## Navigating Complex Family Dynamics in Living Donor Liver Donation: Speedbumps Are Not Always Stop Signs

Emily Tillman, MS, MSW, LSW

**ILDA** 

University of Pittsburgh Medical Center



14th Annual Living Donation Conference

Presented by the American Foundation for Donation and Transplantation

### "Ideal Donor"

- No medical or psychiatric contraindications
- No financial concerns/strong financial support plan
- Adequate health literacy- "did their homework"
- Firm and simple motivation- ex: the "no brainer"
- Intact and supportive family system



## **Family Dynamics in Living Donation**

- Limited research on family dynamics and their impact on living donor motivation and informed consent when donating to a family member (pertaining to US population)
- Current literature does not adequately address specific ways for centers to evaluate and consider donors who may want to donate to a family member with whom they have a complex or distressed relationship



### Bias

 Bias may be towards donors with uncomplicated or traditionally "good" relationships with family member recipient candidates

 May be missing out on the opportunity to complete further assessment or offer additional support in order to allow donors with more complex situations to proceed



### **Creates Limits on:**

A center's ability to help recipient candidates

A program's commitment to the value of donor autonomy



## **Case Study**

 Offers an example of how our team approached the evaluation and support of a donor in a distressed family system while prioritizing:

- Donor Autonomy
- Informed Consent
- Donor Safety



### **UPMC Process**

- Potential donor submits information through our website
- Nurse coordinators screen donors based on criteria (age, BMI, health history, etc)
- ILDA team contacts donor for pre-evaluation conversation
  - Review process, screen for coersion or pressure, discuss medical out
- Evaluation
- Post-Evaluation Follow Up
  - Assess understanding of process and risks



## Living Liver Donor: First Evaluation

- Donor evaluated for donation to his biological parent
  - Metastases to the liver from a non-liver primary cancer
- Male, early 40's, married, two children
- Deemed a good medical and surgical candidate
  - Minimal alcohol use, remote rare drug experimentation, quit nicotine the prior year
  - No psychiatric contraindications
- Confirmed caregiver (wife)
- Self-employed
- Lives in a different state from our center
- Donor described his relationship with his recipient as "distant" but intact

## **Approved But Delayed**

- Donor was approved and surgery was scheduled
- Surgery was then cancelled due to medical issues in the recipient
- A little over one year later, recipient was deemed eligible again
  - Donor once again came forward to donate



### **Second Evaluation**

 No changes to donor's health status, caregiver plan, finances, or psychiatric history

#### However...

- Donor disclosed that he and his recipient had a serious falling out and were no longer on speaking terms
- Donor reported his sibling had considered donating instead because of this rift but the sibling changed their mind
- Donor expressed a strong desire to avoid any contact with his intended recipient at any point during the donation process
- Our team had concerns about how this dynamic would impact donor's ability to proceed safely

#### **Essential Areas of Assessment**

- Motivation
- Informed Consent
- Pressure or Coersion

### **Multiple Timepoints**

- Before Evaluations
- Evaluations
- After Evaluations
- ILDA team following this donor closely throughout

### **Motivation**

- Donor's motivation was assessed thoroughly by ILDA team, nurse coordinator, social work, and psychiatry
  - First Evaluation- Donor reported that he wanted to help his parent live a longer life
  - Second Evaluation- Donor felt strongly that he wanted to donate because he believed it was the right thing for him to do for himself and his value system
    - Exercise in forgiveness
- Donor denied expectations that donation would improve his relationship with his parent or change it in any way.
  - This was a particularly important assessment point during the second evaluation
- Donor denied experiencing any pressure to donate from his intended recipient or other family members at all time points.

### **Informed Consent**

- Donor was educated on risks of living liver donation and endorsed full understanding
- Donor was provided additional information related to transplant as a treatment of liver metastases via living donation and outcomes
- Discussions were held with the donor about stressors that could occur that were unique to his situation
  - No guarantee that he would not encounter his recipient while inpatient or during follow up
    - Informed donor that some of his specific requests (such as being on a separate unit from recipient immediately post surgery) were not feasible
  - Complications or poor outcome for himself or recipient may be more difficult to process



## **Extra Support for Donor**

- ILDA team offered to assist donor find therapy resources
- ILDA team discussed with donor strategies for navigating communication between donor and recipient prior to surgery should he desire it (such as a family meeting with a moderator or other neutral third party)
- Precautions were arranged by the medical team to minimize the chance of contact
  - Room assignments on opposite ends of transplant units
  - Extra briefing with inpatient staff
- Multiple inpatient post-surgery contacts to offer support and assess coping



### **Outcome**

- Donor was approved
- Recipient was agreeable to proceeding
- Transplant was completed
  - Donor did report unintended contact with the recipient on more than one occasion prior to arriving at the hospital for surgery
  - No additional conflict was reported
- Donor endorsed having a positive experience with donation immediately post donation and during multiple follow ups



## **Take Aways**

- While donor evaluation is in many respects "one size fits all", much of it is also "case by case"
  - Unanticipated situations often require flexibility and creativity
  - Anticipate speedbumps
  - Standardized guidelines should be partnered with clinical judgement
- When in doubt, more conversations are better
- Teamwork
- Meeting donors where they are whenever possible
  - If we can do it safely, we should strive to let donors make the call

## **Co-Investigators**

Abhinav Humar, MD

Deborah Maurer, RN, MBA

Emily Tillman, MS, MSW, LSW

Halee V. Stroup, MS, NCC

Vikraman Gunabushanam, MD

Karen Emmett, BSN, RN, CCTN

Aileen Gallatin, MSED, BSN, RN, CCTC

Swaytha Ganesh, MD

Christopher Hughes, MD

Special thanks to all the living donors who give the gift of life



# Thank you



