : N = 33

- ▶ at least 60 min per day
- ▶ *at least* 14 consecutive days
- ▶ Mean 2158,17 minutes (range 880-5625)

## Limited KC Group: N = 23

- ▶ at least 60 min per day
- ▶ *less than* 14 consecutive days
- ▶ Mean 478,8 minutes (range 60-820)

## Control Group: N = 34


## Analyses

*Statistical Analyses: Repeated measures ANCOVAS & MANCOVAS with CRIB II as covariate  
Sidak post-hoc comparisons*


# Results

## HOME: family environment at 3 months

### Learning Materials Scale




\* p = .03



*Gross motor developmental scores from 6 to 12 months CA*


## Results



hs

\* = p < .05


## Results



hs

\* = p < .05

## Results



ths

\* = p < .05

## *Predicting Infants' Language Development at 12 months*

Models	Predictor variables	B	SE B	$\beta$
Step 1	CRIB II	.115	.315	.052
	Family SES	1.38	.946	.208
Step 2	CRIB II	-.037	.322	-.016
	Family SES	1.18	.937	.176
	HOME - Learning Materials (3 months)	-1.64	1.23	-.196
	NCAF – Dyadic Interaction (6 months)	.349	.204	.261
Step 3	CRIB II	.110	.249	-.202
	Family SES	1.18	.937	.248
	HOME - Learning Materials (3 months)	-1.78	1.15	-.214
	NCAF – Dyadic Interaction (6 months)	.204	.202	.152
	Dummy Intervention KC	10.94	4.30	.510*
	Dummy Limited KC	8.50	3.23	.429*

*Model 1:  $R^2 = .044$ ;  $F(2, 66) = 1.09$*


*Model 2:  $R^2 = .113$ ;  $F$  Change (2, 66) = 1.80;  $F$  Model (4, 66) = 1.47*

*Model 3:  $R^2 = .255$ ;  $F$  Change (2, 66) = 4.20\*;  $F$  Model (6, 66) = 2.51\**

\*  $p < .05$



## Language Composite Score at 12 months



Note:  
Bayley Composite Score  
Standard population mean: 100  
SD: 15

# RESEARCH IN ITALY

University of Trieste Trieste 2003-2006

This research has been founded by MIUR. Ministry of Education  
Regione Friuli Venezia Giulia. FVG

## Home environment at 1 year (HOME).


		KMC N = 27	TC N = 26	F	Sig.
1 year		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
Total	HOME	42,5 ± 0,6	41,9 ± 0,6	0.06	0.53
	Mother's emotional and verbal sensitivity	10,0 ± 0,3	10,2 ± 0,3	1.88	0.13
Subscale	Punishment: restriction and avoidance	7,2 ± 0,1	7,1 ± 0,1	0.10	0.98
	Physical environment organization	6,0 ± 0,1	5,5 ± 0,1	1.72	0.16
	Appropriate play material supplied	8,9 ± 0,2	8,3 ± 0,2	2.49	0.05
	Mother's involvement with the children	5,7 ± 0,1	5,6 ± 0,1	0.86	0.50
	Appropriate variation in daily stimulation	4,7 ± 0,1	4,6 ± 0,1	4.16	0.01

Ancova with two IV (type of care), five dependent variables (NCAFS scores) and four covariates (infant gender, mother's age, mother's sociability, mother's residence)

# Results

## HOME: family environment at 3 months

### Learning Materials Scale




\*p = .03

# BAYLEY Scale II

1 year of age		KMC N= 26	TC N=25	F	Sig.
		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
<b>BAYLEY</b>	Mental Developmental Index (MDI)	79,0 ± 3,4	71,6 ± 3,5	3.29	0.05
	Psychomotor Developmental Index (MPI)	74,6 ± 3,7	79,7 ± 3,8	0.80	0.46
	Behaviour Total	118,17 ± 3,0	113,83 ± 3,0	3.46	0.04
	<i>Orientation/Engagement</i>	41,5 ± 1,6	39,3 ± 1,7	1.59	0.21
	<i>Emotional Regulation</i>	39,5 ± 1,2	35,1 ± 1,3	5.28	0.01
	<i>Motor Quality</i>	33,9 ± 0,7	34,8 ± 0,8	1.27	0.29

Ancova with two IV (type of care), five dependent variables (NCAFS scores) and four covariates (infant gender, mother's age, mother's sociability, mother's residence)

## Results



hs

\* = p < .05

Early in life, the brain is particularly plastic, allowing for alternative pathways to form typical behaviour, despite lasting structural deficits ( Fox et al. (2010)

Early *enriched* environment, has been shown to greatly improve cognitive, linguistic, and emotional capabilities in humans.

# Conclusion

- When early experiences are fraught with threat, uncertainty, neglect or abuse, the developing brain circuitry is disrupted, with a consequently greater level of vulnerability in the child's physical and mental health.
- When early experiences are nurturing, stable, and predictable, healthy brain development is promoted, and other organ regulatory systems are facilitated.




Evidence from neurobiological studies indicates that the longer we wait before investing in children who are at great risk, the more difficult it is to achieve an optimal outcome (Fox et al., 2010; Shonkoff, 2010).

Early intervention in the child's environment is generally considered to play a pivotal role for those children who have experienced early biological disruption and who are the most disadvantaged at the youngest ages;

Experience-dependent mechanisms of brain network formation and maturation may be responsible for such changes when children are placed in a stimulating environment (Fox et al., 2010).


## Results



\* =  $p < .05$

## Results

### Mothers' PSI-SF total scores across 12 months



\* =  $p < .05$


## Results

### Mother-infant dyadic interaction scores across 12 months

Intervention KC Mothers were better in:

- Responding to the child distress
- Fostering their Cognitive and Socio-emotional growth

Intervention KC Children developed a better capacity to Respond to caregiver



## *Measures Administered to Participants at Each of the Research Time Point*

<b>RESEARCH TIMES</b>	<b><u>ASSESSMENTS</u></b>		
	<b>Self-report measures</b>	<b>Observational measures</b>	<b>Developmental Scale</b>
<b>Time 1</b> After physiological stability as been reached	Demographic questionnaire; Infant medical characteristics; GPP-I; BAI; BDI; PSI-SF; NPI; FSS; PAI; EMS		
<b>Time 2</b> At discharge	BAI; BDI; PSI-SF; NPI; M/PPAQ; FSS; PAI; EMS;	15 minutes videotaped mother-infant interaction during feeding (NCAF)	
<b>Time 3</b> 3 months (CA)	BAI; BDI; PSI-SF; FSS; PAI; EMS; NPI	15 minutes videotaped mother-infant interaction during feeding (NCAF) Home	

## *Measures Administered to Participants at Each of the Research Time Point*

Time 4 6 months (CA)	BAI; BDI; PSI-SF; M/PPAQ	15 minutes videotaped mother-infant interaction during feeding (NCAF)	BSID-III
Time 5 9 months (CA)	BAI; BDI; PSI-SF; FSS	15 minutes videotaped mother-infant interaction during feeding (NCAF)	
Time 6 12 months (CA)	BAI; BDI; PSI-SF; M/PPAQ; FSS; PAI; EMS	15 minutes videotaped mother-infant interaction during feeding (NCAF)	BSID-III



IX INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF  
KANGAROO MOTHER CARE  
AHMEDABAD, INDIA 22<sup>ND</sup> TO 25<sup>TH</sup>  
NOVEMBER 2012

- Much of what we know about the impact of early experience on brain architecture comes from studies of animal and human environmental deprivation (Fox et al., 2010).
- There is compelling evidence from studies of children who have been abused or subjected to chronic neglect in institutionalized settings, which provides support for the theory that significant adversity early in life can induce physiological responses in the service of short term survival benefits. These responses come at considerable cost to long-term adaptive capacities as well as to both physical and mental health (Cicchetti, Rogosch, Gunnar, & Toth, 2010; Pollak, Nelson, Schllak, Roeber, Wewerka, Wilk, et al., 2010).



- A longitudinal study, the Bucharest Early Intervention Project (BEIP), followed three groups of children: an Institutionalised group, children who have lived virtually all their lives in an institutional setting in Bucharest, Romania; a Foster Care group, which includes children who were institutionalised at birth and subsequently placed in foster care; and a Never Institutionalised group, which includes children living with their biological families in the Bucharest region. When the children in the foster group received high-quality foster care before the age of 2, it led to a dramatic increase in IQ (Nelson, Zeanah, Fox, Marshall, Smyke, & Guthrie, 2007) and to greater language skills compared to those children who were placed in foster care after they turned 2 years old. Their skills of the Foster Care children were more similar to those children who had never been institutionalised (Windsor, Glaze, Koga, & the BEIP Core Group, 2007).

# The presence of a specialised network in the “social brain”



Johnson (2005) hypothesized the existence of an interactive specialization: there is a pre-disposition at birth

but

the interaction with the social environment is indispensable in order to reach a complete and specific maturation of neural connexions.

**All relationships modifications, in quality and quantity, leave lasting and deep traces in developmental processes.**

- Experience-dependent mechanisms of brain network formation and maturation may be responsible for such changes when children are placed in a stimulating environment (Fox et al., 2010).
- Enrichment may lead to a restoration of typical development through the use of a growth-facilitating interpersonal environment.
- In conclusion, when early experiences are nurturing, stable, and predictable, healthy brain development is promoted, and other organ regulatory systems are facilitated.
- When, on the other hand, early experiences are fraught with threat, uncertainty, neglect or abuse, the developing brain circuitry is disrupted, with a consequently greater level of vulnerability in the child's physical and mental health.

Recent approaches to the assessment of child development in early childhood requires a careful examination of:

- individual characteristics of child development
- the personality profile of the caregiver.
- an analysis of the general context



**multifactorial evaluation**

## High prevalence/low severity **language** delay in preschool children born very **preterm**.

Foster-Cohen SH; Friesen MD; Champion PR; Woodward LJ Author : [J Dev Behav Pediatr] Journal Of Developmental And Behavioral Pediatrics: JDBP 2010 Oct; Vol. 31 (8), pp. 658-67.

Illness Index ; Social Environment Abstract: **Objective:** To examine the **language development** at corrected age 4 years of a regionally representative cohort of children born very **preterm** (VPT). Of particular interest was the identification of biological and socioenvironmental risk and protective factors that influence VPT children's early **language development**.

**Method:** Data were collected as part of a prospective longitudinal study of 110 VPT (VPT: $\leq$  33 weeks gestation) and 113 full-term children (full term: 37-41 weeks gestation) born in Canterbury, New Zealand from 1998 to 2000. At corrected age 4 years, all children were assessed with the preschool version of the Clinical Evaluation of **Language** Fundamentals. Extensive information was also collected about children's family social background, perinatal health, childrearing environment, education/intervention exposures, and neurodevelopmental progress from birth to age 4.

**Results:** At the age of 4 years, VPT children were characterized by poorer receptive and expressive **language development** than full-term children. These differences persisted after exclusion of children with neurosensory impairment as well as statistical adjustment for the effects of social risk. Within the VPT group, the key predictors of children's overall **language development** were family social risk at birth ( $p = .05$ ), severity of white matter abnormalities on neonatal magnetic resonance imaging ( $p = .49$ ), observed parent-child synchrony ( $p = .001$ ), and concurrent child cognitive ability ( $p = .001$ ). Together, these factors accounted for 45% of the variance in children's total Clinical Evaluation of **Language** Fundamentals-Preschool scores.

**Conclusion:** By preschool age, children born VPT show early emerging mild to moderate **language** delays that are likely to affect their school success and longer-term developmental progress. Findings highlight the importance of potentially modifiable factors such as early **brain** injury and parenting quality in predicting the **language** outcomes of children born VPT. Foster-Cohen SH; Friesen MD; Champion PR; Woodward LJ Author :

Entry Dates: *Date Created:* 20101006 *Date Completed:* 20110202 Update Code: 20111122

- Language Development and The Brain Mechanisms of Preterm Children  
**Authors:** Chen, YX  
Zhu, LQ **Source:** *PROGRESS IN BIOCHEMISTRY AND BIOPHYSICS*;  
OCT, 2011, 38 10, p884-p890, 7p. **Publisher Copyright:** CHINESE ACAD  
SCIENCES, INST BIOPHYSICS **ISSN:** 10003282  
**Abstract:** Language development in preterm children is quite special. Behavioral studies found that preterm children were lagging behind their full term peers in areas such as vocabulary, syntax, and semantic verbal fluency. The effect of preterm birth on language development may last till early adulthood, and the degrees of such lags were influenced by biological and social factors. With the development of brain imaging, studies began to examine the brain development of premature children. Researchers have found group differences in white matter (WM) structures, subcortical gray matter (GM), and the cerebellum among preterm adolescents and their full term peers; yet the brain mechanism of language development in preterm children needs further researches to confirm. The paper describes the latest progress of behavior and neuron studies on preterm children's language development, thus to explore the law of language development and cognitive neuroscience mechanism in preterm children. Research suggests that behavior study and brain research should be combined to extend their advantages, thus to explore the mechanism of the language development of premature children, and to provide unique evidence of language acquirement of normal children.

- Neonatal pain, parenting stress and interaction, in relation to cognitive and motor development at 8 and 18 months in preterm infants **Authors:** Ruth E. Grunau, b, c, Michael F. Whitfield, a, b, c, Julianne Petrie-Thomasc, Anne R. Synnes, b, c, Ivan L. Cepedaa, Adi Keidara, Marilyn Rogersc, Margot MacKayc, Philippa Hubber-Richardc, Debra Johannesenc 10.1016/j.pain.2009.02.014
- **Abstract:** Procedural pain in the neonatal intensive care unit triggers a cascade of physiological, behavioral and hormonal disruptions which may contribute to altered neurodevelopment in infants born very preterm, who undergo prolonged hospitalization at a time of physiological immaturity and rapid brain development. The aim of this study was to examine relationships between cumulative procedural pain (number of skin-breaking procedures from birth to term, adjusted for early illness severity and overall intravenous morphine exposure), and later cognitive, motor abilities and behavior in very preterm infants at 8 and 18 months corrected chronological age (CCA), and further, to evaluate the extent to which parenting factors modulate these relationships over time. Participants were N=211 infants (n=137 born preterm 32 weeks gestational age [GA] and n=74 full-term controls) followed prospectively since birth. Infants with significant neonatal brain injury (periventricular leucomalacia, grade 3 or 4 intraventricular hemorrhage) and/or major sensori-neural impairments, were excluded. Poorer cognition and motor function were associated with higher number of skin-breaking procedures, independent of early illness severity, overall intravenous morphine, and exposure to postnatal steroids. The number of skin-breaking procedures as a marker of neonatal pain was closely related to days on mechanical ventilation. In general, greater overall exposure to intravenous morphine was associated with poorer motor development at 8 months, but not at 18 months CCA, however, specific protocols for morphine administration were not evaluated. Lower parenting stress modulated effects of neonatal pain, only on cognitive outcome at 18 months.



## Sample

Preterm infants and their parents were recruited in the selected hospitals between June 2006 and August 2008. Infants born at less than 37 gestational weeks (GA) and 2000 grams, who reached physiological stability, as decided by the medical team, were eligible for recruitment. Infants with major congenital malformations were excluded from the study, as were cases with any parental psychopathological history and/or any ongoing family social issues. The latter could in fact impinge on the psychological and behavioural variables investigated.

A power analysis calculated a sample size of 125 subjects, in order to detect differences between groups in relation to our primary outcome with an alpha of .05 and a beta of .08, estimating an effect size of medium magnitude equivalent to  $\omega^2$  of .05. Five hundred and sixty six (566) children of less than 2000 grams and less than 37 weeks of gestation were born during this period. Of these 267 (47,17%) were eligible to be approached. Two hundred and thirty eight (238) were approached and a total of 135 were recruited following consecutive admission to the NICU. The remaining 109 refused to take part in the research (see Figure 3.1). Twenty-nine (29) families were not approached even if eligible because of logistical problems.

- The following between-group variables were controlled for infants: gender, parity, singleton versus twins, and medical risk (CRIB II).
- Family between-group control variables were: maternal and paternal age at infant birth, education, ethnicity, occupation, socio-economic status, number of children and mothers' personality characteristics. The latter control variable was necessary in order to exclude any personal characteristic bias in the mother's choice to provide Kangaroo Care to their newborn. Participants were assessed using a questionnaire to collect parental demographic information and infant medical characteristics

The results show that the infants' health status did not influence the family's participation: no significant differences existed between the two groups in relation to the infants' birth gestational age, weight, Apgar score at 5 minutes and medical risk (CRIB II) at the entry of the trial. However, the following differences were found in relation to demographic variables: maternal age,  $F(1, 134) = 9.23$ ;  $p = .003$ , marital status,  $\chi^2(2, 134) = 10.65$ ;  $p = .005$ , mother's occupation,  $\chi^2(3, 134) = 16.16$ ;  $p = .001$ , and family socio-economic status,  $\chi^2(7, 134) = 27.78$ ;  $p < .001$ . As illustrated in Table 1 and 2, the results indicate that those mothers who dropped out of the research group tended to be younger, single, with a higher percentage of unemployment and lower economic status than the mothers who participated.

- Moreover, parental personality characteristics were evaluated administering a standardised questionnaire (GPP-I, Gordon, 1993; see the measure section below for a full description). Socio-economic status was computed using the UK National Statistic Socio-Economic Classification (NS- SEC, 2001). Finally, infant neonatal risk was evaluated using the Clinical Risk Index for Babies (CRIB II) (Parry, 2003), which is calculated by compounding the influence of GA, birth temperature, worst base excess in the first 12 hours of life, and gender. Mettere una delle diapo comn il flow chart dei tests

- The homogeneity between the group of families who dropped out of the research at the
- infant's discharge from hospital (at Time 2) and the families who participated in the
- remaining research times has been investigated through an examination of the families'
- demographic characteristics and the infants' medical condition at birth.

The aim was to answer some specific questions: whether KC applied alongside incubator care in a High-tech NICU promotes the formation of the parent-infant relationship and of bonding, and whether KC has an effect on the specific areas investigated, across the first year of the infants' life. Three groups were compared: Intervention KC, where mothers provided skin-to-skin contact to their infant, Limited KC, where a lower amount of KC was provided and the Control group.

## ..... . .... **When the baby is preterm**

- **H/S watches the mother less than a full term baby**
- **H/S vocalizes and smiles very little**
- **H/S does not clearly communicate h/h needs**
- **H/H interactive capacities are very limited therefore**
- **The interactive process can be damaged**
- **The developmental processes in general can be damaged**
- **The language development can be damaged**
- **The motor development can be damaged**
- **.....**

This study has demonstrated the positive impact of KC intervention on maternal stress, on the mothers' attachment towards their infants, on the mother-infant dyadic interaction, on the infants' home environment and on the infants' gross motor, language and adaptive behaviour development. Moreover, Figure 4.12 provides a visual representation of the predictive power of the KC intervention in relation to its long-term effects on motherinfant dyadic interaction, maternal attachment, parenting stress and language development. This study has also established that the efficacy of KC was stronger when mothers followed the recommended structured implementation (at least 1 hour per day for 14 consecutive days).



Pregnancy, Premature Infants, Neurology, Children, Brain, Body Weight, Child Development, Adolescent Development, Literature Reviews, Comparative Analysis, Meta Analysis, Cognitive Ability, Age Differences

**Abstract:** **Aim:** The aim of this article was to clarify the impact and consequences of very preterm birth (born less than 32wks of gestation) and/or very low birthweight ([VLBW], weighing less than 1500g) on brain volume development throughout childhood and adolescence. **Method:** The computerized databases PubMed, Web of Knowledge, and EMBASE were searched for studies that reported volumetric outcomes during childhood or adolescence using magnetic resonance imaging and included a term-born comparison group. Fifteen studies were identified, encompassing 818 very preterm/VLBW children and 450 term-born peers. Average reductions in the total brain volume, white matter volume, grey matter volume, and in the size of the cerebellum, hippocampus, and corpus callosum were investigated using meta-analytic methods. **Results:** Very preterm/VLBW children were found to have a significantly smaller total brain volume than the comparison group ( $d = -0.58$ ; 95% confidence interval [CI] -0.43 to -0.73;  $p$  less than 0.001), smaller white matter volume ( $d = -0.53$ ; CI -0.40 to -0.67;  $p$  less than 0.001), smaller grey matter volume ( $d = -0.62$ ; CI -0.48 to -0.76;  $p$  less than 0.001), smaller cerebellum ( $d = -0.74$ ; CI -0.56 to -0.92;  $p$  less than 0.001), smaller hippocampus ( $d = -0.47$ ; CI -0.26 to -0.69;  $p$  less than 0.001), and smaller corpus callosum ( $d = -0.71$ ; CI -0.34 to -1.07;  $p$  less than 0.001). Reductions have been associated with decreased general cognitive functioning, and no relations with age at assessment were found. **Interpretation:** Very preterm/VLBW birth is associated with an overall reduction in brain volume, which becomes evident in equally sized reductions in white and grey matter volumes, as well as in volumes of

diverse brain structures throughout childhood and adolescence ●

- This study investigates the Third Edition of the Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development (Bayley-III) and: (1) early patterns of neurodevelopmental performance among preterm infants 8–12 months of age; and (2) correlations between known risk factors and neurodevelopmental outcome of preterm infants in this cohort. Mean Language Index (LI;  $91\pm 15$ ) and Motor Index (MI;  $94\pm 17$ ) were significantly lower than the Cognitive Index (CI;  $102\pm 15$ ,  $p < .01$ ). For the majority (53%) of infants, language development was their weakest domain; for another 39%, motor skills were the weakest area of development. Almost one-quarter (22%) of this cohort had mildly delayed language and motor skills, while 7% had significantly delayed language and motor skills. Regression models revealed severely abnormal head ultrasound significantly predicted MI, LI, and CI. Oxygen dependence at discharge predicted CI, LI, and race/ethnicity predicted LI, MI. Results support the addition of the Language Index to the newly revised Bayley-III Scales. Prediction models of developmental performance confirm known neonatal risk factors and reveal sociodemographic risk factors that call for additional research.

Language delay is a well documented problem that occurs on a higher rate in preterm children compared to full term children. Preverbal social skills, such as the ability to share attention to an object with another person (i.e., triadic interaction), are suggested to reflect part of the processes through which children learn language. This longitudinal study examined preverbal and verbal skills in 25 preterm and 35 full term children in order to investigate if birth status affects language development through the proposed mediating processes of preverbal dyadic and triadic skills. Dyadic initiatives during the still-face episode were assessed at 6months. Triadic responsiveness (gaze following) was examined at 9 and 14months. Triadic initiatives (joint attention and behavioral request) were also assessed at 14months. At 30months, receptive and expressive language was examined. The data showed group differences in 6-month dyadic initiatives, 9-month triadic responsiveness, 14-month triadic behavioral request initiatives and 30-month receptive and expressive language skills at the expense of the preterm children, confirming their risk for a less favorable preverbal and verbal development. Multiple mediation analyses confirmed the hypothesis that birth status affects language development partially through preverbal skills, which is important for clinical practice.

Language delay is a well documented problem that occurs on a higher rate in preterm children compared to full term children. Preverbal social skills, such as the ability to share attention to an object with another person (i.e., triadic interaction), are suggested to reflect part of the processes through which children learn language. This longitudinal study examined preverbal and verbal skills in 25 preterm and 35 full term children in order to investigate if birth status affects language development through the proposed mediating processes of preverbal dyadic and triadic skills. Dyadic initiatives during the still-face episode were assessed at 6months. Triadic responsiveness (gaze following) was examined at 9 and 14months. Triadic initiatives (joint attention and behavioral request) were also assessed at 14months. At 30months, receptive and expressive language was examined. The data showed group differences in 6-month dyadic initiatives, 9-month triadic responsiveness, 14-month triadic behavioral request initiatives and 30-month receptive and expressive language skills at the expense of the preterm children, confirming their risk for a less favorable preverbal and verbal development. Multiple mediation analyses confirmed the hypothesis that birth status affects language development partially through preverbal skills, which is important for clinical practice.

Aim: The aim of this article was to clarify the impact and consequences of very preterm birth (born less than 32wks of gestation) and/or very low birthweight ([VLBW], weighing less than 1500g) on brain volume development throughout childhood and adolescence. Method: The computerized databases PubMed, Web of Knowledge, and EMBASE were searched for studies that reported volumetric outcomes during childhood or adolescence using magnetic resonance imaging and included a term-born comparison group. Fifteen studies were identified, encompassing 818 very preterm/VLBW children and 450 term-born peers. Average reductions in the total brain volume, white matter volume, grey matter volume, and in the size of the cerebellum, hippocampus, and corpus callosum were investigated using meta-analytic methods. Results: Very preterm/VLBW children were found to have a significantly smaller total brain volume than the comparison group ( $d = -0.58$ ; 95% confidence interval [CI]  $-0.43$  to  $-0.73$ ;  $p$  less than 0.001), smaller white matter volume ( $d = -0.53$ ; CI  $-0.40$  to  $-0.67$ ;  $p$  less than 0.001), smaller grey matter volume ( $d = -0.62$ ; CI  $-0.48$  to  $-0.76$ ;  $p$  less than 0.001), smaller cerebellum ( $d = -0.74$ ; CI  $-0.56$  to  $-0.92$ ;  $p$  less than 0.001), smaller hippocampus ( $d = -0.47$ ; CI  $-0.26$  to  $-0.69$ ;  $p$  less than 0.001), and smaller corpus callosum ( $d = -0.71$ ; CI  $-0.34$  to  $-1.07$ ;  $p$  less than 0.001). Reductions have been associated with decreased general cognitive functioning, and no relations with age at assessment were found. Interpretation: Very preterm/VLBW birth is associated with an overall reduction in brain volume, which becomes evident in equally sized reductions in white and grey matter volumes, as well as in volumes of diverse brain structures throughout childhood and adolescence.

Procedural pain in the neonatal intensive care unit triggers a cascade of physiological, behavioral and hormonal disruptions which may contribute to altered neurodevelopment in infants born very preterm, who undergo prolonged hospitalization at a time of physiological immaturity and rapid brain development. The aim of this study was to examine relationships between cumulative procedural pain (number of skin-breaking procedures from birth to term, adjusted for early illness severity and overall intravenous morphine exposure), and later cognitive, motor abilities and behavior in very preterm infants at 8 and 18 months corrected chronological age (CCA), and further, to evaluate the extent to which parenting factors modulate these relationships over time. Participants were N=211 infants (n=137 born preterm 32 weeks gestational age [GA] and n=74 full-term controls) followed prospectively since birth. Infants with significant neonatal brain injury (periventricular leucomalacia, grade 3 or 4 intraventricular hemorrhage) and/or major sensori-neural impairments, were excluded. Poorer cognition and motor function were associated with higher number of skin-breaking procedures, independent of early illness severity, overall intravenous morphine, and exposure to postnatal steroids. The number of skin-breaking procedures as a marker of neonatal pain was closely related to days on mechanical ventilation. In general, greater overall exposure to intravenous morphine was associated with poorer motor development at 8 months, but not at 18 months CCA, however, specific protocols for morphine administration were not evaluated. Lower parenting stress modulated effects of neonatal pain, only on cognitive outcome at 18 months.

Low-frequency oscillations in cerebral blood flow that are suggestive of resting-state brain activity have recently been reported, but no study on the development of resting-state brain activity in preterm infants has been performed. The objective of this study was to measure the cerebral blood flow oscillations, which are assumed to represent brain function in the resting state, in preterm and term infants of the same postconceptional age. The subjects were 9 preterm infants who had reached full term (gestational age (GA): 23–34weeks, postconceptional age: 37–46weeks) and 10 term infants (GA: 37–40weeks, postconceptional age: 37–41weeks). Their changes in concentration of oxyhemoglobin ([oxyHb]) and deoxyhemoglobin ([deoxyHb]) were measured in the parieto-temporal region during quiet sleep using multi-channel near-infrared spectroscopy, and the power spectral densities (PSD) of the oscillations in the concentrations of these molecules were analyzed and compared. The preterm infants displayed a higher proportion of 0.06–0.10Hz low frequency oscillations of [oxyHb] and [deoxyHb] than the term infants, and the gestational age and the proportion of low frequency oscillations were inversely correlated. These findings suggest that resting-state cerebral blood flow oscillations differ between preterm and term infants, and that the development of circulatory regulation and nerve activity in preterm infants are influenced by the extrauterine environment.

# Neonatal Intensive Care Unit

Temporary separation of the infant from his/her mother



Primary care of the baby is transferred to the professional providers from the mother



Limitation of crucial physical and psychological aspects of infant-parent contact



Disruption of parent-infant reciprocal bonding



Risk of parenting disorder











# Specific Aims

- **To investigate the psychological impact of KC on single infants and twins regarding:**
  - **Maternal anxiety**
  - **Infants' interactive signals**
  - **Mother-infant relationship**

## *Secondary and long-term aims:*

- **To find if there are maternal psychological characteristics that favour the KC Procedure**
- **To verify KMC long-term effect at 3, 6, and 12 months**

## **Groups were similar ( $p > .05$ ) for:**

**Gestational age; weight at birth; type of delivery; sex;  
Apgar 1 min.; Apgar 5 min;**

**Mother's age; mother's education; mother's occupation;  
medical checks, mother's personality characteristics.**

**Father's education; father's occupation; father's age;**

**Presence of both parents.**

# Maternal personality characteristics Gordon (Anova)

	KMC N= 40 Mean &SD	TC N=42 Mean & SD	F	Sig. .05
Ascendency	52,73 ± 30,087	54,60 ± 28,004	0.049	0.826
Responsibility	70,05 ± 26,786	73,48 ± 27,126	0.190	0.665
Emotional stability	66,18 ± 24,377	58,24 ± 27,866	1.067	0.307
Sociability	43,32 ± 25,674	58,32 ± 28,231	3.595	0.064
Self-esteem	60,68 ± 28,997	63,12 ± 30,741	0.078	0.782
Caution	64,36 ± 25,205	62,76 ± 25,523	0.047	0.830
Original thought	48,05 ± 29,538	50,88 ± 33,714	0.093	0.762
Personal relationships	62,36 ± 28,337	54,40 ± 29,679	0.879	0.354
Vigour	65,86 ± 27,691	58,36 ± 27,936	0.851	0.361


# Stress at birth

		KMC N= 40	TC N=42	F	Sig.
		Mean & SD	Mean & SD		.05
Total	Parent Stress Index	131,82 ± 15,739	133,90 ± 14,557	0.383	0.538
	Parental Distress	46,15 ± 5,060	46,71 ± 4,587	0.273	0.603
Subscales	Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	45,46 ± 7,085	46,26 ± 6,382	0.286	0.594
	Difficult Child	40,21 ± 6,590	40,93 ± 5,615	0.284	0.596
	Defensive Responding	27,67 ± 3,489	27,38 ± 2,723	0.170	0.681

## Stress at discharge (Anova)

		KMC N= 40	TC N=42	F	Sig.
		Mean & SD	Mean & SD		.05
Total	Parent Stress Index	<u>143,60 ± 13,619</u>	<u>135,79 ± 16,153</u>	5.582	0.020
	Parental Distress	<u>46,68 ± 5,595</u>	<u>45,17 ± 7.115</u>	6.120	0.010
Subscales	Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	<u>50,43 ± 5,420</u>	<u>46,05 ± 7,050</u>	9.865	0.002
	Difficult Child	44,55 ± 6,361	43,67 ± 6,599	0.380	0.540
	Defensive Responding	<u>28,65 ± 3,215</u>	<u>26,83 ± 3,741</u>	5.537	0.020





# Interaction at discharge

		KMC N= 40	TC N=42	F	Sig.
		Mean & SD	Mean & SD		.05
<b>Total</b>	<b>NCAFS</b>	<u>47,97 ± 8,70</u>	<u>43,73 ± 5,96</u>	6.432	<b>0.013</b>
	<b>Sensitivity</b>	13,18 ± 2,58	12,83 ± 2,02	0.462	0.499
<b>Subscales</b>	<b>Response to distress</b>	9,64 ± 1,44	9,90 ± 1,23	0.736	0.394
	<b>Socio emotional growth fostering</b>	<u>10,79 ± 2,66</u>	<u>9,40 ± 2,32</u>	6.190	<b>0.015</b>
	<b>Cognitive fostering</b>	<u>4,26 ± 1,68</u>	<u>3,30 ± 1,20</u>	8.387	<b>0.005</b>
	<b>Child's clarity of cues</b>	<u>6,92± 2,26</u>	<u>5,65 ± 1,67</u>	8.110	<b>0.006</b>
	<b>Child responsiveness</b>	<u>3,13± 1,52</u>	<u>2,08 ± 0,69</u>	15.746	<b>0.001</b>

# **STUDY 2**

## **(Twins)**

# TWINS

**22 preterm twins newborns and their mothers  
divided into  
target group (9) and control group (13)**

# Stress at birth (Twins)

		KMC N= 9	TC N=13	F	Sig.
		Mean & SD	Mean & SD		.05
<b>Total</b>	<b>Parent Stress Index</b>	<b>136,00 ± 15,775</b>	<b>136,31 ± 16,250</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.966</b>
	<b>Parental Distress</b>	<b>47,25 ± 5,625</b>	<b>48,00 ± 4,203</b>	<b>0.122</b>	<b>0.731</b>
<b>Subscales</b>	<b>Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction</b>	<b>47,00 ± 7,270</b>	<b>47,15 ± 7,221</b>	<b>0.002</b>	<b>0.963</b>
	<b>Difficult Child</b>	<b>41,75 ± 7,166</b>	<b>41,15 ± 5,800</b>	<b>0.044</b>	<b>0.836</b>
	<b>Defensive Responding</b>	<b>28,00 ± 3,817</b>	<b>28,62 ± 2,103</b>	<b>0.230</b>	<b>0.637</b>

# Stress at discharge (Twins)

		KMC N= 9	TC N=13	F	Sig.
		Mean & SD	Mean & SD		.05
Total	Parent Stress Index	148,78 ± 13,737	135,54 ± 19,355	3.105	0.090
	Parental Distress	52,00 ± 5,339	47,15 ± 5,771	3.980	0.060
Subscales	Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	<u>51,56 ± 4,531</u>	<u>44,46 ± 9,342</u>	4.418	<b>0.050</b>
	Difficult Child	45,44 ± 7,073	43,31 ± 5,978	0.586	0.450
	Defensive Responding	30,67 ± 3,937	28,00 ± 3,317	2.955	0.100

# Stress at discharge

## General sample

		KMC N= 40	TC N=42	F	Sig.
		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
Total	Parent Stress Index	143,60 ± 13,619	135,79 ± 16,153	5,582	0,020
	Parental Distress	46,68 ± 5,595	45,17 ± 7,115	6,120	0,010
Subscales	Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	50,43 ± 5,420	46,05 ± 7,050	9,865	0,002
	Difficult Child	44,55 ± 6,361	43,67 ± 6,599	0,380	0,540
	Defensive Responding	28,65 ± 3,215	26,83 ± 3,741	5,537	0,020

## Twins

		KMC N= 9	TC N=13	F	Sig.
		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
Total	Parent Stress Index	148,78 ± 13,737	135,54 ± 19,355	3,105	0,090
	Parental Distress	52,00 ± 5,339	47,15 ± 5,771	3,980	0,060
Subscales	Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	51,56 ± 4,531	44,46 ± 9,342	4,418	0,050
	Difficult Child	45,44 ± 7,073	43,31 ± 5,978	0,586	0,450
	Defensive Responding	30,67 ± 3,937	28,00 ± 3,317	2,955	0,100

# Interaction at discharge (Twins)

		KMC N= 9	TC N=13	F	Sig.
		Mean & SD	Mean & SD		.05
<b>Total</b>	<b>NCAFS</b>	<u>48,56 ± 8,70</u>	<u>42,00 ± 5,53</u>	4.088	<b>0.050</b>
	Sensitivity to baby's signals	12,78 ± 3,07	12,15 ± 1,14	0.454	0.508
	Response to distress	10,67 ± 0,500	10,08 ± 1,382	1.484	0.237
<b>Subscale</b>	Socio emotional growth fostering	<u>10,44 ± 2,78</u>	<u>8,15 ± 1,864</u>	5.371	<b>0.031</b>
	Cognitive fostering	<u>4,78 ± 1,48</u>	<u>3,15 ± 1,21</u>	7.958	<b>0.011</b>
	Child's clarity of cues	7,00 ± 1,87	5,77 ± 1,42	3.080	0.095
	Child responsiveness	<u>3,33 ± 1,58</u>	<u>1,92 ± 0,494</u>	9.228	<b>0.006</b>



## General sample

		KMC N= 40	TC N=42	F	Sig.
		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
Total	NCAFS	47,97 ± 8,70	43,73 ± 5,96	6.432	0.013
	Sensitivity	13,18 ± 2,58	12,83 ± 2,02	0.462	0.499
	Response to distress	9,64 ± 1,44	9,90 ± 1,23	0.736	0.394
Subscales	Socio emotional growth fostering	10,79 ± 2,66	9,40 ± 2,32	6.190	0.015
	Cognitive fostering	4,26 ± 1,68	3,30 ± 1,20	8.387	0.005
	Child's clarity of cues	6,92± 2,26	5,65 ± 1,67	8.110	0.006
	Child responsiveness	3,13± 1,52	2,08 ± 0,69	15.746	0.001

## Twins

		KMC N= 9	TC N=13	F	Sig.
		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
Total	NCAFS	48,56 ± 8,70	42,00 ± 5,53	4.088	0.050
	Sensitivity	12,78 ± 3,07	12,15 ± 1,14	0.454	0.508
	Response to distress	10,67 ± 0,500	10,08 ± 1,382	1.484	0.237
Subscales	Socio emotional growth fostering	10,44 ± 2,78	8,15 ± 1,864	5.371	0.031
	Cognitive fostering	4,78 ± 1,48	3,15 ± 1,21	7.958	0.011
	Child's clarity of cues	7,00 ± 1,87	5,77 ± 1,42	3.080	0.095
	Child responsiveness	3,33 ± 1,58	1,92 ± 0,494	9.228	0.006

# STUDY 3

# Aims study 3

To verify **KMC long-term influence:**

1. on mothers' emotional state: **stress**
2. on mother-child **interaction**
3. On **family style**
4. On the baby's **cognitive development**
5. the **length of the effect at 3-6-12 months**

# METHODOLOGY

(STUDY 3)

## Participants

64 preterm babies and their mothers

30 dyads

**KMC**

Mother practices KMC

34 dyads

**CT**

*mother is invited to visit her child  
and to take him/her in her arms if  
she so wishes*


### Inclusion criteria:

- Infant weight < 1800 g.
- Gestational age < 37 weeks
- Absence of any malformation in the baby
- Presence of both parents


# Research Plan

D  
A  
T  
A

C  
O  
L  
L  
E  
C  
T  
I  
O  
N



# Mothers' stress differences between groups



# Interaction at discharge

		KMC N= 30	TC N=33	F	Sig.
		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
<b>Total</b>	<b>NCAFS</b>	<b>44,4 ± 1,8</b>	<b>44,2 ± 1,7</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.96</b>
	<b>Sensitivity to baby's signals</b>	<b>13,2 ± 0,4</b>	<b>13,4 ± 0,4</b>	<b>0.42</b>	<b>0.83</b>
<b>Subscale</b>	<b>Capacity of alleviating the b's uneasiness</b>	<b>9,1 ± 0,3</b>	<b>9,5 ± 0,3</b>	<b>1.49</b>	<b>0.21</b>
	<b>Socio emotional growth fostering</b>	<b>9,9 ± 0,6</b>	<b>10,1 ± 0,6</b>	<b>1.03</b>	<b>0.41</b>
	<b>Cognitive fostering</b>	<b>3,7 ± 0,3</b>	<b>3,4 ± 0,3</b>	<b>0.30</b>	<b>0.91</b>
	<b>Child's clarity of cues</b>	<b>5,7 ± 0,5</b>	<b>5,41 ± 0,4</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.50</b>
	<b>Child responsiveness</b>	<b>2,7 ± 0,3</b>	<b>2,37 ± 0,3</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>0.26</b>

Ancova with two IV (type of care), five dependent variables (PSI/SF scores) and four covariates (infant gender, mother's age, mother's sociability, mother's residence)

# Interaction at 3 months

		KMC N= 30	TC N=33	F	Sig.
		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
er Total	NCAFS	51,0 ± 1,9	44,7 ± 1,9	1.12	0.36
	Sensitivity	13,6 ± 0,5	12,2 ± 0,4	1.21	0.32
	Response to baby's distress	10,1 ± 0,2	9,2 ± 0,2	1.42	0.23
	Socio emotional growth fostering	11,1 ± 0,5	8,8 ± 0,5	1.89	0.11
	Cognitive fostering	4,4 ± 0,4	3,5 ± 0,4	0.78	0.57
	Child's clarity of cues	7,7 ± 0,5	7,2 ± 0,5	0.46	0.80
	Child responsiveness	4,2 ± 0,4	3,4 ± 0,4	0.47	0.80

Ancova with two IV (type of care), five dependent variables (PSI/SF scores) and four covariates (infant gender, mother's age, mother's sociability, mother's residence)




# Interaction at 6 months

		(STUDY 3)			
		KMC	TC	F	Sig.
		N= 29	N=34		
		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
Total	NCAFS	57,8 ± 1,9	47,5 ± 1,8	4.58	0.00
	Sensitivity to baby's signals	13,6 ± 0,3	11,9 ± 0,3	4.12	0.00
Subscale	Response to distress	10,9 ± 0,2	10,3 ± 0,2	2.29	0.06
	Baby's Socio emotional growth fostering	12,1 ± 0,5	9,6 ± 0,4	4.31	0.00
	Baby's cognitive development fostering	5,9 ± 0,5	4,7 ± 0,4	1.64	0.16
	Child's capacity to produce clear signals to the caregiver	9,7 ± 0,6	6,8 ± 0,5	2.38	0.05
	Child responsiveness	6,38 ± 0,5	3,5 ± 0,5	0.48	0.00

Ancova with two IV (type of care), five dependent variables (PSI/SF scores) and four covariates (infant gender, mother's age, mother's sociability, mother's residence)

# Interaction mother-preterm baby: group analysis



## Home environment at 1 year (HOME).

		KMC N = 27	TC N = 26	F	Sig.
1 year		Mean e DS	Mean e DS		.05
Total	HOME	42,5 ± 0,6	41,9 ± 0,6	0.06	0.53
	Mother's emotional and verbal sensitivity	10,0 ± 0,3	10,2 ± 0,3	1.88	0.13
Subscale	Punishment: restriction and avoidance	7,2 ± 0,1	7,1 ± 0,1	0.10	0.98
	Physical environment organization	6,0 ± 0,1	5,5 ± 0,1	1.72	0.16
	Appropriate play material supplied	8,9 ± 0,2	8,3 ± 0,2	2.49	0.05
	Mother's involvement with the children	5,7 ± 0,1	5,6 ± 0,1	0.86	0.50
	Appropriate variation in daily stimulation	4,7 ± 0,1	4,6 ± 0,1	4.16	0.01

Ancova with two IV (type of care), five dependent variables (NCAFS scores) and four covariates (infant gender, mother's age, mother's sociability, mother's residence)

# RESULTS

1. **Stress:** *KC mothers had a lower level of stress than CT mothers at discharge.*

2. **Interaction:** *at six months of corrected age (babies) the KC dyads showed better interactivity than CT dyads:*

*- higher level of sensitivity to baby's signals*

*- behaviour more conducive to favouring the social growth*

*higher capacity to produce clear signals for the caregiver*

*- higher capacity to provide appropriate responses to the caregiver*

3. **Home environment:** *at 1 year corrected age KMC parents provide the baby with more appropriate play material and more varied stimuli during the day than CT parents*

*the day*

4. **Cognitive development:** *at 1 year corrected age KC babies have reached a higher index of cognitive development than CT babies.*

# Discordances in the INTERACTIVE PROFILE

## (Tallandini, Scalembra 2006)

At discharge, the behaviour of KC parents is more conducive to social and cognitive growth and KC infants show a greater capacity for *making their needs understood and higher responsivity* than CT dyads

## (STUDY 3)

At discharge, KC dyads show an interactive profile similar to CT dyads

Study 1 groups are statistically different from study 3 group \* ( $p > .05$ ) for:

- number of children per mother
- type of delivery (caesarian)
- mother's age
- 

- KMC days (24,4 ± 11,0)
- KMC minutes (2933,4 ± 1237,3)
- KMC per day (123,7 ± 18)

(more children)  
(more caesarian deliveries)  
(older mothers)

- (13,4 ± 7,1)  $F=18.12; Sig.= 0.00$
- (1834,2 ± 813)  $F=14.14; Sig.= 0.00$
- (156,5 ± 43)  $F=10.01; Sig.= 0.00$

# Is there a dose effect?

**Group 1**            **KC = 630-1407 minutes**

**Group 2**            **KC = 1408-2067 minutes**

**Group 3**            **KC = 2068-3745 minutes**

# HOMOGENEITY

The three groups are statistically similar ( $p > .05$ ) for:

## Infants

Gestational age, gender; birth weight; Apgar 1 min.; Apgar 5 min.; neonatal risk index (CRIB); type of delivery; number of twins; age in days when the infant starts KC; infant's weight when h/s starts and terminates KC; hospital stay duration; type of feeding.

## Mothers

Mothers' age; mothers' education; mothers' work; children's number; medical checks; mothers' residence during baby's hospitalization; 9 out of 10 personality characteristics (GPPI).

## Fathers

Fathers' age; fathers' education; fathers' work.

## Does the duration of KMC application influence the mothers' emotional *stress* at discharge?

	KC 630-1407 min N=10 Media e DS	KC 1408-2067 min N=11 Media e DS	KC 2200-3800 min N=9 Media e DS	F	Sig. .05
Parent Stress Index	78,4 ± 11,6	71,5 ± 11,0	68,9 ± 14,3	1,55	0,23
Parental Distress	26,3 ± 2,9	26,2 ± 7,5	21,1 ± 5,8	2,43	0,11
Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	23,6 ± 6,6	20,0 ± 4,7	20,0 ± 5,3	1,39	0,26
Difficult Child	28,5 ± 6,4	25,4 ± 5,1	27,8 ± 7,7	0,70	0,51
Defensive Responses	15,5 ± 1,6	14,4 ± 3,1	12,7 ± 3,9	2,18	0,13

Ahmedabad  
Anova with three IV (KMC length) and 5 DV (PSI/SF subscales).



Does the duration of KMC application influence the mothers' emotional *stress* at 3 months ?

	KC 630-1407 min N=10 Media e DS	KC 1408-2067 min N=11 Media e DS	KC 2200-3800 min N=9 Media e DS	F	Sig. .05
Parent Stress Index	73,8 ± 10,3	63,6 ± 10,5	57,4 ± 14,7	4,66	0,02
Parental Distress	27,5 ± 6,1	23,1 ± 5,3	19,3 ± 5,7	4,84	0,02
Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	22,4 ± 3,6	17,7 ± 4,3	17,0 ± 4,5	4,90	0,01
Difficult Child	23,9 ± 6,0	22,8 ± 5,0	21,1 ± 5,6	0,61	0,55
Defensive Responses	15,7 ± 4,2	13,5 ± 3,3	11,0 ± 3,3	3,90	0,03

## Does the duration of KMC application influence the mothers' emotional *stress* at 6 months ?

	KC 630-1407 min N=10 Media e DS	KC 1408-2067 min N=11 Media e DS	KC 2200-3800 min N=9 Media e DS	F	Sig. .05
Parent Stress Index	69,2 ± 9,2	54,3 ± 10,9	65,7 ± 21,6	2,56	0,09
Parental Distress	23,9 ± 3,9	19,7 ± 6,8	23,4 ± 9,9	0,96	0,39
Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	22,4 ± 4,2	17,1 ± 3,1	18,9 ± 5,5	3,69	0,04
Difficult Child	22,9 ± 3,7	17,6 ± 3,5	20,3 ± 4,8	3,34	0,05
Defensive Responses	13,8 ± 3,3	11,2 ± 5,0	13,8 ± 6,6	0,77	0,47

# Does the duration of KMC application influence the dyadic interaction at discharge?

	KC 630-1407 min N=10 Media e DS	KC 1408-2067 min N=11 Media e Ds	KC 2068-3745 min N=9 Media e DS	F	Sig. .05
Nursing Child Assessment Feeding Scale	39,6 ± 6,8	44,9 ± 7,9	50,3 ± 6,7	5,25	0,01
Sensitivity to baby's signals	12,7 ± 2,2	13,1 ± 1,4	13,2 ± 2,0	0,95	0,39
Capacity of alleviating the baby's uneasiness	8,5 ± 1,3	9,8 ± 1,1	8,9 ± 1,5	2,77	0,80
Socio emotional growth fostering	8,9 ± 2,6	8,9 ± 2,9	12,2 ± 1,4	5,73	0,01
Baby's cognitive development fostering	2,9 ± 1,4	3,9 ± 1,5	4,7 ± 1,3	3,63	0,04
Baby's capacity to produce clear signals to the caregiver	4,5 ± 1,6	6,3 ± 2,7	7,0 ± 1,5	3,84	0,03
Baby's capacity of answering the caregiver	2,1 ± 0,3	2,9 ± 1,6	3,7 ± 2,3	2,32	0,12

# Does the duration of KMC application influence the mothers' emotional *stress* at 1 year?

	KC 630-1407 min N=10 Media e DS	KC 1408-2067 min N=11 Media e DS	KC 2200-3800 min N=9 Media e DS	F	Sig. .05
Parent Stress Index	72,6 ± 12,8	66,1 ± 18,8	65,4 ± 21,1	0,44	0,65
Parental Distress	27,1 ± 7,1	23,1 ± 6,9	25,1 ± 9,7	0,56	0,58
Parent Child Dysfunctional Interaction	23,0 ± 10,4	19,1 ± 4,6	18,1 ± 5,3	1,15	0,33
Difficult Child	25,0 ± 4,5	22,7 ± 6,8	20,4 ± 8,2	1,04	0,37
Defensive Responses	14,6 ± 2,3	12,6 ± 4,1	13,7 ± 4,3	0,50	0,61

# Does the duration of KMC application influence the dyadic interaction at 3 months?

	KC 630-1407 min N=10	KC 1408-2067 min N=11	KC 2068-3745 min N=9	F	Sig.
	Media e DS	Media e DS	Media e DS		.05
<b>Nursing Child Assessment Feeding Scale</b>	48,6 ± 7,4	49,2 ± 11,1	53,4 ± 8,0	0,79	0,46
<b>Sensitivity to baby's signals</b>	13,3 ± 2,5	13,2 ± 2,3	14,0 ± 1,4	0,40	0,67
<b>Capacity of alleviating the baby's uneasiness</b>	9,7 ± 1,1	9,7 ± 1,1	10,0 ± 0,5	0,29	0,75
<b>Socio-emotional growth fostering</b>	10,9 ± 2,2	9,7 ± 2,7	11,8 ± 1,8	1,98	0,16
<b>Baby's cognitive development fostering</b>	4,6 ± 1,8	3,9 ± 2,0	4,4 ± 1,9	0,38	0,68
<b>Baby's capacity to produce clear signals to the caregiver</b>	6,8 ± 1,4	8,1 ± 3,2	8,7 ± 2,4	1,43	0,26
<b>Baby's capacity of answering the caregiver</b>	3,3 ± 1,8	4,5 ± 1,9	4,6 ± 2,3	1,29	0,29

# Does the duration of KMC application influence the dyadic interaction at 6 months?

	KC 630-1407 min N=10 Media e DS	KC 1408-2067 min N=10 Media e Ds	KC 2068-3745 min N=9 Media e DS	F	Sig. .05
Nursing Child Assessment Feeding Scale	56,9 ± 7,4	62,3 ± 9,4	52,8 ± 10,2	2,68	0,09
Sensitivity to baby's signals	12,9 ± 1,7	14,6 ± 1,6	13,2 ± 1,9	2,74	0,08
Capacity of alleviating the baby's uneasiness	10,8 ± 0,6	10,9 ± 0,3	11,0 ± 0,0	0,55	0,58
Socio-emotional growth fostering	12,1 ± 1,6	13,2 ± 1,9	10,7 ± 1,9	4,58	0,02
Baby's cognitive development fostering	6,4 ± 2,0	6,5 ± 2,3	4,9 ± 2,9	1,28	0,29
Baby's capacity to produce clear signals to the caregiver	9,2 ± 2,3	10,3 ± 2,9	8,3 ± 2,2	1,43	0,26
Baby's capacity of answering the caregiver	6,5 ± 2,8	6,8 ± 2,3	4,7 ± 2,4	1,95	0,16

# RESULTS "dose effect"

- Stress:
- at *3 months corrected age* in mothers who practiced more hours of *KMC* showed *less total stress*
  - at *6 months corrected age*, the group with *intermediate to high KMC* presented *less stress generated by the baby's characteristics and by difficulties of h/h interaction*
- Interaction:
- at *discharge* mothers who practiced more hours of *KMC* had a better general interactive style
  - at *6 months corrected age*, the behaviour of parents who practised an intermediate quantity of *KMC* was more conducive to socio-emotional growth.



In general, more time dedicated to *KMC* has a positive *influence* on the mothers' stress levels and mother-baby dyadic interaction

- **Johnson M (2009) social brain**

**+**

- **Environment influences**

**=**



# RESULTS

## KMC

---

**Stress at discharge**

**lower than CT mothers**

**Dyad Interaction at 6 months (corrected age)**

**better interactivity  
greater sensitivity to baby's signals  
behaviour more conducive to social growth  
higher capacity to give appropriate responses to caregiver**

**Family interaction with baby (1 year corrected age)**

**more appropriate play material  
more variety in stimulation**

**Cognitive development**

**Higher than CT babies**

# Conclusion

1. KMC is a very useful procedure as it helps to overcome mothers' psychological difficulties linked to preterm delivery.
2. KMC is very useful for the baby fostering h/h emotionl, social, and cognitive growth in the indicated areas.
3. KMC can have a positive influence on the family environment.
4. In general, more time dedicated to KMC has a positive *influence* on the mothers' stress levels and mother-baby dyadic interaction

- ***C. Scalembra***
- ***P. Corbatto***
- ***L. Genesoni***
- ***A. Huertas-Ceballos***
- ***R. Leigh Curran***
- ***V. Morsan***
- ***L. Tellini***

# PRE-REQUISITES

## STAFFING

- KC does not require any more staff than conventional care.
- Existing staff (doctors and nurses) should know when and how to initiate the KC method.

## CAREGIVERS

- Adopting KC should be the result of an **informed decision** and should not be perceived as an obligation.
- The mother should recover before initiating KC if she has suffered complications during pregnancy or delivery or is otherwise ill.

## BABY

- Babies with severe illness or requiring special treatment may wait until recovery before KC begins. Babies are treated according to UCLH's clinical guidelines.
- KC sessions can begin when baby still requires medical treatment.
- However, **baby's condition must be stable**.
- The ability to feed (to suck and swallow) and breathe spontaneously are not an essential requirement (KC can begin during tube-feeding and while the baby is still in CPAP).

School of Mental Health, 27  
Frognaal, Hampstead, London, NW3 6AR, 12 June 2010

# IMPLEMENTATION

- When exactly KMC can begin for premature babies **must be judged individually**, and full account should be taken of the condition and status of each baby and his/her caregivers.
- In general the following can be expected:
  - 1800g ≤ Soon after birth.
  - 1200g and 1799g ≤ A week
  - 1200g ≥ Many weeks



School of Mental Health, 27  
Frognaal, Hampstead, London, NW3 6AR, 12 June 2010

# IMPLEMENTATION

- When exactly KMC can begin for premature babies **must be judged individually**
- **Mother and child need to be ready**



# KANGAROO POSITIONING

- **Between the mother's breasts in an upright position [chest to chest].**
- **Secure him/her with the binder.** The head, turned to one side, is in a **slightly extended position.**
- **Hips should be flexed and extended in a "frog" position; the arms should also be flexed.**
- **Tie the cloth firmly?? It depends from the type of pouch.** The baby's abdomen should not be constricted and should be somewhere at the **level of the mother's epigastrium.**



# KANGAROO POSITIONING

- **Between the mother's breasts in an upright position [chest to chest].**
- **Secure him/her with the binder.** The head, turned to one side, is in a **slightly extended position.**
- **Hips should be flexed and extended in a "frog" position; the arms should also be flexed.**
- **Tie the cloth firmly?? It depends from the type of pouch.** The baby's abdomen should not be constricted and should be somewhere at the **level of the mother's epigastrium.**





# KANGAROO POSITIONING

- **Between the mother's breasts in an upright position [chest to chest].**
- **Secure him/her with the binder.** The head, turned to one side, is in a **slightly extended position.**
- **Hips should be flexed and extended in a "frog" position; the arms should also be flexed.**
- **Tie the cloth firmly?? It depends from the type of pouch.** The baby's abdomen should not be constricted and should be somewhere at the **level of the mother's epigastrium.**



# DURATION AND MONITORING

- **Length**
- Skin-to-skin contact-gradually.
- Sessions that last less than 60 minutes should be avoided.
- **Duration**
- When the mother and baby are comfortable, skin-to-skin contact continues for as long as they like.
- It tends to be used until the baby reaches term or 2500g. This is when it is safe to advise the mother to wean the baby gradually from KC.
- **Monitoring the baby's condition**
- Temperature
- Observing breathing and well-being
- Record keeping

# KANGAROO POSITIONING

- **Between the mother's breasts in an upright position [chest to chest].**
- **Secure him/her with the binder.** The head, turned to one side, is in a **slightly extended position.**
- **Hips should be flexed and extended in a "frog" position; the arms should also be flexed.**
- **Tie the cloth firmly?? It depends from the type of pouch.** The baby's abdomen should not be constricted and should be somewhere at the **level of the mother's epigastrium.**



## Barriers reported by the medical and nursing staff in the implementation of KMC in high tech environment

- Wrongly considered a sub-standard care
- How to assess the infant readiness for KMC, such as infant safety concerns and physiological stability
- KC can be considered as extra work for the nursing staff in busy high tech environment (nurses ratio for each infant)
- Cultural issues can arise in culture where skin-to-skin contact between the providers and the baby is considered inappropriate
- Inadequate level of privacy during KC can be upsetting for certain mother
- Presence of cultural barriers to paternal participation

## Implementation of KMC in NICU - UK

- **1. Preliminary steps:** Agreement of all medical and nursing staff on KMC implementation

- Provision of KMC written policies and guidelines for medical and nursing staff (see WHO guidelines)

- Creation of an informative booklet for parents

- **2. Teaching staff:** Presence of a KMC Trained Nurse, in charge of the KMC implementation

- Regular teaching sessions to train the Nursing Staff

- Seminars about KMC on regular cycle offered to all components of the medical staff

## Implementation of KMC in tertiary NICU - UK

- 4. To **KMC materials**?: Binder to secure the baby
  - Mirror to see the baby's face
  - Diary to register the KMC sessions and the carer observations
  
- 3. **Teaching parents:** To inform all parents in the Unit of the KMC existence
  - To teach parents how to position, held and transfer the infant in and out the incubator
  
- 5. To provide **Continuous? education**: Regular team meetings to rectify and improve the implementation strategies

## Difficulties experienced in the implementation of a KMC research project in the UK

- No Randomised Controlled Trial due to ethical issues

## Psychological effects of KMC

KMC mothers:

- present **lower maternal stress** (Tallandini & Scalembra, 2006)
- show **fewer symptoms of depression** (Feldman et al., 2002)
- perceive their infant as **less abnormal** (Feldman et al., 2002)
- have a **better sense of parenting role** (Affonso et al., 1993)
- feel **more confident and competent** in meeting their baby's needs (Tessier et al., 1998)



these results **have not been replicated in a UK setting**

(Miles et al., 2005; Whitelaw et al., 1988)



## Aims of Research Project

Investigation of the effects of Kangaroo Mother Care (KMC) in a **British** context on:

- maternal psychological well-being
- mother-preterm infant relationship
- couple relationship

## Conflicting results:

### Italy & Israel

(Tallandini & Scalembrà, 2006; Feldman et al., 2002;2003)

- KMC intervention for minimum 60 min per day



Positive effect  
of KMC

### UK

(Whitelaw et al., 1988; Miles et al., 2005)

- KMC intervention for an average of 30 min (Whitelaw, 1998) or 20 min (Miles et al., 2005) per day



Neither benefit nor adverse  
consequences of KMC

# Hypotheses <sup>1/2</sup>

- ➔ **Maternal Psychological well-being**
  - lower **parental stress** (Tallandini & Scalembra, 2006)
  - fewer symptoms of **depression** (Feldman et al., 2002)
  - lower **anxiety** levels (Affonso, 1998)

## Hypotheses <sup>2/2</sup>

- ➔ **Mother-preterm infant relationship**
  - better **perception** of their infant  
(Feldman et al., 2002)
  - better **attachment** to their infant
  
- ➔ **Couple relationship**
  - more **marital satisfaction**
  - greater **parenting alliance**

## Participants

64 preterm infants and their mothers:

**KMC Group** - 43 mother-preterm infant dyads

**Control Group** - 21 mother-preterm infant dyads


### Eligibility criteria:

- less than 2000 g. and 37 weeks of GA at birth
- absence of congenital malformations
- absence of history of psychopathology and social issues in the family

# Results <sup>1/3</sup>

## Study 1: Maternal Psychological well-being

➤ Parental Stress




*Mothers' PSI-SF total scores at discharge*

# Results <sup>2/3</sup>

## Study 1: Social Support

### Social support




*Mothers' FSS total scores after discharge*

# Results <sup>2/3</sup>

## Study 1: Social Support

### Social support



*Mothers' FSS total scores after discharge*



## Study 2:

### intervention KMC

**KMC Intervention Group** : N = 24

- at least 60 min per day
- at least 14 consecutive days

*Mean = 2,431.52 min; range 880-5,625*

**Limited KMC Group**: N = 21

- at least 60 min per day
- less than 14 consecutive days

*Mean = 487.38 min; range 100-800*


**Control Group**: N = 21

*Statistical Analyses: ANCOVAS & MANCOVAS with CRIB II as covariate and Singletons/Twins added as a between-subjects factor*

# Results <sup>2/3</sup>

## Study 2: Maternal Psychological well-being

➤ Difficult Child  
PSI-SF Sub-Scale



\* =  $p < .05$

IKMC=Intervention KMC

LKMC=Limited KMC

Mothers' Difficult Child scores after discharge

## Study 3:

### KMC “dose” effect

#### **Low Dose KMC Group: N = 12**

- under the 25th percentile  
(range: 100 – 540 min.)

#### **High KMC Group: N = 10**


- over the 75th percentile  
(range: 2120 – 5625 min.)

*Statistical Analyses: ANCOVAS & MANCOVAS with CRIB II as covariate*

# Results <sup>1/2</sup>

## Study 3: Mother-infant relationship

➤ Perception of the preterm infant



*Mothers' NPI-II scores after discharge*

Ahmedabad

# Conclusions <sup>1/2</sup>

## Replication of earlier findings

(Tallandini & Scalembra, 2006; Feldman et al., 2002)

- **Positive** effects of KMC on:
  - ➔ Parental Stress
  - ➔ Maternal perception of the infant as a less “difficult child”

# Conclusions <sup>2/2</sup>

## Novel Findings:

- Need of a **minimum amount** (1hour) of KMC
- Benefit of regular and scheduled intervention (14 days)
- **Dose-effect** of KMC (unlike previous studies, e.g. Tallandini & Scalembra, 2006; Miles et al., 2005)
  - ➔ **but only** on the mothers' perception of their infants

In attachment theory, several hypotheses about the association between attachment and cognitive development have been generated. In a series of meta-analyses on 32 studies, we tested whether the quality of attachment is related to intelligence (DQ or IQ) and to language competence.

Attachment showed a weak association with DQ and IQ measures (combined  $r = .09$ ;  $N = 1026$ ). The combined effect size for the relation between attachment and language competence was  $r = .28$  ( $N = 303$ ). We conclude, first, that differences in intelligence do not play a major role in shaping attachment relationships. Differences in quality of attachment are not confounded in any significant way with differences in intelligence. Second, secure children appeared to be more competent in the language domain than insecure children. Language development appears to be stimulated in the context of a secure attachment relationship because secure parents may be better 'teachers' and secure children may be better motivated 'students'.

# Cognitive and Behavioral Outcomes of School-Aged Children Who Were Born Preterm: A Meta-analysis

FREE

Adnan T. Bhutta, MBBS; Mario A. Cleves, PhD; Patrick H. Casey, MD; Mary M. Cradock, PhD; K. J. S. Anand, MBBS, DPhil

*JAMA*. 2002;288(6):728-737. doi:10.1001/jama.288.6.728.

Text

## ABSTRACT

**Context** The cognitive and behavioral outcomes of school-aged children who were born preterm have been reported extensively.

**Objective** To estimate the effect of preterm birth on cognition and behavior in school-aged children.

**Data Sources** MEDLINE search (1980 to November 2001) for English-language articles, supplemented by a manual search of personal files maintained by 2 of the authors.

**Study Selection** We included case-control studies reporting cognitive and/or behavioral data of children who were born preterm and who were evaluated after their fifth birthday if the attrition rate was less than 30%.

From the 227 reviewed studies, cognitive data from 15 studies and behavioral data from 16 studies were selected.

Egger weighted-linear regression method.

**Data Synthesis** Among 1556 cases and 1720 controls, controls had significantly higher cognitive scores compared with children who were born preterm (weighted mean difference, 10.9; 95% confidence interval [CI], 9.2-12.5). The mean cognitive scores of preterm-born cases and term-born controls were directly proportional to their birth weight ( $R^2 = 0.51$ ;  $P < .001$ ) and gestational age ( $R^2 = 0.49$ ;  $P < .001$ ). Age at evaluation had no significant correlation with mean difference in cognitive scores ( $R^2 = 0.12$ ;  $P = .20$ ). Preterm-born children showed increases in externalizing and internalizing behaviors in 81% of studies and had more than twice the RR for developing ADHD (pooled RR, 2.64; 95% CI, 1.85-3.78). No differences were noted in cognition and behaviors based on the quality of the study.

**Conclusions** Children who were born preterm are at risk for reduced cognitive test scores and their immaturity at birth is directly proportional to the mean cognitive scores at school age. Preterm-born children also show an increased incidence of ADHD and other behaviors.



[The Journal of Pediatrics](#)

[Volume 158, Issue 5](#), May 2011, Pages 766–774.e1

**Language Abilities in Children Who Were Very Preterm  
and/or Very Low Birth Weight: A Meta-Analysis**

**Conclusions**

Language ability is reduced in VPT/VLBW children. When considering only school-aged children, this reduction is still present, suggesting that their difficulty appears to be ongoing. Rigorous studies examining a range of language subdomains are needed to fully understand the specific nature of language difficulties in this population.