

1 **Title page**

2 **Title:** Families Experience of a Relatives Brain Stem Death Diagnosis: A Systematic Review

3 **Running title:** Families experience of brain stem death

4 **Authors:**

5

6 Ella CADE-SMITH <sup>1</sup>, Liam MACKAY <sup>2,3</sup>, Dhuleep Sanjay WIJAYATILAKE <sup>4</sup>, Marc KINGSLEY <sup>2</sup>,

7 Madiha SHAIKH <sup>1, 2, 4</sup>

8

9 **Affiliations:**

10

11 <sup>1</sup> University College London, Research Department of Clinical, Educational and Health Psychology

12 <sup>2</sup>North East London NHS Foundation Trust

13 <sup>3</sup> University College London, Division of Psychiatry

14 <sup>4</sup>Neuro Intensive Care Unit, Queen's Hospital, Barking, Havering and Redbridge University Hospitals

15 Trust

16

17 **Corresponding author:** Madiha Shaikh, [Madiha.shaikh@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:Madiha.shaikh@ucl.ac.uk)

18

19 **Key words:** Brain Stem Death, Brain Death, Family, Relatives, Intensive Care, Critical Care

20

21

22

23

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

## Abstract

### AIM:

Being diagnosed as Brain Stem Dead is a very challenging experience for families. Most research regarding brain stem death focuses on Organ Donation and there is currently little research into families' experience of brain stem death. The aim is to review the family's experience of brain stem death.

DESIGN: Systematic review

### METHOD:

A narrative synthesis was conducted for 9 studies including qualitative and quantitative study designs. Four electronic databases: AHMED (Allied and Complimentary Medicine), Emcare (1995-present), Medline (Ovid) and APA Psych Info (Ovid) were searched. No limit was placed on date of publishing due to this being a relatively under researched topic. The original search was conducted on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2021 and rerun on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2022 to ensure the inclusion of any new published studies.

### RESULTS:

Six main themes were identified, including: The Unexpected Prognosis; Coming to terms with brain stem death- grieving process; Request for organ donation; Observing brain stem death testing; The impact of staff on families' experience; and the lasting impact.

### CONCLUSION:

Families of patients with brain stem death are often left with a lack of understanding surrounding the diagnosis, the process, and the short and long term distress it can cause. There is need for research into family's experiences and brain stem death testing specifically so that more reliable data can be produced. There is a need to establish national, or international practice surrounding family care in intensive care in cases of brain stem death. This review highlights the importance of establishing specific brain stem death protocols, enabling more effective and consistent support for families.

**Keywords:** *Brain Stem Death, Brain Death, Family, Relatives, Intensive Care, Critical Care*

49

50

51

52

53

54

## Introduction

55 Despite the first definition of brain stem death (BSD) being identified in 1968 by the Harvard Medical  
56 School, there still is not a universally shared concept or recognition accepted (1, 2). General  
57 understanding of BSD is the permanent and total loss of all brain function in the brainstem and  
58 cerebrum (3) when oxygen or blood supply to the brain is stopped. BSD differs from a vegetative  
59 state or coma as with BSD, mechanical ventilation is required for the patient to breathe and is a  
60 permanent state with no possibility of recovery.

### 61 **Global Differences in BSD Practice**

62 As a result of the lack of universal standard of method for BSD diagnosis, the practise surrounding  
63 brain death can vary across countries (4, 5, 6, 7). This suggests that current guidelines need to be re-  
64 visited (8). Moreover, some under-developed countries do not have any protocols surrounding BSD  
65 (5). Prior to testing for BSD, proof is required to confirm that there is irreversible structural brain  
66 damage, and that all possibility of a reversible cause of coma can be excluded. Some components of  
67 the formal neurological examination and diagnostic criteria that follows are: apnoea testing, absence  
68 of corneal reflex, absence of vestibulo-ocular reflex, demonstration of no motor response to pain, no  
69 pupillary response to light and no gag reflex tests (9). These are designed to test the lack of automatic  
70 responses, demonstrating permanent damage to the brainstem. Countries will utilize not only different  
71 tests, but they also require these tests to be conducted by different professionals with varying  
72 expertise (4). Therefore, the differences in perception and practices surrounding brain death globally

73 are substantial, making the concept of BSD complex for both professionals and patients and their  
74 families.

## 75 **Spiritual Considerations**

76 The notion of brain death is also complex because of individual, spiritual and religious perspectives  
77 on what constitutes death. Randhawa 10) noted that in the UK, brain death has ‘in some faith groups,  
78 led to considerable debate and remains contested by faith leaders. For example, Popal Popal (11)  
79 found that US Islamic physicians with higher religiosity were less likely to equate BSD with  
80 cardiopulmonary criteria for assessing death, as well as less likely to consider BSD to signify the soul  
81 departing. Also, the Orthodox rabbinic community is divided on whether BSD equates death, with  
82 some leading orthodox rabbinic leaders believing that only cardiopulmonary death indicates death  
83 (12). This highlights the conflicting nature of the prognosis. Discussions surrounding the validity of  
84 BSD have stemmed from these religious, spiritual and moral controversies, as well as further  
85 development of BSD criteria within the scientific community (13). These impact understanding of  
86 BSD and perception of organ donation. Religions may have differing opinions on the specific organs  
87 that can and cannot be donated (14), resulting in a wealth of research over recent years debating BSD  
88 and the ethics of organ donation specifically.

## 89 **Organ Donation**

90 Specialist organ donation nurses speak with patients’ families about organ donation during the process  
91 of a family members’ diagnosis of BSD as donor’s death by neurological criteria increases the  
92 likelihood of a successful transplant (15). In some countries, such as Scotland (16) and England (17)  
93 donation is presumed, thereby working within an ‘opt-out’ system, whereas other counties operate an  
94 ‘opt-in’ system. Furthermore, in some countries like the Netherlands, organ donation is requested  
95 before the confirmation of BSD (18). Conversations of this nature are very sensitive for people  
96 considering the sudden nature of BSD diagnosis as well as having potential disagreements regarding  
97 what the family member and the family themselves would prefer. Consequently, research regarding  
98 the family members’ perspective of a relatives BSD is primarily about the organ donation decision

99 and process. This has resulted in less focus on the families' overall experience of their relatives BSD  
100 diagnosis itself.

### 101 **The current review**

102 Death by neurological criteria is often an unexpected, tragic, and difficult experience. Patients who  
103 are diagnosed as BSD can still appear to be breathing, retaining their usual colour and body  
104 temperature, because of the ventilator oxygenating their bodies. That being so, scepticism or  
105 confusion of BSD is understandable (19).

106 In the same way diagnostic criteria is not standardised internationally across Intensive Care Units  
107 (ICUs) (20), treatment for families going through this difficult situation is not either. Often  
108 communication and language are confused, and this inconsistency can lead to further distress (21).  
109 For these reasons, adequate and appropriate care is paramount for the families of those diagnosed as  
110 BSD.

111 Given the lack of research regarding family's experiences of BSD, a review of the current studies is  
112 important to analyse and evaluate peoples' perceptions and experiences of BSD and the care they  
113 received to help understand what best practice looks like, what needs to be improved, and what could  
114 be developed to ensure support for families.

115

## 116 **Methods**

117 The review was prospectively registered on PROSPERO (CRD42022332267). Since initial  
118 registration the analysis approach and choice of quality bias tool have been altered. Four electronic  
119 databases: AHMED (Allied and Complimentary Medicine), Emcare (1995-present), Medline (Ovid)  
120 and APA Psych Info (Ovid) were searched. No limit was placed on date of publishing due to this  
121 being a relatively under researched topic.

122 Search terms were created using the PICO framework, resulting in the three concepts: Brain Stem  
123 Death, Family and Experience. The following terms were used in our searches: ((brain adj dea\*) OR  
124 (brain adj stem adj dea\*) OR (death adj by adj neurological adj criteria)) AND (family OR families

125 OR (loved adj one\*) OR carer\* OR partner\* OR spouse OR parent\* OR guardian\* OR sibling\* OR  
126 brother\* OR sister\*) AND (experience\* OR presence OR attitude\* OR acceptance OR opinion\* OR  
127 perspective\*). The original search was conducted on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2021 and rerun on 6<sup>th</sup> December  
128 2022 to ensure the inclusion of any new published studies.


129 Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods studies that reported families' experience of a relatives  
130 BSD were included. Studies were included if participants were related to a person with BSD, as a  
131 result of blood connection (e.g., sibling, grandmother), marriage (e.g., partner, step-father) or had any  
132 significant relationship with the person with BSD.

133 Studies that were not in English, reviews and individual case reports were excluded.

134 Title and abstract and full text screening were conducted by ECS. LM independently assessed  
135 eligibility of 100% of papers at the full text stage. Any disagreements were resolved with author MS.  
136 Author ECS extracted study data using a predefined Microsoft excel form. Extracted data included  
137 author(s), year, country, study objective, participants age and relationship to the person with BSD, and  
138 families' experiences of BSD.

139

140 **Figure 1.** PRISMA Flow Diagram Figure 1. PRISMA flow diagram (22)



141

142 A narrative synthesis was used due to the inclusion of various study designs (23). Data was translated  
 143 using thematic analysis using an inductive approach (23). In this context a process of ‘translation’ of  
 144 primary themes or concepts reported across studies was used to explore similarities and/or differences  
 145 between different studies (24). This provided a means of organising and summarising the findings  
 146 from a range of studies and reflect directly, the main ideas and conclusions across studies, rather than  
 147 developing new knowledge. Thus, the key qualitative and quantitative findings are presented as they  
 148 are reported in the original paper. The Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal Tool (JBI) was used  
 149 to review the potential risk of bias and quality of publication of qualitative, quantitative, and  
 150 randomised control trial studies (10 item scale and 13 item scale) and the Mixed Methods Appraisal  
 151 Tool (MMAT) was used to review mixed method studies (7 item scale). Papers were independently

152 assessed by two authors and any disagreements were resolved through discussion or further evaluation  
153 with a third author.

154 The questions could be answered as ‘yes’, ‘no’ or ‘unclear’. Risk of bias was determined using the  
155 following criteria: Calculated as low risk of bias if at least 70% of answers were scored ‘yes’, a  
156 moderate risk of bias if 50-69% were scored ‘yes’ and a high risk of bias was considered if there were  
157 less than 50% scored ‘yes’ for the individual study (25).

158  
159

160

## Results

161 As shown in the PRISMA flow diagram, a total of 16 papers were assessed for eligibility and 9 met  
162 inclusion criteria for this review (Figure 1). Across the 9 studies, 606 family members were included.  
163 The studies were from Sweden ( $n = 2$ ), England ( $n = 2$ ), the USA ( $n = 2$ ), the Netherlands ( $n = 1$ ),  
164 France ( $n = 1$ ), and Switzerland ( $n = 1$ ). Most studies used a qualitative method ( $n = 6$ ), followed by  
165 mixed methods ( $n = 2$ ) and one Randomised Controlled Trial ( $n = 1$ ). The key study details and  
166 results are shown in Table 1.

### 167 **Quality assessment**

168 Most studies were rated as being low quality (i.e., high risk of bias;  $n = 4$ ), whilst three studies were  
169 rated as being of medium quality and two as high (i.e. low risk of bias). Most qualitative studies  
170 failed to consider the influence of the researcher on the research as authors did not locate themselves  
171 theoretically and/or culturally and there was not congruence between the research methodology and  
172 the methods used to collect data (e.g., using grounded theory but failing to use an iterative process in  
173 terms of participant recruitment).

174 The RCT by Tawil et al. Tawil, Brown (26) was scored low because it was unclear whether the  
175 treatment groups were similar at baseline and whether the outcome assessors were blind to the  
176 treatment allocation.

177 Finally, the mixed methods study by Omrod et al., Ormrod, Ryder (27) scored low because the  
178 different components of the study were not effectively integrated to answer the research question.

179 **Table 1.** Summary of Research Papers Included in Review

<b><u>Study</u></b>	<b><u>Design</u></b>	<b><u>Participants</u></b>	<b><u>Quality</u></b>
<b>Frid et al. Frid, Bergbom (28); Sweden</b>	<b>Qualitative</b>	<b><i>n</i> = 17 family members 14 narratives included (some interviewed in pairs); 16-68 years old</b>	<b>Low</b>
<p><b>Before ICU: Disquieting Event</b></p> <p><u>The sudden change:</u> <i>“I was at my workplace when the telephone suddenly rang, and somebody said that your mother is in hospital”</i></p> <p><u>The growing seriousness:</u> <i>“If they call then of course it means something”</i></p> <p><u>The great chaos:</u> <i>“Then my whole life collapsed- there was nothing but chaos”</i></p> <p><b>-During ICU: Uncertain Vigil</b></p> <p><u>The encounter with my loved one:</u> <i>“But when I went in and saw all those cords, then I realised that he was ill”.</i></p> <p><u>The encounter with myself:</u> <i>“I wanted to be close to him. I chatted and sang to him. I wanted to make it into something nice”.</i></p> <p><u>The encounter with the carers and my support network friends:</u> <i>“We were many relatives there and we all supported each other.” “They seemed so busy doing their own things, there was nobody we could be in touch with.”</i></p> <p><b>During ICU: Arduous Struggle</b></p> <p><u>The encounter with the surrounding world:</u> <i>“One had to think that the machine [respirator] sustained her. Had it not been for the machine she wouldn’t be lying there”.</i></p> <p><u>The difficult realization:</u> <i>“There was something funny that didn’t make sense, you could understand it intellectually but not emotionally”</i></p> <p><u>The difficult end:</u> <i>“I felt a bit suspicious that they might use the organs”. “He was lying there first in the respirator and then he just sort of disappeared, one should have been given the possibility to see him afterwards”.</i></p> <p><u>The good end:</u> <i>“As it can save life, she wouldn’t have minded.” “We went in afterwards. Somebody had lit a candle. She was lying there so tranquil and delicate, as if she was asleep. It felt good to see her like that.”</i></p> <p><b>After ICU: The difficult road ahead</b></p>			

The state of grieving: “You just didn’t have the strength to think about what had happened.”

Working through the grief: “I worked a great deal with it myself. When the others had gone to bed, then I could sit by myself and cry in peace.”

The maturing grief: “The sorrow has changed character one has got some distance to what happened”.

The different life: “Going through a thing like this makes one different. One becomes more grown up.”

**Frid et al. Frid, Haljamae (29)  
Sweden**

**Qualitative**

**n = 17 family members; 16-68 years old**

**High**

**Experiencing chaotic unreality:** “That’s what was so difficult. He was supposed to be dead and yet you could see that he was breathing. It was certainly difficult to grasp. It was like a sort of murder”.

**Experiencing an Inner Collapse:** “NN had talked to somebody who said that there was probably no hope. I only know that it was then that I felt I was sort of descending into hell”.

**Experiencing a Sense of Forlornness:** “It was like being in two separate glass rooms, we were there but we sort of couldn’t reach each other any more”.

**Clinging to the hope of survival:** “It’s hard to imagine someone is dead when she/he is still breathing. Yes, I suppose one is hoping in spite of everything. You’re a fighter. That’s how it feels”.

**Being reconciled with the reality of death:** “Then we went in to see our mother. They had arranged it nicely with flowers and candles. We were left alone. We were only in there a few minutes. Then strong emotions surfaced, it was as if a stone fell away. So, I don’t know how I would be now if I hadn’t gone in and seen her. That was the end so to speak...”

**Receiving care which gives comfort:** “They gave us what we needed. And what did we need? Sometimes we needed a cup of coffee. Sometimes just a few words, asking us how we felt. So, I didn’t feel as if we were invisible but that they saw us”.

**Kentish-Barnes et al. Kentish-Barnes, Cohen-Solal (30), France**

**Qualitative**

**n = 24 family members; 41-77 years old**

**Medium**

**Thinking the patient as a dead person: the responsibility of the decision**

Who makes the decision? *“It was me who made the decision for her, she was a generous person, she wasn’t perfect, but she did have some great qualities, she was generous, she looked after children, she had strong principles”*

A feeling of responsibility? *“It wasn’t my decision, it was M.’s”*

Toward whom do family members feel responsible?*“Well I wanted organ donation for her but her sisters said ‘mum, I don’t want anyone to touch my sister’s body’, my husband didn’t want that either, so we said no”*

**Thinking the patient as a person despite brain death**

Death, a clear (but subjective) concept: *“My children and I stayed until the end, until they told us ‘it’s over, he is brain dead’, and then well, from then on, my kids and I decided to leave. He was dead; there was no point in staying”*

Death, a complex (and subjective) concept: *“It’s as though we were in another world, as though we weren’t really there, we just couldn’t react at all. My daughter... well for me she was just sleeping, she was still there really. I didn’t have a sense of loss at the time. I was like floating. We didn’t realize at the time—it came later.”*

One death or multiple deaths? *“So then after 20 minutes or maybe half an hour, she died... (...). They told us they were going to turn everything off and that they would call us and that’s what they did and so then we went so we could be with her for her last moments”*

**Organ donation, driving bereavement toward life**

Donation, a connection to others, for life: *“I was really pleased. That’s crazy, really. But initially I said Ok it’s a difficult moment, I tended to see things very negatively, when in fact, it brought back a smile to my face. I was falling to pieces, in tears, but morally, psychologically, it really helped me”*

Organ donation a connection to the patient, beyond death: *“I remember the day when I felt that hope inside me. And she rang to say that the organs had successfully been transplanted, that the patients were well and that gave me a lot of strength to carry on*

**Kesselring et al. Kesselring, Kainz (31), Switzerland**

**Qualitative**

**n = 40 family members; 20-79 years old**

**High**

**1<sup>st</sup> stage: The initial encounter**

*"I had to wait first—I arrived in this unfamiliar territory—and was not immediately allowed to see my husband".*

### **2<sup>nd</sup> stage: Receipt of bad news**

*"First, you feel some hope in seeing him lying there, but then you have to work through this news, this shock".*

### **3<sup>rd</sup> stage: The confrontation with brain death and the request for organ donation**

#### Confrontation with brain death:

1. Learning new facts: *"One saw in the pupils that cells did not function anymore. And he could not move at all anymore. Functions will not recover. This is death".*
2. Dealing with ambiguities of perception: *"It was unbelievable. I see my husband lying there, well shaved, sun-tanned as he always is, breathing and breathing. It was like he was [still] alive!"*
3. Being uncertain about the moment of death: *"On one she died on the 23rd, and on the other, she died on the 24th".*

#### Request for the organ donation:

1. Who made the decision?
2. Their knowledge of the patient's stance on organ donation: *"My husband and I are scientists; it is clear (he wanted) to donate".*
3. The relatives' specific beliefs about the body/mind and organs  
*"[the body] should be left in peace' or 'not used as a spare parts repository'.*
4. Concern about who might receive the organs

*'someone unknown to you and about whom you know nothing of how he leads his life'.*

### **4<sup>th</sup> stage: Making the decision**

Clear decision

Ambivalent decision

Consequences of the decision: *"They took lots of blood, made x-rays and so on and you start to doubt whether all these disturbances to the body are really necessary? ...What have I done"*

Other findings:

**Professional behaviour throughout the process as perceived by relatives**

**Relatives' memories**

**Non-traumatic memories**

**Traumatic memories**

<b>Kompanje et al. Kompanje, de Groot (18), Netherlands</b>	<b>Qualitative</b>	<b>n = 8 family members</b>	<b>Low</b>
---	--------------------	-----------------------------	------------

**Experiences of Relatives:**

*“We knew that my mom had died when the intensivist stopped the respirator and when we saw an absence of breathing.”*

*“We were shocked when the nurse reconnected the respirator after the apnea test had been performed. For us, she was dead when she was not breathing, but then she breathed again.”*

<b>Lloyd-Williams et al. Lloyd-Williams, Morton (32), England</b>	<b>Qualitative</b>	<b>n = 29 next of kin of BSD patient, 32-72 years old</b>	<b>Medium</b>
---	--------------------	---	---------------

**Care of the patient and relatives**

*“The attention the nurses gave her was incredible. She was full of tubes to keep her alive. The nurses talked to her, wiped her mouth. I will always be grateful to them it was really moving.”*

*“I would have liked someone to put an arm around me, to look after me, to ask if I wanted tea, seeing the state I was in, I was out of my mind. You need someone to lead you and someone to spend time with you.”*

**Facilities**

*“I could not sit down because there weren’t enough chairs so had to stand while the doctor was talking to me.” [Beatrice, on being told by the consultant, in the middle of the family room, that her child was brain dead]”*

**Communication about death**

*“It was terrible being told that my son’s brain was ‘scrambled.’”*

*“I was never told actually - I had to infer it. They said, ‘From the tests we have never seen anyone come back from this stage. ‘What I would have wanted is, ‘F is clinically dead and the machine is doing everything. ‘I couldn’t believe, because the body was warm and moving - they were going to take things from the body.it is hard not knowing if she is dead. Is she? I knew in a way, but was not told. They should have said, ‘F is now dead’ - told you straight. I would have got my thoughts straight. I needed to be told.’” [Alice]*

**Bereavement**

*“In the end J [nurse] came to see us off. This helped a lot.”*

<b>Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27), England</b>	<b>Mixed methods</b>	<b>n = 27 family members</b>	<b>Low</b>
--	----------------------	------------------------------	------------

Qualitative:

**Understanding the brain stem death tests**

*“We all knew he had died and the doctors only confirmed this after the tests were performed.”*

*“I thought the tests were to find out what was wrong with him to help him get better.”*

**Observation of brain stem death testing**

*“Doctors and nurses should explain each element of the testing procedure ... found aspects of it distressing...especially during application of pressure to the eyes.” “I thought something positive might happen, we might prove them wrong (the medical team) and he would respond – advice should be clear... avoid giving false hopes.”*

*“I believed mother had died when I observed the testing.”*

**Organ donation**

*“We agreed to organ donation, mum’s liver and kidneys were transplanted. The family found organ donation helpful and were comforted by knowing other people had benefited.”*

Quantitative:

Pre-measurement: Impact of Event Scale and the General Health Questionnaire-12.

23/27 relatives agreed to complete the IES and GHQ-12 scales.

5/23 Observed the tests:

Average IES scores were 23.8 (intrusion), 21.0 (avoidance) and 25.0 (GHQ).

18/23 Absent from the tests:

Average IES scores were 17.4, 15.0 and 16.8 for the non-observers (n=18).

This could imply higher levels of depression and anxiety in relatives who observed the tests. However, unfortunately the small number of relatives who observed precluded a meaningful statistical comparison.

Measurement: Structured Interview

#### **Understanding Brain Stem Death Tests**

24/27 understood that the purpose of the tests was to confirm death

9/27 still had hope that the BDE tests could prove survival

18/27 understood death had carried out before the tests

3/27 relatives remained confused about the implications of the tests

Out of those 3/27, 2/3 hoped that once the ventilators were removed that their relative would still breathe

#### **Observation of BSD Testing**

13/27 were offered the choice of observing the tests, 11/27 were not and 3/27 couldn't remember. 1/27 had not been offered the choice but made a request to observe the testing process and this was granted.

All relatives (n=27) would like to have been offered the choice of observing BSD testing but only 5 took the offer including the person who requested. Out of the 14/27 who were not offered the choice to observe tests, 5 felt they would have liked to.

All 5/27 who did observe the tests were pleased that they had done so and felt that it had removed any doubts that death occurred.

Out of the 8/27 who did not take up the offer of observing the tests, 1/8 regretted not taking the decision and wished they had.

**Organ donation**

9/23 families agreed to organ donation.

3/4 families who observed the tests agreed to donation.

0 of the relatives who agreed to organ donation had any regrets about this decision. However, 3/27 relatives who did not agree to organ donation subsequently had regrets.

<p><b>Tawil et al. Tawil, Brown (26), New Mexico, USA</b></p>	<p><b>Randomized Control Trial</b></p>	<p><b><i>n</i> = 58 immediate family members</b>  <b><i>n</i>=38 to be present during BDE</b>  <b><i>n</i>=20 to be absent during BDE</b></p>	<p><b>Medium</b></p>
---	--	---	----------------------

**Quantitative:**

Randomized Control Trial: To be present at family members brain stem death examination or to be absent.

Pre-Measurement:

Understanding BSD questionnaire (scores 0-5 with higher scores suggesting better understanding): Absent during BDE group=2.5, Present during BDE group=3.0

Post-Measurement:

Absent during BDE group= 2.5, Present during BDE group=5. Randomized Control Trial: To be present at family members brain stem death examination or to be absent.

One month after BSD testing:

Impact of Event Scale (IES) General Health Questionnaire (GHQ-12)

Data obtained from 41 subjects: 24 subjects randomized to be present during BDE and 17 subjects randomized to be absent.

IES:

Median IES scores for the subjects

randomized to be present during the BDE were 20.5 (IQR,13.5–41.5), compared with median scores of 23.5 (IQR, 11.3–40.5) for those subjects randomized to be absent (*p* = 0.211).

GHQ:

Median GHQ-12 scores were also similar between the study groups, with median scores of 13.5 (IQR, 11.3–16.8) for subjects randomized to be present during the BDE and 13 (IQR, 8–20) for subjects randomized to be absent (*p* = 0.187).

<b>Siminoff Siminoff (33), Southwest Pennsylvania &amp; Northeast Ohio, USA</b>	<b>Mixed methods</b>	<b><i>n</i> = 403 family members and significant others</b>	<b>Low</b>
<p><b><u>Quantitative:</u></b></p> <p>The family interview consisted of 3 parts.</p> <p>1<sup>st</sup> part: Unstructured Interview consisting of a series of open-ended questions to gather a description of the events leading up to the pronouncement of patient’s brain death and what happened after.</p> <p>2<sup>nd</sup> part: Series of Structured and Semi-Structured questions.</p> <p>3<sup>rd</sup> part: Structured Interview Questions.</p> <p><b>Informing families of brain stem death diagnosis</b></p> <p>97.6% of 420 identified patient cases were informed their family member was brain dead. Found 10/17 family members who claimed to have not been informed, were and are included.</p> <p><b>Understanding brain death</b></p> <p>Of the 403 families that remember being informed of the brain stem death diagnosis, 28.3% could provide an accurate explanation.</p> <p>4.5% gave a completely inaccurate definition.</p> <p><b>Awareness of brain stem death tests</b></p> <p>More than half of the families (56.8%) could identify at least 1 test to determine brain death.</p> <p>1/5 felt that there hadn't been any specific tests done to determine the diagnosis.</p> <p>23.1% knew of tests but not what they were.</p> <p><b>Acceptance of brain death</b></p> <p>78.95% believed there was no chance of recovery either before or after the determination of brain stem death.</p> <p>21.2% believed there was still a chance of their family members recovery after the diagnosis was given.</p> <p>Nonwhite family members were more inclined to continue to hope that the patient would recover even after they learned the patient was brain dead (41.9%) and less likely to give up hope (58.1%) than white families (<math>\chi^2=16.74</math>, <math>df=1</math>, <math>p &lt;.001</math>).</p> <p>256 (63.5%) of the families first considered the patient dead when they were told the patient was brain dead, whereas 21.8% first considered the patient dead when the machines were turned off and the heart stopped (<math>n=88</math>).</p> <p>14.6% (<math>n=59</math>) were confused or unsure.</p>			

Nearly 60% of families made statements indicating that they thought the patient was still alive ( $n=241$ ), even after being told he or she was brain dead.

Those who thought the patient was still alive tended to be older than those who unequivocally understood the patient had died (45.61 vs 42.83 years,  $t$  test=-2.09,  $p = .037$ ).

Finally, 29.5% ( $n=119$ ) agreed with the statement that a person is dead only when his or her heart stops.

Nonwhite family members were more likely to agree with this statement than white family members ( $Z$  score for Mann Whitney=2.67;  $p = .008$ ).

Having a lower level of education was also associated with agreement (Spearman rho=-.17,  $p < .001$ ).

#### **Understanding and acceptance of brain death and the donation decision**

60.2% of the people who said that braindead individuals were still alive chose to donate, whereas 53.7% of the people who made no ambiguous statements donated ( $p = .20$ ).

Respondents who accepted that their loved one was dead when informed that he or she was brain dead were more likely to donate than those who did not consider the patient dead until the machines were turned off and the heart stopped (62.5% vs 39.8%,  $\chi^2 = 14.47$ ,  $df=2$ ,  $p = .001$ ).

Those who were unsure as to exactly when the patient had died had a donation pattern similar to families who equated brain death with death (62.7% vs 62.5% donated).

Those who donated were less likely to agree with the general statement that someone is dead only when the heart stops than those who did not donate ( $Z$  score Mann-Whitney=-3.48,  $p = .0005$ ).

The connection between hope, brain death, and donation almost reached statistical significance ( $p = .051$ ). That is, families who continued to hope for the patient's recovery after being told the patient was brain dead were less likely to donate than those who had given up hope of recovery.

181 **Narrative Synthesis**

182 Results were synthesised based on similarity across the included studies, placed in chronological  
 183 order and relabelled. This resulted in six overarching themes (Table 2).

184 **Table 2** Narrative synthesis: thematic map

Main Identified Theme	Sub-theme
1. The unexpected prognosis	
2. Coming to terms with Brain Stem Death- grieving process:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Denial: Lack of understanding and unanswered questions</li> <li>○ Bargaining: Understanding but not believing and the hope for survival</li> <li>○ Acceptance</li> </ul>
3. Request for organ donation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The impact of acceptance</li> <li>○ Providing a purpose</li> <li>○ An unwanted responsibility and cause for additional distress</li> </ul>
4. Observing Brain Stem Death testing:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ An uncertain process</li> <li>○ An inconsistent offer</li> <li>○ Increasing understanding and acceptance</li> </ul>
5. The effect of staff on family’s experience:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Feeling seen by staff</li> <li>○ Feeling neglected by staff</li> </ul>
6. The lasting impact:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Experiencing grief</li> <li>○ Impact on well-being</li> </ul>

185

186 1. The unexpected prognosis

187 Families experienced difficulties with the suddenness in which they received news of their family  
188 members' imminent or confirmed BSD diagnosis.

189 Frid et al. Frid, Bergbom (28) talked about the shock participants felt at the beginning. They identified  
190 "The disquieting event" including the sudden change, the growing seriousness, and the great chaos.  
191 Lloyd-Williams et al. Lloyd-Williams, Morton (32) also referenced experience of a sudden change,  
192 the event happening too quickly for the relative to understand; "*Her death was so sudden, so quick.*  
193 *The doctor said, 'You know your wife is going to die'. I was staggered. In a matter of hours, she went*  
194 *from completely fine to being told that. I was totally gob-smacked. All too sudden. She was such an*  
195 *alive person*".

196 Frid et al. Frid, Haljamae (29) reported imagery used to describe participants first encounter with the  
197 BSD prognosis that included an empty room, murder, the collapse of life and descending into hell.  
198 Kesselring et al. Kesselring, Kainz (31) identified family members' travelling to the hospital, 'often in  
199 a state of shock' after having witnessed the catastrophic event themselves or having received the news  
200 from services or friends. They found the family member would then be informed immediately or  
201 hours later that they should expect 'bad news'. This 'bad news' would be delivered privately or in  
202 public waiting rooms, by professionals they knew or those that they did not. This uncertainty added to  
203 the chaos they were experiencing, the disintegration of the life they once knew. Kentish-Barnes et al.  
204 Kentish-Barnes, Cohen-Solal (30) also report a feeling of being in another world, or as though the  
205 world that was known to the participant is 'collapsing'.

206 2. Coming to terms with Brain Stem Death

207 This theme has been split into 3 stages (denial, bargaining and acceptance) that resemble some stages  
208 of Kübler-Ross Kübler-Ross (34) staged grieving process. Denial, which includes a lack of  
209 understanding and unanswered questions, bargaining, in which there is understanding but not  
210 believing and having the hope for survival, and acceptance.

211 **Denial: Lack of understanding and unanswered questions**

212 In each study, there was a focus on family members understanding of their relatives' brain stem death  
213 diagnosis. In Siminoff's Siminoff (33) study, out of the 403 family members informed of the brain  
214 stem death diagnosis, only 28.3% could provide an accurate explanation of the diagnosis and 4.5%  
215 provided an entirely inaccurate explanation. Kesselring et al. Kesselring, Kainz (31) found that none  
216 of the participants they interviewed could reproduce a 'scientific' description of BSD. For many, it  
217 was difficult to differentiate between BSD and states like a coma, despite being given verbal  
218 explanations and documents.

219 For some, even witnessing the BSD testing left them with a confused understanding. Kompanje et al.  
220 Kompanje, de Groot (18) revealed that many did not realise what the tests were supposed to  
221 demonstrate, or what they would entail. Some had thought the tests could prove the potential for  
222 survival, and not as a way of confirming the patients BSD which demonstrates a lack of  
223 communication from their relatives' physicians (27). Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27) found some  
224 similar results, 9/27 family members still had some hope that the tests would demonstrate potential  
225 survival, 3/27 remained confused about the status of death after observing the tests, and 2 out of those  
226 3 hoped that even after the ventilation was withdrawn, the BSD patient might still breathe.

227 **Bargaining: Understanding but not believing and the hope for survival**

228 Some people when interviewed demonstrated a true understanding of BSD and what the implications  
229 were. However, that understanding did not stop the families hope for survival, even if they knew it  
230 was not possible. This conflict was often referenced because of the body being warm, and the  
231 ventilator still causing the body to breathe and appear alive.

232 The participants in Kentish-Barnes et al. Kentish-Barnes, Cohen-Solal (30) appeared to imply that  
233 though they had understanding, to feel fully convinced they needed to see the body after the  
234 ventilators were turned off. The warmth of the body and movement of the chest whilst the ventilators  
235 caused the patient to 'breathe' would seemingly lead families to experience an inner conflict; a  
236 clinical understanding of their family members' reality whilst being confronted with the experience of  
237 their loved one appearing alive; *"We kept on touching her, all the time, she was warm.....so she was*

238 *there. And frankly, when I think about it now, I know that during all that time we believed that she*  
239 *would come back. Even if we knew it wasn't possible”.*

240 Others felt that they understood the concept of BSD, but due to not witnessing the BSD tests they did  
241 not feel able to accept or believe it. The BSD testing was believed to provide a finality for some that  
242 they were unable to have if not allowed to observe (27).

243 Siminoff's Siminoff (33) study found most families accepted that their family member would not  
244 recover either before or immediately after the pronouncement of brain death (78.95%), but 21.1% still  
245 felt that their relative may survive and recover. Despite this, over half (60%) of families made  
246 statements indicating they believed the patient was still alive after being told their family member was  
247 brain dead ( $n = 241$ ). It was found that those who still believed were generally older than those who  
248 fully understood that the relative had passed away (Mean age = 45.61 vs 42.83 years).

#### 249 **Acceptance**

250 Acceptance of a situation is to recognize, endure and believe something to be true. The experience of  
251 acceptance will exist at different levels and develop over time.

252 Frid et al. Frid, Bergbom (28) found that for some family members, acceptance occurred once they  
253 were able to realise their loved one had passed despite them showing signs of life (breathing, warm  
254 skin etc). Kesselring et al. Kesselring, Kainz (31) also found some families could accept their  
255 relative's death despite showing signs of life. However, they also found that others needed to see the  
256 relative once the organ donation operation was complete. In this state, the body would be cold and  
257 unmoving, having most likely been in the morgue. This enabled the families to witness their family  
258 member in a condition that fit their pre-existing understanding of death, rather than warm and  
259 seemingly breathing; *“After the operation, I was able to see him once more. I was very happy and*  
260 *seeing him cold was good since you cannot say goodbye when he is still breathing”*

261 For some, observing the BSD testing enabled the family member to have closure. Ormrod et al.  
262 Ormrod, Ryder (27) found that all five relatives who observed the tests were pleased that they had  
263 done so and felt that, for them, it had removed any doubts that death had occurred.

264 Siminoff Siminoff (33) referred to the concept of acceptance as “Giving Up Hope” which was related  
265 to the family’s ethnicity. Non-white family members were less likely to give up hope (58.1%) than  
266 white families and more inclined to continue to hope that their family member would recover even  
267 after learning the patient was brain dead (41.9%). Furthermore, 63.5% of the families first considered  
268 their relative to be dead when the announcement of the brain death diagnosis was given, whereas  
269 21.8% first considered their relative to be dead when the machines had turned off and their heart had  
270 stopped. Moreover, they found that those with lower-level education were more likely to agree with  
271 the statement that a person is only dead when their heart stops, and that non-white family members  
272 were more likely to agree with this statement than the white family members.

### 273 3. Request for organ donation

#### 274 **Impact of acceptance**

275 Siminoff Siminoff (33) found that the families understanding of brain stem death was not an indicator  
276 of organ donation, as demonstrated by the fact that 60.2% of the people who said that brain dead  
277 individuals were still alive chose to donate. However, acceptance of the family members death did  
278 correlate with families organ donation decision. Firstly, the families who accepted that their loved one  
279 had died when told that they were brain dead were more likely to donate than those who thought their  
280 loved one had died once the machines had been turned off and their hearts had stopped (62.5% vs  
281 39.8%). Secondly, those family members who were ambiguous as to exactly when their relative had  
282 died had a similar pattern of donating to those who understood brain death to be death (62.7% vs  
283 62.5%).

284 Moreover, it was found that those who agreed to donate their relatives’ organs were less likely to  
285 agree with the statement that someone is only dead when their heart stops than those who did not  
286 donate.

#### 287 **Providing a purpose**

288 Frid et al. Frid, Bergbom (28) found that for those who had a good idea of what their family members  
289 would have wanted, making the decision of organ donation seemed like a way of connecting with  
290 them.

291 Frid et al. Frid, Haljamae (29) found the imagery that came up was that of a mutilated body. The  
292 participant felt that though the organ donation process may involve a ‘violation’ of the deceased, it is  
293 the ‘right thing to do’ if it can save someone’s life. Some of the participants in Kentish-Barnes et al.  
294 Kentish-Barnes, Cohen-Solal (30) study expressed this and the strength it provided them in a time of  
295 grieving, as well as a belief that it led to a continuation of the relatives’ memory.

296 Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27) found that 9/23 of the families agreed to organ donation, none of  
297 which reported to have regretted this decision afterwards. Out of the 4 families who did observe the  
298 BSD tests (5 relatives in total), 3/4 agreed to donation. Furthermore, Ormrod et al. interviewed  
299 patients who had received contact from the transplant recipients, which provided comfort and a  
300 feeling of connection with the families who had been positively impacted by their relative Ormrod,  
301 Ryder (27). Organ donation can also provide a space for grieving and acceptance in families’  
302 experience of BSD. For some, the time and process around organ donation provided a space for  
303 reflection in an otherwise bewildering situation (30); *“So I used that time that was actually for the*  
304 *organ donation process, I used it to accept a situation that was not even conceivable a few hours*  
305 *earlier there. So that was extraordinary in fact”*.

### 306 **Unwanted decision and cause for additional distress**

307 Though for some organ donation can be a positive experience, for others it can provide additional  
308 distress in an already very painful situation.

309 Frid et al. Frid, Haljamae (29) highlighted two notions people can experience; the ability to see the  
310 person as indivisible and divisible. For some, the person is a whole body, a unit, in which case the  
311 concept of organ donation is very difficult.

312 Another point of distress can come from the family members having to weigh up their own views on  
313 organ donation, and those of the deceased (30). If these do not align, the process can be very  
314 conflicting. Furthermore, some families do not feel it is their place to make the decision at all (30).

315 Kesselring et al. Kesselring, Kainz (31) found some family members’ reference witnessing the donor  
316 management, finding watching the disturbances that were made to the body led to ambivalence

317 surrounding their decision; *“They took lots of blood, made x-rays and so on and you start to doubt*  
318 *whether all these disturbances to the body are really necessary? . . . What have I done?”*.

319 In addition, others (due to being asked regarding organ donation when they were still not fully  
320 accepting or understanding of BSD) spoke of finding the process especially distressing, wondering  
321 afterwards whether they had “killed (them) by consenting”.

322 However, Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27) found no difference in recorded IES and GHQ-12 scales  
323 in those who did donate and those who did not donate their organs. 3 relatives who denied consent for  
324 organ donation in their study reported regretting their decision, and some felt that their original  
325 decision was linked to them having not observed brain stem death testing, perhaps highlighting the  
326 potential influence of observing BSD tests on organ donation.

#### 327 4. Observation of Brain Stem Death testing

##### 328 **An uncertain purpose**

329 The results highlighted the lack of information that was provided by professionals about the tests,  
330 both in terms of the process and what the individual tests entail. This appeared to add to the family  
331 members uncertainty surrounding an already overwhelming situation.

332 Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27) studied the impact of families observing the BSD tests and found  
333 that 24/27 participants understood that the purpose of the tests was to confirm BSD. However, 33%  
334 still had hope that the tests could prove potential survival had occurred before they were carried out.  
335 11% (3/27) were confused about the implications of the tests, with some (2/3) people hoping that even  
336 after the ventilators were withdrawn, their relative may still breathe alone and survive.

337 Siminoff Siminoff (33) found that more than half of their participants could identify at least one test  
338 to determine BD. However, 23.1% knew of specific tests used but could not provide any explanation  
339 or if they did, they spoke of misconceptions. 1/5 even felt that there had not been any specific tests  
340 done to determine the diagnosis of their loved one.

341 This uncertainty was also cause for additional distress for family members. Participants stated concern  
342 that the tests would inflict pain on their relative. Some found the tests quite difficult to watch,

343 especially if the tests were not explained to them throughout. On the other hand, if the family had not  
344 observed the BSD tests, some of their imagined ideas of those tests could also cause distress.

#### 345 **An inconsistent offer**

346 Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27) also found that out of the 13 participants who were offered the  
347 choice of observing the tests, 11/27 claimed they were not offered this opportunity and 3/27 said that  
348 they could not remember. One of the participants who was not offered the choice, requested they see  
349 the tests which was granted. All participants included in their study ( $n = 27$ ) said afterwards that they  
350 would have liked to have been able to observe the tests, but only 5 accepted this offer, including the  
351 participant who requested. Out of the 8 participants who were offered the opportunity to observe but  
352 declined, 1/8 regretted not making the decision and wished that they had.

#### 353 **Increasing understanding and acceptance**

354 Tawil et al. Tawil, Brown (26) conducted a randomized control trial and found that observing the tests  
355 led to an increased understanding of BSD. They measured family members understanding of BSD  
356 prior to randomizing them into two groups, one of which would allow the family members to be  
357 present whilst the BSD tests took place, and the other where they were absent. At a baseline, the  
358 group which would be present had a median score of 3/4 and the group who were not going to be  
359 present in the BSD tests had a median score of 2.5/4. However, when the groups understanding was  
360 measured immediately after the experience, those who were randomized to be present for the BSD  
361 tests had increased scores and therefore increased understanding of brain death, whereas those who  
362 were randomized to be absent from the tests demonstrated no change in their understanding.  
363 Furthermore, 66% of those who were present during the BSD tests achieved perfect post-intervention  
364 BSD understanding scores, compared to only 20% who were absent (median 5.0 vs 2.5).

365 In addition, their study demonstrated that there was a correlation between those with a higher  
366 education, who were earning over \$25,000, who were younger and those who understood and could  
367 describe BSD tests. 36/38 of those who were present during the tests reported that being able to  
368 observe them had helped their understanding of BSD. In addition, 32/38 said they would recommend  
369 family presence during the tests to others going through the same experience.

370 In addition, Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27) found that out of the 14 who had not been offered the  
371 opportunity to observe the tests, 5 said they would have liked to in retrospect. All 5 participants who  
372 did observe the BSD tests were pleased they had done and reported that it had removed any doubt that  
373 their family member had died. For some, seeing the tests only confirmed what they already knew, and  
374 was seen as more of a formality.

375 Moreover, other interviewees reflected on the potential usefulness in observing BSD testing for  
376 decision making surrounding organ donation, wondering whether perhaps the tests would have  
377 provided confirmation of death, resulting in making the decision process easier.

## 378 5. The effect of staff on family's experience

### 379 **Feeling seen by staff**

380 Encounters with the carers are perceived as important to families, demonstration of empathy and  
381 genuine sympathy are key in making the families feel supported and 'seen' (28).

382 Having both the family members and the BSD relative treated with respect and cared for was  
383 important for a positive experience. This included communication regarding the BSD, taking initiative  
384 to answer any unanswered questions, treating the families loved one with dignity (like being washed)  
385 and communication to the loved one at times too (28, 31, 32); *"They saw if we looked questioning at  
386 them and they provided information of their own accord. One didn't need to ask, that I thought was  
387 really good."* (28)

388 Specific support for organ donation surrounding any misunderstanding or religious needs were also  
389 provided, leaving families feeling supported and heard (31); *"[The patient's] greatest fear was organ  
390 trade, he felt very strongly about it. Two physicians took their time, sat with us 2.5 hours and really  
391 explained everything to us . . . They gave us time to discuss things and offered psychological support  
392 if we needed it. It went very smoothly"*

393 **Feeling neglected by staff**

394 In some papers, staff were reported to have been ‘too busy’ to spend quality time with families to  
395 make sure they were ok and understood what was happening (28). Family members wished they had  
396 received more support and guidance from those in the know (32).

397 Another issue that families confronted was a lack of communication or miscommunication which led  
398 to distress, confusion, and unanswered questions (28, 31, 32); *“Nobody said anything to us there –*  
399 *nobody communicated with us. Nobody came out and talked to us during those days – we were told*  
400 *absolutely nothing.”* (28).

401 Families not feeling heard or respected often centred around organ donation, with families refusing  
402 donation and being asked again afterwards (31).

403 6.The lasting impact

404 **Experiencing grief**

405 Family members can often still have unanswered questions about BSD, long after the experience is  
406 over (28). Further to this, with the BSD diagnosis and organ donation experience happening so  
407 quickly, the last image families can have of their family member is of them warm and breathing (due  
408 to the ventilator). This can cause people to feel as though they are saying goodbye to their loved one  
409 whilst they are still alive (30). Others did not feel they were able to say goodbye to their family  
410 members at all because of the difficult ending as well as not being informed where the patient would  
411 be taken to (28).

412 Moreover, observing BSD testing without a full explanation of their purpose and what they entail can  
413 potentially leave families with more distress (27). Though, for those who did not observe the BSD  
414 testing, not knowing what the procedure included led them to have negative images of what they  
415 imagined it to be (27).

416 A way people were able to cope is by finding meaning in what happened. For example, knowing that  
417 if they had survived, they may not have had a good quality of life (28). However, many families  
418 reported wanting further support after their experience in ICU, feeling it would have helped them deal

419 with their grief (28, 30, 32); “*A letter after the event, saying something like, ‘We understand how*  
420 *things are. In the meantime, here is a number.’ You are on your own afterwards. You have got time to*  
421 *think. It would be nice if they would see if you would like to attend a support group or answer*  
422 *questions, to know that you are not on your own. It would be good if they let you know straight*  
423 *away.*”(32).

#### 424 **Impact on well-being**

425 Tawil et al. Tawil, Brown (26) and Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27) measured participant well-  
426 being utilizing the Impact of Event Scale (IES) and General Health Questionnaire-12 (GHQ-12).

427 Tawil et al. Tawil, Brown (26) obtained 41 subjects post measurements (71%): 24 subjects which  
428 were randomized to be present for the BSD tests and 17 who were randomized to be absent. The IES  
429 and GHQ-12 were similar for both groups. The median IES results for those who were present for the  
430 tests was 20.5 and the results of those who were absent were 23.5. In addition, the GHQ-12 scores  
431 were also similar between the groups. The participants in the group who were present in the tests had  
432 a median score of 13 and those who were absent had a median score of 13.6.

433 Ormrod et al. Ormrod, Ryder (27) found that the average IES scores of the 5 relatives who observed  
434 the tests were 21.0 (avoidance) and 23.8 (intrusion) and the average GHQ-12 score was 25. This was  
435 compared to the IES & GHQ-12 scores of the rest of the participants which was 15 (avoidance), 17.4  
436 (intrusion) and 16.8 (GHQ-12). These results could suggest that there were higher levels of depression  
437 and anxiety in those who observed the tests, though due to the small number of relatives who  
438 observed the tests it is difficult to create a meaningful statistical comparison.

## 439 **Discussion**

440 The narrative synthesis highlighted six key common themes across the included studies: The  
441 unexpected prognosis, coming to terms with brain death-grieving process, request for organ donation,  
442 observation of brain stem death testing, impact of staff on family’s experience and the lasting impact.

443 One of the main findings is that families often do not understand the concept of BSD, what the  
444 diagnosis is, and what the implications are. Research suggests that patients only accurately recall  
445 around 49% of information communicated to them by healthcare professionals when prompted (35)  
446 and that 40-80% of information given by healthcare professionals is often forgotten immediately (36).  
447 This highlights the importance of giving information in multiple formats as verbal comprehension and  
448 recall can be compromised in distress.

449 A lack of communication and input from staff forces families to have to work out the answers for  
450 themselves and considering the wide range of debate surrounding BSD online, time in the ICU with  
451 expert professionals presents an opportunity for clarification that families may not receive elsewhere.  
452 Research has shown that families in ICU often perceive staff as being busy and unavailable (37),  
453 report having to constantly seek out staff to get updated information, being rarely approached by staff  
454 to ask if there was anything they needed to know and often not provided with a private space to  
455 discuss news with professionals (38). The findings highlight the importance of staff input on family's  
456 experience and need for better family support provision and training for clinical staff.

457 The review also highlighted the resulting difference between people understanding and accepting a  
458 relatives BSD. For some, despite understanding the diagnosis and the implications, their hope for their  
459 loved one surviving was not waived. For many, seeing their relatives seemingly alive and breathing  
460 gave cause for additional distress and uncertainty. In some instances, observing BSD testing could be  
461 helpful in peoples' movement towards acceptance of death. Many people were pleased to have been  
462 present for the testing and to have had the choice and said they would recommend it to future families.

463 With proper communication and explanation from staff, the process was found to provide further  
464 explanation of BSD and cement peoples pre-existing understanding. However, without clarification of  
465 its purpose and what it would entail, it left some family members further confused. Hodgkinson and  
466 liams Hodgkinson and liams (39) found that with sudden death of relatives, viewing the body may  
467 increase levels of anxiety and distress in the short term, but it lessens the distress for people in the  
468 long term. Though there is little research into the effects of observing BSD tests on family's  
469 experience, long term impact, their understanding, acceptance and grief, nevertheless, these results  
470 suggest the importance of integrating the choice for families to observe the tests.

471

472 Religion and spirituality are likely to play a role in this experience of holding on to hope vs  
473 acceptance, like in the case of Jahi McMath (40). The concept of brain death is less than 100 years old  
474 and therefore religions and their many denominations may have various beliefs on whether brain stem  
475 death is believed to be ‘death’ (41). This highlights the importance of involving Chaplaincy or  
476 equivalent services in supporting families. Many believe that grief plays a particularly poignant role in  
477 the ethical encounter of brain death as it begs the question of what constitutes life and death (42). We  
478 can currently recognise grief through a variety of psychological models. Often, they appear linear as if  
479 the journey of grief has an end. However, the Kübler-Ross Kübler-Ross (34) model looks at 5 stages  
480 of grief that one can experience in any order. Kubler-Ross based this understanding on her work  
481 within palliative care, the stages include; denial, anger, bargaining, depression and acceptance. In  
482 many models of grief, the idea of ‘acceptance’ is key.

483 The allowed time for ‘acceptance’ and understanding of the diagnosis is referred to in BSD literature.  
484 In 2014, the Neurocritical Care Society (43) published a toolkit online regarding brain death to help  
485 hospitals in the US modernize their policies around the determination of BSD. When considering the  
486 communication with family, they refer to a ‘reasonable amount of time’ being allowed for the family  
487 to see the relative and come to terms with the diagnosis before the ventilator is removed. This implies  
488 that grief can be ‘handled’ by allowing family to spend some time with their family member so that  
489 they can come to accept the bereavement Friedrich (42).

490

491 Organ donation as a process was reported to have provided some additional time for the family to  
492 process their experience as well as reassurance, knowing the tragedy could have some purpose in  
493 saving another’s life. Although this seemingly depended on the level of communication received.  
494 Often families did not feel as if they were fully informed of the organ donation procedure, nor were  
495 they granted the time to come to terms with the events. Being asked to donate family members organs  
496 without either fully understanding the implications of BSD or without having ‘given up hope’ could  
497 lead to further distress (31). It left some to wonder whether their own decisions had contributed to  
498 their loved one’s death. Siminoff Siminoff (33) found that understanding of BSD did not correlate

499 with the rate of which people donated, in fact they found that some who did not understand or accept  
500 their loved ones' death still agreed to donation.

501 Other studies focusing on organ donation have found that families require simple, clear, accessible  
502 information about the cause and diagnosis of BSD and decision making in small bitesize pieces,  
503 including this time to think and ask questions to best support people and encourage donation (44).  
504 Some participants also described it as a '*suspended death*' (28) describing a discrepancy between  
505 what they felt was the time of death and the medicolegal death which they claimed interfered with  
506 their grieving process (death anniversaries unknown, for example). Boss Boss (45) identified a new  
507 type of loss named 'Ambiguous Loss'. It occurs when a loved one is physically present but not  
508 psychologically, like Dementia. Boss states that because the loved one is here, but seemingly not,  
509 grief can be frozen or 'put on hold', which leaves people traumatized (46). It is important to consider  
510 the idea of ambiguous loss when thinking about BSD, the family member appearing warm and  
511 breathing when told their life is permanently lost.

512

513 When considering families well-being scores, research included within this review has mixed results.  
514 Tawil et al. Tawil, Brown (26) found no significant difference in family members' median IES and  
515 GHQ-12 scores of those who observed brain stem tests and those who did not. However, a moderate  
516 or severe impact of trauma requires a score of over 26, with 33 and above being considered as the best  
517 representation for a probable PTSD diagnosis. Both groups, present and absent, reported their highest  
518 IES to be above 26. In addition, though no significant difference was found between the two groups'  
519 median, the group which was present for the BSD testing was found to have the highest scores, both  
520 reaching above the score of 33 (avoidance and intrusion scores). Furthermore, Ormrod et al. Ormrod,  
521 Ryder (27) found in their study that observing the tests led to an increase in the likelihood of  
522 depression and anxiety. Findings highlight the need for long-term psychological support for families.

523

## 524 Strengths and Limitations

525 This review is the first to synthesise families experience of a relatives brain stem death diagnosis and  
526 highlight potential clinical and research opportunities that can better support families. The quality  
527 assessment and full text screening was carried out independently by two authors to reduce the level of  
528 bias.

529 It is also important to consider the strengths and limitations of the topic area. The review consisted of  
530 606 participants overall ( $n = 403$  from one study), thus additional research would need to be produced  
531 on this topic to ensure a larger sample could be reviewed across a range of settings. In addition, only 3  
532 studies with quantitative data were included and therefore the heterogeneity in study methodology and  
533 populations limited a meta-analysis. Furthermore, the quality assessment of the data showed 4/9  
534 studies included had a high risk of bias and low publication quality indicating the need for higher  
535 quality research.

536 The diversity of practice could also be considered a barrier in conducting this review. The wide range  
537 of variables including healthcare settings (private, public, understaffed etc), specific country or state  
538 guidelines surrounding BSD, mandatory protocols and tests used to identify BSD are all important  
539 variables to consider that will impact a family's experience which often were not specifically  
540 identified within the individual papers themselves.

541 Moreover, very few studies focused on the cultural impact of both researchers and participants when  
542 experiencing BSD, especially given the role of spirituality and religion in the experience of  
543 understanding, and accepting death. Quality assessment highlighted that cultural or geographical  
544 location was not considered when examining peoples experience of BSD, demonstrated through a  
545 lack of statement from the authors locating themselves and the lack of demographic information  
546 included, with only 2 referencing ethnicities.

547

## 548 Implications

### 549 Intensive Care Unit Support Protocols

550 Though countries may differ on their diagnostic criteria for BSD, there is a possibility for a unified  
551 perception or method of practice when involving and supporting the families.

552 Initial care families receive has an impact on grief and that the way families are initially informed of  
553 their relatives BSD has a significant impact on their overall understanding (47). Not only does the  
554 explanation of BSD need to be uncomplicated and accessible, but that support is provided throughout  
555 each stage and in different formats (verbal and written) so that the explanation can be reiterated to  
556 confirm understanding and staff are present for any further questions (48, 49)

557 Caswell Caswell G (50) conducted a study of communication between families and staff in end-of-life  
558 care. They found that staff could recognise the desire to have more than one conversation with  
559 relatives but also acknowledged that they were often reluctant to want to talk about death. Reportedly  
560 in most countries, how to speak with patients about death is not included in medical school and allied  
561 health professional's education (51). Therefore, it is important that professionals have a protocol they  
562 can follow to allow for adequate support, consistency in communication and confidence in providing  
563 care under these incredibly sensitive circumstances. If meaningful staff involvement is facilitated via  
564 implemented care protocols within these settings, family members' psychological needs can be met  
565 and their grieving process supported (52).

566 These protocols could include; private locations in which families can be spoken to regarding the  
567 BSD diagnosis and what it entails, psychoeducation, a uniform description that professionals within  
568 ICU are familiar with and feel confident in talking through to avoid misinformation or inappropriate  
569 language, having an allotted case worker/staff member to whom any questions or concerns can be  
570 raised to help the family throughout the process, allowing families time with their relative to give  
571 space for acceptance, working with the families to find out what support may be best for them in the  
572 future and arranged check-in calls to follow up on any potential mental health support needs and  
573 signposting services/resources to support with their grief.

574 The John Hopkins Hospital, USA created its first Death by Neurological Criteria Team in June 2016.  
575 This team's development means that diagnosis of BSD can happen faster as a result of specific  
576 professionals who are experienced in BSD working together to conduct the tests and support the  
577 families (53).It is of interest to see the evaluation of such services and how they benefit families.  
578 Given the families' unique experience of grief, and the apparent confusion and uncertainty  
579 surrounding official announcement of BSD, families in this situation require specific grief support to  
580 help navigate them throughout this incredibly difficult time. Volpe Volpe (54) argued that in order to  
581 care for the BSD relatives' families effectively and manage the inevitable ethical and moral conflicts  
582 surrounding the diagnosis, there needs to be further research into new understandings of grief and  
583 ways in which that understanding can be incorporated into the communication with these families.

584 Trauma-informed support

585 Kristensen Kristensen (55) argues that support for those family members who have experienced  
586 sudden and violent deaths of loved ones may require different grief support interventions than for loss  
587 from natural death. This is because several studies have shown that these sudden bereavements can  
588 adversely affect mental health of close ones, with mental health disorders appearing more elevated  
589 and with recovery taking longer. Studies also show that peoples initial reactions to the news of sudden  
590 death (like denial or guilt for example) can assist professionals in estimating how long or severe the  
591 process and progression of grief may be, whether traumatic or pathological (56, 57). This early  
592 identification of traumatic grief can enable appropriate follow up and specific support.

593 Bolton Bolton JM (58) found that those who grieve after unexpected death are three times more likely  
594 to have psychological disorders than those who grieve a natural death. Though the reviewed studies  
595 did not explore any potential trauma symptoms associated with the experience of their loved one  
596 passing, Tawil et al. Tawil, Brown (26) demonstrated how this experience could potentially lead to  
597 symptoms of PTSD and some participants referenced specific distress surrounding imagery and  
598 memories from their hospital experience. For example, though for some witnessing the BSD tests  
599 helped with their acceptance of the loved ones diagnosis, some referenced experiencing intrusive  
600 memories over a year later and even those who did not witness the tests found the imagined version of

601 them seemingly traumatic,; *'The most vivid parts of the tests was the cotton wool – I don't know why*  
602 *but I remember it over and over again.'*; *'I visualise the tests even though I never saw them'*. (27).

603 Scott Scott (59) found that social support following a sudden bereavement is associated with reduced  
604 depressive and PTSD symptoms. Thus, further research into trauma-informed grief support needs of  
605 the family members affected both in the short and long term are needed.

## 606 Cultural Implications

607 As shown in Siminoff Siminoff (33) cultural differences can impact the way in which we understand  
608 death and are able to accept it. It is important for us to examine the way in which this not only will  
609 impact families experience of BSD, but also the way in which professionals may understand it too.  
610 Consequently, additional implications to consider could include providing a safe space for  
611 professionals themselves to ask questions. It is important to have a workforce which is knowledgeable  
612 and respectful, understanding not only the different beliefs that could exist between their service  
613 users, but also within their team, encouraging discussion without judgement to ensure their well-being  
614 is also considered. If physicians are well-informed in this way, they can then better manage sensitive  
615 discussions with families and reduce confusion (14).

616 Moreover, working closely with chaplaincy services and religious leaders can increase trust of the  
617 medical interventions and help families feel at ease (19).

## 618 Conclusion

619 This review demonstrates the psychological impact of a relatives' brain stem death diagnosis on  
620 families, most notably families lack of understanding of the brain stem death diagnosis, even months  
621 after their relative has passed and longer-term psychological distress. It is of importance to establish  
622 specific BSD protocols that can aid a consistent approach, better communication with families and  
623 further research into ways in which families can be supported throughout this process to avoid adverse  
624 consequences and psychological distress.

625

626

627

628  
629  
630  
631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

645

646

647

648

649

650

651

652

653

## References

- 654 1. Engelhardt T. Redefining Death: The Mirage of Consensus. Youngner SJ, Arnold RM,  
655 Schapiro R, editors. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press; 1999.  
656 2. McConnell JR. The ambiguity about death in Japan: an ethical implication for organ  
657 procurement. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. 1999;25(4):322-4.

- 658 3. Walter K. Brain Death. *JAMA Journal of the American Medical Association*.  
659 2020;324(11):1116.
- 660 4. Wijdicks EFM. Brain death worldwide: Accepted fact but no global consensus in  
661 diagnostic criteria. *Neurology*. 2002;58(1):20-5.
- 662 5. Wahlster S WE, Patel PV, Greer DM, Hemphill JC, Carone M, Mateen FJ. Brain death  
663 declaration: Practices and perceptions worldwide. *Neurology*. 2015;5(84(18):):1870-9.
- 664 6. Yuan F, Zhang, W., Wen, W., Li, H., Wu, S. and Wang, L. Variability Across Countries for  
665 Brain Stem Death Determination in Adults. 2020.
- 666 7. Greer D, . Shemie, SD,. Lewis, A., et al. Determination of Brain Death/Death by Neurologic  
667 Criteria: The World Brain Death Project. *JAMA*. 2020;324(11):1078-97.
- 668 8. Bell MDD. Brainstem death testing in the UK, time for reappraisal? . *British Journal of*  
669 *Anaesthesia*. 2005;92(5):633-40.
- 670 9. Dwyer R, Motherway, C. and Phelan, D. Diagnosis of Brain Death in Adults; Guidelines.  
671 Intensive Care Society of Ireland. 2016.
- 672 10. Randhawa G. Death and Organ Donation: Meeting the Needs of Multiethnic and  
673 Multifaith Populations. *British Journal of Anaesthesia*. 2012(108):88–91.
- 674 11. Popal S, Hall, S. and Padela, A. Muslim American physicians' views on brain death:  
675 Findings from a national survey. *Avicenna Journal of Medicine*. 2021;11((02)):63-9.
- 676 12. John L. MG, Stephan M., Kenneth P., Jeremy R S., Avraham S., Moshe D T., Mordechai W.,  
677 Ruth L F. The Critical Role of Religion: Caring for the Dying Patient from an Orthodox Jewish  
678 Perspective. *Journal of Palliative Medicine*. 2010;13(10).
- 679 13. Verheijde JL, Rady, M. Y., & Potts, M. Neuroscience and Brain Death Controversies: The  
680 Elephant in the Room. *Journal of religion and health*. 2018;57((5),):1745–63.
- 681 14. Lancet T. Religion, organ transplantation, and the definition of death. *The Lancet*.  
682 2011;377(9762):271.
- 683 15. UK Donation Ethics Committee. An ethical framework for donation after confirmation of  
684 death using neurological criteria (DBD): Academy of Medical Royal Colleges; 2016 [Available  
685 from: [https://www.aomrc.org.uk/wp-](https://www.aomrc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Ethical-framework-donation-after-confirmation-death-using-neurological-criteria-2.pdf)  
686 [content/uploads/2016/07/Ethical-framework-donation-after-confirmation-death-using-neuro-](https://www.aomrc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Ethical-framework-donation-after-confirmation-death-using-neurological-criteria-2.pdf)  
687 [logical-criteria-2.pdf](https://www.aomrc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/Ethical-framework-donation-after-confirmation-death-using-neurological-criteria-2.pdf).
- 688 16. Christie B. Scotland plans to move to opt-out system for organ donation. *BMJ*.  
689 2017(358):3298.
- 690 17. Care UGDoHaS. Introducing 'opt-out' consent for organ and tissue donation in England  
691 2020 [Available from: [https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/introducing-opt-out-](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/introducing-opt-out-consent-for-organ-and-tissue-donation-in-england)  
692 [consent-for-organ-and-tissue-donation-in-england](https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/introducing-opt-out-consent-for-organ-and-tissue-donation-in-england).
- 693 18. Kompanje EJ, de Groot YJ, Bakker J, Ijzermans JN. A national multicenter trial on family  
694 presence during brain death determination: the FABRA study. *Neurocrit Care*. 2012;17(2):301-  
695 8.
- 696 19. Stahl DaT, T. Death by Neurological Criteria: Caring for Families amid Tragedy. *The*  
697 *Linacre Quarterly*. 2019;86(4):394-403.
- 698 20. Yang Q, Miller, G. East–West Differences in Perception of Brain Death. *Bioethical Inquiry*.  
699 2015;12:211-25.
- 700 21. Youngner SJ, Landefeld, C. S., Coulton, C. J., Juknialis, B. W., & Leary, M., . 'Brain death' and  
701 organ retrieval. A cross-sectional survey of knowledge and concepts among health  
702 professionals. *JAMA*. 1989;261(15):2205–10.
- 703 22. Page M J MJE, Bossuyt P M, Boutron I, Hoffmann T C, Mulrow C D et al. . The PRISMA  
704 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *The PRISMA*.  
705 2021;372:71.
- 706 23. Ryan R. Cochrane Consumers and Communication Review Group: data synthesis and  
707 analysis. Cochrane Consumers and Communication Review Group 2013.
- 708 24. G W, Noblit, R, D, Hare., Meta-ethnography: synthesizing qualitative studies. 1988.
- 709 25. The Joanna Briggs Institute. Joanna Briggs Institute reviewers' manual. Adelaide: The  
710 Joanna Briggs Institute; 2014.

- 711 26. Tawil I, Brown LH, Comfort D, Crandall CS, West SD, Rollstin AD, et al. Family presence  
712 during brain death evaluation: a randomized controlled trial\*. *Crit Care Med*. 2014;42(4):934-  
713 42.
- 714 27. Ormrod JA, Ryder T, Chadwick RJ, Bonner SM. Experiences of families when a relative is  
715 diagnosed brain stem dead: understanding of death, observation of brain stem death testing and  
716 attitudes to organ donation. *Anaesthesia*. 2005;60(10):1002-8.
- 717 28. Frid I, Bergbom I, Haljamae H. No going back: narratives by close relatives of the  
718 braindead patient. *Intensive Crit Care Nurs*. 2001;17(5):263-78.
- 719 29. Frid I, Haljamae H, Ohlen J, Bergbom I. Brain death: close relatives' use of imagery as a  
720 descriptor of experience. *J Adv Nurs*. 2007;58(1):63-71.
- 721 30. Kentish-Barnes N, Cohen-Solal Z, Souppart V, Cheisson G, Joseph L, Martin-Lefevre L, et  
722 al. Being Convinced and Taking Responsibility: A Qualitative Study of Family Members'  
723 Experience of Organ Donation Decision and Bereavement After Brain Death. *Crit Care Med*.  
724 2019;47(4):526-34.
- 725 31. Kesselring A, Kainz M, Kiss A. Traumatic memories of relatives regarding brain death,  
726 request for organ donation and interactions with professionals in the ICU. *Am J Transplant*.  
727 2007;7(1):211-7.
- 728 32. Lloyd-Williams M, Morton J, Peters S. The end-of-life care experiences of relatives of  
729 brain dead intensive care patients. *J Pain Symptom Manage*. 2009;37(4):659-64.
- 730 33. Siminoff L, A., Mercer, M, B., Arnold, R. Families' understanding of brain death. *Progress*  
731 *in Transplantation*. 2003(13):218-24.
- 732 34. Kübler-Ross E. *On death and dying*. The Macmillan Company. 1969.
- 733 35. Laws M B, Y Lee., T, Taubin., W, H, Rogers., & I, B, Wilson.,. Factors associated with  
734 patient recall of key information in ambulatory specialty care visits: Results of an innovative  
735 methodology. 2018.
- 736 36. R P, C, Kessels.,. Patients' memory for medical information. *J R Soc Med* 2003;96(5):219-  
737 22.
- 738 37. Dunne K SK. Family experiences of palliative care in the acute hospital setting. *Int J*  
739 *Palliat Nurs*. 2000;6:170-8.
- 740 38. Robinson J GM, Ingleton C., . Patient and family experiences of palliative care in hospital:  
741 What do we know? An integrative review. *Palliative Medicine*. 2014;28:18-33.
- 742 39. Hodgkinson PE, Joseph, S., Yule, W., & Wil-, liams R. Viewing human remains following  
743 disaster: Helpful or harmful? *Medicine, Science and Law*. 1993(33):197-202.
- 744 40. RD T. Defining Death—Making Sense of the Case of Jahi McMath. *JAMA*.  
745 2018;319(18):1859-60.
- 746 41. Chiramel FD KVS, Ali MM, Singh B, Mohamed ZU. The view of major religions of india on  
747 brain stem death and organ donation. *Amrita J Med*. 2020;16(82):6.
- 748 42. Friedrich AB. More Than “Spending Time with the Body”: The Role of a Family’s Grief in  
749 Determinations of Brain Death. *Bioethical Inquiry*. 2019(16):489-99.
- 750 43. Neurocritical Care Society. *Brain Death Toolkit*. 2014.
- 751 44. Sque M LT, Payne S, et al.,. Why relatives do not donate organs for transplants ‘sacrifice’  
752 or ‘gift of life’? *J Adv Nurs*. 2007;61:134-44.
- 753 45. Boss P. *Ambiguous loss: learning to live with unresolved grief*. 1999.
- 754 46. Boss P. *The Trauma and Complicated Grief of Ambiguous Loss*. *Pastoral Psychology*  
755 2010(59):137-45.
- 756 47. Sque M, Long-Sutehall, T., & Payne, S. (2003). *Organ and Tissue Donation: Exploring the*  
757 *Needs of Families*. 2003.
- 758 48. Pearson A, Robertson-Malt S, Walsh K, Fitzgerald M., . Intensive care nurses’ experiences  
759 of caring for brain dead organ donor patients. *Journal of Clinical Nursing* 2001;2001(10):132-  
760 39.
- 761 49. M R. *The presence of relatives during brainstem death testing in an intensive care unit*.  
762 *Intensive Care Society*. 2013;14(4).

- 763 50. Caswell G PK, Harwood R, Porock D. Communication between family carers and health  
764 professionals about end-of-life care for older people in the acute hospital setting: a qualitative  
765 study. *BMC Palliative Care* 2015;1(14):35.
- 766 51. Güven BB, Maden, Ö., Satar, A.D. et al., . Factors affecting the emotional reactions of  
767 patient relatives who receive news of death: a prospective observational study. *BMC Psychol.*  
768 2022;10:58.
- 769 52. Doran M. The presence of family during brain stem death testing. *Journal of Intensive*  
770 *Critical Care Nursing.* 2004;b(20):87-92.
- 771 53. John Hopkins M. The Challenges of Defining and Diagnosing Brain Death. 2021.
- 772 54. Volpe R, J.S. Crites, and K.L. Kirschner. . Temporizing after spinal cord injury. *Hastings*  
773 *Center Report.* 2015;45(2):8-10.
- 774 55. Kristensen P, Weisaeth, L., & Heir, T. . Bereavement and Mental Health after Sudden and  
775 Violent Losses: A Review. *Psychiatry: Interpersonal and Biological Processes.* 2012:75-97.
- 776 56. Çelik FGH HÇ. After landslide in Rize “traumatic grief”: three case studies. *J Clin*  
777 *Psychiatry.* 2015;18(4):130-6.
- 778 57. Simon NM WM, Keshaviah A, Dryman MT, LeBlanc NJ, Shear MK., . Informing the  
779 symptom profile of complicated grief. *Depress Anxiety.* 2011;28(2):118-26.
- 780 58. Bolton JM AW, Leslie WD, Martens PJ, Enns MW, Roos LL, et al., . Parents bereaved by  
781 offspring suicide: a population-based longitudinal case-control study. *JAMA Psychiat*  
782 2013;70(2):158-67.
- 783 59. Scott HR, Pitman, A., Kozhuharova, P., & Lloyd-Evans, B. . A systematic review of studies  
784 describing the influence of informal social support on psychological wellbeing in people  
785 bereaved by sudden or violent causes of death. *BMC psychiatry.* 2020;20(1):265.
- 786