 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Qualitative Research

When the patient is making the (wrong) diagnosis: a biographical approach to patients consulting for presumed lyme disease.

Running head : "Lyme Disease : when the patient is making the (wrong) diagnosis"

Authors: Romain Lutaud[a,b,c], Pierre Verger[c], Patrick Peretti-Watel[d], Carole Eldin[e].

[a]Department of General Practice, Aix Marseille Univ, Marseille, France, [b]UMR UMR 7268 ADES, EFS, CNRS, Aix-Marseille univ, Marseille France, [c]ORS PACA, Observatoire régional de la santé Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, Marseille, France, [d]UMR VITROME, Aix Marseille Univ, IRD, AP-HM, SSA, Marseille, France, [e]UMR UVE, Aix Marseille Univ, IRD, Inserm, Marseille, France.

Correspondence to Dr R. Lutaud, Department of General Practice, Aix Marseille Univ, 27 bd Jean Moulin, 13385 Marseille, France ; E-mail : romain.lutaud@univ-amu.fr

Key messages:

- Patients suffering from functional somatic syndrome tend to attribute their symptoms to Lyme Disease.

- Personal testimonies on the Internet are often at the origin of the irruption of the LD diagnosis in patient pathways.

- General practitioners are not perceived by their patients as being sufficiently responsive to their complaints.

- Patients took the lead in diagnosis locking them in medical wandering.

- GPs as managers of care pathways, should involve patients in diagnostic process to improves adherence to the diagnosis of functional somatic syndrome.

Abstract

Background: Media coverage of Lyme disease (LD) has led to an increase in consultations for presumed LD in Europe. However, LD is confirmed in only 10-20% of patients, with a significant number remaining in a diagnostic dead-end.

Objectives:

To reach a deeper understanding of how patients themselves contribute to the diagnostic process.

To describe the genesis of the LD hypothesis in care pathways.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Methods: In 2019, 30 patients from a prospective cohort consulting in the infectious diseases department at University Hospital in Marseille for presumed LD were recruited for semi-structured interviews. The inclusion criteria were : suffering from subjective symptoms for 6 months, no clinical or paraclinical argument suggesting current LD. The patients' medical trajectories were collected using a biographical approach.

Results: The diagnosis of Lyme disease was primarily triggered by identification with personal testimonies found on the internet. Most of patients were leading the diagnostic investigation. Majority of participants were convinced they had LD despite the lack of medical evidence and the scepticism of their referring GP.

Conclusion: GPs should first systematically explore patients' etiologic representations. We hypothesize that a patient-centered approach improves adherence to the diagnosis especially in the management of medically unexplained symptoms. Long COVID-19 syndrome challenge offers an opportunity to promote active patient involvement in diagnosis.

Keywords: lyme disease, clinical decision-making, medical history taking, physician-patient relation, primary health care, qualitative research.

Introduction

Lyme disease (LD), which received little media coverage in France until the end of the 2000s, is now the subject of a controversy **(1)**, with sometimes virulent public debates. Doctors and patients represented by associations, demand recognition of a chronic form of the disease associated with non-specific symptoms such as pain, asthenia, and concentration disorders **(2)**. In this context, long-term antibiotic treatments are often prescribed despite the absence of proven benefits and may cause serious adverse reactions and even death in some patients **(3–7)**.

To date, there is no evidence in humans pointing towards the diagnostic criteria of a possible chronic LD **(8)**. However, media coverage of this disease has led to an increase in consultations for presumed LD in France and in Europe **(9,10)**. In France, annual incidence is estimated at around 33,000 cases and presents strong regional disparities, with the incidence being very low around the Mediterranean area, where the vector is rare **(11)**.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Series of patients consulting with a suspicion of LD result in a confirmed diagnosis of LD for only 10 to 20%, while significant numbers of patients (6-26%) with non-specific symptoms (arthralgia, asthenia, myalgia, headaches) remain undiagnosed at the end of the etiological investigation **(12–14)**.

In a context of easier access to medical information, media coverage of many health issues, and official discourse promoting patient autonomy **(15)**, this paradigm has been begun to be reversed the last decades: physicians are now confronted with patients who produce diagnoses and seek to confirm them through the use of health professionals **(16)**.

Using a biographical approach, we sought to describe the diagnostic pathways of patients who initially consulted for a suspicion of LD and for whom this diagnosis had been rejected by an infectiologist at the time of their inclusion in the study. We wanted to better understand firstly the influence of the social environment on the genesis of LD hypothesis ; secondly the role of the patient in the diagnostic investigation.

Materials and Methods

Study design and sampling

This is a qualitative single-centre study. Participants were recruited from a regional clinical research program dedicated to tick-borne diseases led by University Hospital Institute (IHU) Méditerranée Infections in Marseille. This project was approved by an ethical committee. The reporting of this study follows the COREQ guidelines (**figure S1**).

Between 1 May and 30 June 2019, a convenience sampling was performed: we recruited the first 30 consecutive patients from a prospective cohort consulting in infectious diseases department at the IHU for presumed LD willing to be interviewed. Patients were eligible to participate if they were 18 years or older, French-speaking, and able to provide informed consent. They had all previously been seen in consultation with a senior infectiologist. Inclusion criteria were as follows: presenting non-specific symptoms such as fatigue, difficulty concentrating, joint, muscle or headache pain for at least six months; having a negative Lyme serology; and no evidence for an organic differential diagnosis.

Interview guide and biographical approach

The interview guide (**table 1**) was developed and iteratively revised during pretesting with five older adults (not included in the study). The semi-structured interviews followed a biographical approach, using an interview guide covering the history of symptoms and referrals to different medical specialties, detailed diagnostic pathway,

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

including the history of the differential diagnoses, genesis of the LD diagnosis, the patient's prioritisation of the most likely diagnostic hypotheses, and the associated diagnostic degree of certainty (low, medium, high). The interview guide also covered relationships with health professionals, in particular general practitioners (GPs), their role in conducting the diagnostic enquiry, the impact of symptoms on daily life, and finally patients' views of the disease. The biographical approach uses a life-events calendar method (**figure S2**), a retrospective data collection tool highlighting the chronological order and proximity of events to jointly analyse several aspects of the patient's life **(17)**.

2.3 Data collection and analysis

One male investigator (RL) trained in qualitative methods conducted all interviews in person. The investigator had no direct clinical relationship with any participant. Interviews occurred in a private meeting room at the IHU after a scheduled follow-up consultation. The interviews were systematically audio recorded with the patients' agreement. We also used personal documents spontaneously provided by the patient (medical files, illness diary etc) and investigator' field notes. Interviews were fully transcribed, coded and analysed using the NVivo qualitative data software. All the collected data were systematically cross-checked. Two investigators (RL and CE, the clinician who performed the medical consultation) independently coded all transcripts. Differences were reconciled by consensus until 100% agreement was reached.

The clinical profile category was defined according to the patient's prioritisation of symptoms, in decreasing order of their impact on their quality of life. The category "diagnostic survey coordinator" was coded from the intersection of the following elements: the person who asked for serology test, the patient's deliberate search for a "pro-Lyme doctor" to confirm the diagnosis, spontaneous consultation of specialists (without referral by the GP), particularly infectious disease consultations, presence/absence of a referring GP (or other referring physician) and finally spontaneous statements during the qualitative interview (e.g. "I conducted the investigation"). The category "pro-Lyme caregiver" was chosen if the patient reported during their pathway at least one consultation with a "specialist in chronic LD", whether they were a doctor or other caregiver providing non-conventional medicines (naturopath, kinesiologist, nutrition-therapist). The category of "Lyme activist" was chosen if the patient was a member of an association or an active member of a forum dedicated to LD.

Results

Participant and interview characteristics (**Table 2**).

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

We included 30 patients. Participants were mainly women with an average age of 47.3 years, with a high education level. Interviews lasted from 44 minutes to 85 minutes. The "pain" clinical profile was predominant. The history of the disease was long with an average symptom duration of 8.5 years.

Results: the verbatims are described in table 3.

Diagnostic pathway **(tables 3-4)**

During their diagnostic investigation, the patients had consulted many specialists (often more than 4, including the psychiatrist), they had more often used complementary therapies (naturopathy, homeopathy, kinesiology, etc.) and most of them had consulted a pain-relief center. Regarding the history of differential diagnoses, most patients mentioned the diagnosis of fibromyalgia, but rejected it because they considered it as a diagnosis by default and a way of psychiatrizing their symptoms. In the end, after double coding, we found that 23 patients had coordinated alone the etiological search; for the others, the investigation was carried out by their referring physician (Table 4).

The role of physicians appears paradoxical: although patients frequently solicited them (number of referrals), physicians were powerless, or unwilling, to offer structured care pathways. The long diagnostic and therapeutic wandering of these patients contributes to reinforce the feeling of being definitively misunderstood by the medical profession and in fine to lock them in their sufferings.

Genesis of the Lyme Disease diagnostic hypothesis **(tables 3, 5)**

A majority of patients did not report a history of tick bites. For these patients, the main types of potential exposure to the Lyme vector were the presence of ticks in their environment, contact with traditionally tick-carrying animals, and having spent time in a region perceived to be endemic like forests in the north-east of France.

The hypothesis of "chronic LD" in the diagnostic pathway/trajectory of patients was most often triggered by their identification with other patients' clinical narratives circulating on different media and social networks.

Other circumstances triggered diagnostic investigations including presence of false positive Lyme serology during a medical check-up, family or close friends raising the question of LD and finally, the hypothesis evoked by their doctors.

All patients had previously undergone serological testing in a laboratory. Serology was often prescribed at the request of patients, despite the fact that their referring doctors were sceptical about the Lyme hypothesis. For a

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

majority of patients, the test was negative, for the others, the result was considered as a false positive by the clinician according to international and national guidelines **(18,19)**. Some patient had used laboratories whose techniques were not validated by international standards: private laboratories in Germany, "alternative" private French laboratories, or via a self-test kit obtained on the internet, all recommended by the websites of various patient associations. In addition, nearly half of patients had received an antibiotic therapy for "chronic Lyme disease", which was not justified on the basis of current recommendations.

Majority of patients stated that they believed the diagnosis of LD to be the main explanation for their symptoms and considered this diagnosis to be highly certain. Patients with a "Lyme activist" profile were marginal in our sample.

Expected secondary benefits of LD diagnosis

For some patients LD was an additional disease necessary to explain all the symptoms when the diagnosis of the doctor does not explain everything or when the singular picture of the patient does not fit into the general framework of one disease. LD syndrome was clearly a way to explain all the symptoms. In addition, it was easily perceived as a disease that could be cured by the use of antibiotics for which they needed prescribers. LD diagnoses were clearly perceived, beyond putting a word to their symptoms, as a hope for recovery.

Discussion

When the patient makes the diagnosis

A large majority of patients (with the participation of their entourage) were at the origin of the LD hypothesis. The important role of narratives from other patients on social networks or in the media supports our first hypothesis regarding the role of social environment in the genesis of "diagnostic hypotheses". These stories are particularly valued by patients in situations marked by the absence of a satisfactory diagnostic proposal from doctors. The proliferation of personal testimonies on the internet illustrates this type of bias. The general public refers to this type of information source much more often, to the detriment of more "objective" and official sources **(15,20,21)**. This is in line with the results of a qualitative survey performed in Connecticut (USA), which reported that patients with LD placed greater trust in the experiences of close relatives who had contracted Lyme disease than in information disseminated by health professionals and health authorities **(22)**. Moreover, patients could find online tools to back up their hypotheses.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Majority of patients managed to convince their GP to prescribe a Lyme serology test, illustrating that the medical decision is no longer monopolised by doctors. This reflects the contemporary role of patients claiming the legitimacy of a diagnosis based on their own experience **(23,24)**. The recognition of the patients' diagnostic proactivity has recently been the subject of studies in the field of social sciences of health **(16,25–28)**. Fainzang showed that diagnostic work was more particularly exercised by patients when physicians are unable to elucidate the causes of their disorders than when they are, with patients taking charge of the entire sequence from self-diagnosis to self-prescribing **(27)**.

A diagnosis set in advance"

For the first time, our study explores the level of conviction associated with LD diagnosis. A large majority of patients did not report a tick bite, but often mentioned that they may have been bitten without noticing or remembering. A negative serology was not sufficient to completely exclude the diagnosis of LD and, in the case of uncertain serologies, patients often gave more weight to the positivity of the ELISA test than to a negative Western Blot reference test. The "Lyme activist" profile, and/or an encounter with a "pro-Lyme" caregiver concerned a minority of the pathways described in this study and cannot by itself explain this high level of conviction observed among participants.

The attribution of symptoms to a well-identified external (environmental) cause is well described in the literature on LD and more generally on somatoform disorders **(29–31)**. The infectious origin is often guilt-reducing for patient and and offers the prospect of a potentially curable disease.

Moreover, the higher level of certainty about the LD hypothesis in patients leading their own diagnostic pathway suggests they had a pre-established etiological scenario and were seeking to put together the different elements of the medical puzzle to demonstrate this. In cognitive psychology, this phenomenon is known as "confirmation bias" and describes our tendency to seek, interpret, promote, and recall information that confirms or supports our previous personal beliefs or values **(21,32)**. Cognitive confirmation bias clearly exacerbates false belief entrapment and isolation of the patient in the care pathway **(21)**.

Disappointment with science and scientific controversies

The current controversies over the chronic form of LD remind us of the strength of the population's contemporary disenchantment with science, as highlighted by Ulrich Beck **(15,33)**. Both the general population and the medical

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

community are disappointed in modern science, which generates a multitude of highly specialised, fragmented, temporary, and often contradictory results, especially in the biomedical field. This is especially the case in the French context of the Lyme controversy. In 2018, French scientific societies and the National Academy of Medicine refused to approve the recommendations on LD published by the Haute Autorité de Santé, a French government agency **(34,35)**. Indeed, French scientific societies (including French College of General Practitioners) did not recognise the new clinical entity called "symptom/polymorphic syndrome persisting after a possible tick bite" arguing that the term was not based on scientific evidence and opened the door to over-diagnosis and inappropriate antibiotic prescriptions **(35,36)**.

Strengths and limitations

The originality of this study lies in the population studied which consists of patients who have reached a diagnostic dead-end. In this frequent situation regarding LD, we showed that most of the patients were the driving force of the etiological investigations of their symptoms. Despite medical evidence, almost half of them were strongly convinced that they were suffering from LD.

To our knowledge, this study was also the first to apply a biographical approach to the analysis of the diagnostic trajectories of patients consulting in infectious disease wards for a suspected LD. This approach allowed for the joint analysis of contextualised self-reported data and clinical data from medical records. The interviews, by focusing on the overlap between life, medical and clinical events, highlighted the two dimensions at work in any care pathway: biology and biography **(37)**.

As for any qualitative study, it's hard to extrapolate the findings. In addition, convenient sampling method introduces motivation bias into the study in particular to over-select patients who are more reflective and engaged in their care pathway. But our sample size (n=30) was the largest to date among the international qualitative research published on the subject **(29,30,38–40)**.

Comparison with existing literature

A previous qualitative study involving 13 patients in the Savoy region of France reported the same results on the role of the internet and the media in the care pathways of these patients and in triggering their suspicion of chronic LD **(29)**. However, the method of recruitment through a patient association led to an over-representation of patients who had activist attitudes, who were more likely to support conspiracy theories, who were explicitly reported to

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

be in conflict with the medical profession, and who had been "exposed to Lyme doctors". Other international qualitative studies on the subject focused on the experience and impact of the disease in the daily life of patients **(30,38,39)**.

Conclusions

The clinician's ability to listen to the patient's disease history rarely includes consideration of the patient's diagnostic experience(16). By opposing the doctor as the sole custodian of the medical diagnosis(41), to patients reduced to the subjectivity of their symptoms, run the risk of seeing the development of diagnostic dead-end or parallel diagnostic pathways. Dissatisfaction with the medical diagnosis is the classic explanation for the use of alternative medicine **(42,43)**. Finally, the empowerment of the patient **(44)** in the diagnostic process suggests that doctors in France in particular are insufficiently trained to deal with functional somatic syndrome **(21)**.

In conclusion, clinicians should systematically explore the etiological representations of their patients in a patient-centred care approach in order to improve adherence to the diagnosis and o recreate the conditions for a therapeutic alliance especially in the management of functional somatic syndromes. In some aspects, the management of patients with suspected Long COVID-19 syndrome will certainly challenge us to promote active patient involvement in diagnosis **(44)**.

Acknowledgments: We thank our colleagues, Jeremy Ward (sociologist of our research unit) and Clementine Montagnac (from the Neurology Department) for their collaboration in our study.

Ethical approval: The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and approved by was approved by an ethical committee (French Committee for the Protection of Persons, authorisation No. 2019 T3-10)**.** Written Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Funding: This research was supported by the IHU Méditerranée Infection; the National Research Agency under the programme "Investissements d'avenir" [ANR-10-AHU-03]; the Region Provence Alpes Côte d'Azur and European funding "FEDER PIRMI".

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

References

1. Sordet C. Chronic Lyme disease: fact or fiction? Joint Bone Spine. 2014 Mar;81(2):110–1.

2. Feder HM, Johnson BJB, O'Connell S, Shapiro ED, Steere AC, Wormser GP. A Critical Appraisal of "Chronic Lyme Disease." N Engl J Med. 2007 Oct 4;357(14):1422–30.

3. Marzec NS. Serious Bacterial Infections Acquired During Treatment of Patients Given a Diagnosis of Chronic Lyme Disease — United States. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2020 May 31];66. Available from: https://www.facebook.com/CDCMMWR

4. Marks CM, Nawn JE, Caplow JA. Antibiotic Treatment for Chronic Lyme Disease-Say No to the DRESS. JAMA Intern Med. 2016 01;176(12):1745–6.

5. Holzbauer SM, Kemperman MM, Lynfield R. Death Due to Community-Associated Clostridium difficile in a Woman Receiving Prolonged Antibiotic Therapy for Suspected Lyme Disease. Clin Infect Dis. 2010 Aug 1;51(3):369–70.

6. Berende A, ter Hofstede HJM, Vos FJ, van Middendorp H, Vogelaar ML, Tromp M, et al. Randomized Trial of Longer-Term Therapy for Symptoms Attributed to Lyme Disease. N Engl J Med. 2016 Mar 31;374(13):1209–20.

7. Huyshe-Shires SR. Misleading information about Lyme disease. BMJ [Internet]. 2019 Nov 8 [cited 2020 Jun 1];367. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/content/367/bmj.l6385

8. Melenotte C, Drancourt M, Gorvel JP, Mège JL, Raoult D. Post-bacterial infection chronic fatigue syndrome is not a latent infection. Med Mal Infect. 2019 Mar;49(2):140–9.

9. Septfons A, Goronflot T, Jaulhac B, Roussel V, Martino SD, Guerreiro S, et al. Epidemiology of Lyme borreliosis through two surveillance systems: the national Sentinelles GP network and the national hospital discharge database, France, 2005 to 2016. Eurosurveillance. 2019 Mar 14;24(11):1800134.

10. Wijngaard CC van den, Hofhuis A, Simões M, Rood E, Pelt W van, Zeller H, et al. Surveillance perspective on Lyme borreliosis across the European Union and European Economic Area. Eurosurveillance. 2017 Jul 6;22(27):30569.

11. Figoni J, Chirouze C, Hansmann Y, Lemogne C, Hentgen V, Saunier A, et al. Lyme borreliosis and other tick-borne diseases. Guidelines from the French Scientific Societies (I): prevention, epidemiology, diagnosis. Médecine Mal Infect. 2019 Aug 1;49(5):318–34.

12. Jacquet C, Goehringer F, Baux E, Conrad JA, Ganne Devonec MO, Schmutz JL, et al. Multidisciplinary management of patients presenting with Lyme disease suspicion. Médecine Mal Infect. 2019 Mar;49(2):112–20.

13. Haddad E, Chabane K, Jaureguiberry S, Monsel G, Pourcher V, Caumes E. Holistic Approach in Patients With Presumed Lyme Borreliosis Leads to Less Than 10% of Confirmation and More Than 80% of Antibiotic Failures. Clin Infect Dis. 2019 May 30;68(12):2060–6.

14. Bouiller K, Klopfenstein T, Chirouze C. Consultation for Presumed Lyme Borreliosis: The Need for Multidisciplinary Management. Clin Infect Dis. 2019 May 17;68(11):1974–1974.

15. Peretti-Watel P, Ward J, Lutaud R, Seror V. Lyme disease: Insight from social sciences. Médecine Mal Infect. 2019 Mar 1;49(2):133–9.

16. Fainzang S. A deviant diagnosis? Doctors faced with a patient's diagnostic work. In: Diagnostic Fluidity [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 May 31]. Available from: http://llibres.urv.cat/index.php/purv/catalog/view/296/331/747-1

17. Groupe de réflexion sur l'approche biographique. Biographies d'enquêtes - Bilan de 14 collectes biographiques [Internet]. Ined Editions; 2009 [cited 2020 May 31]. 340 p. (Méthodes et savoirs; vol. 3). Available from: https://www.ined.fr/en/publications/editions/methodes-savoirs/biographies-d-enquetes-bilan-de-14-collectes-biographiques-en/

18. Eldin C, Raffetin A, Bouiller K, Hansmann Y, Roblot F, Raoult D, et al. Review of European and American guidelines for the diagnosis of Lyme borreliosis. Med Mal Infect. 2019 Mar;49(2):121–32.

19. Raffetin A, Saunier A, Bouiller K, Caraux-Paz P, Eldin C, Gallien S, et al. Unconventional diagnostic tests for Lyme borreliosis: a systematic review. Clin Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2020 Jan;26(1):51–9.

20. Grant L, Hausman BL, Cashion M, Lucchesi N, Patel K, Roberts J. Vaccination Persuasion Online: A Qualitative Study of Two Provaccine and Two Vaccine-Skeptical Websites. J Med Internet Res. 2015;17(5):e133.

21. Gocko X, Tattevin P, Lemogne C. Genesis and dissemination of a controversial disease: Chronic Lyme. Infect Dis Now. 2021 Feb 1;51(1):86–9.

22. Macauda MM, Erickson P, Miller J, Mann P, Closter L, Krause PJ. Long-Term Lyme Disease Antibiotic Therapy Beliefs Among New England Residents. Vector-Borne Zoonotic Dis. 2011 Mar 21;11(7):857–62.

23. Aronowitz RA. The Rise and Fall of the Lyme Disease Vaccines: A Cautionary Tale for Risk Interventions in American Medicine and Public Health. Milbank Q. 2012 Jun;90(2):250–77.

24. Pollak M. Une Identité blessée [Internet]. Paris, France: Métailié; 1993 [cited 2020 May 31]. 412 p. Available from: https://editions-metailie.com/livre/une-identite-blessee/

25. Jutel A. Beyond the Sociology of Diagnosis. Sociol Compass. 2015;9(9):841–52.

26. Jutel AG. Putting a Name to It: Diagnosis in Contemporary Society. JHU Press; 2014. 198 p.

27. Fainzang S. Self-Medication and Society: Mirages of Autonomy. 1 édition. London ; New York: Routledge; 2016. 146 p.

28. Michiels-Corsten M, Weyand AM, Gold J, Bösner S, Donner-Banzhoff N. Inductive foraging: patients taking the lead in diagnosis, a mixed-methods study. Fam Pract. 2021 Nov 27;cmab144.

29. Forestier E, Gonnet F, Revil-Signorat A, Zipper AC. Cheminement diagnostique et vécu des patients se pensant atteints de « maladie de Lyme chronique ». Rev Médecine Interne [Internet]. 2018 Apr [cited 2018 Jun 27]; Available from: http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0248866318304843

30. Rebman AW, Aucott JN, Weinstein ER, Bechtold KT, Smith KC, Leonard L. Living in Limbo: Contested Narratives of Patients With Chronic Symptoms Following Lyme Disease. Qual Health Res. 2017 Mar;27(4):534–46.

31. Duddu DV, Isaac MK, Chaturvedi SK. Somatization, somatosensory amplification, attribution styles and illness behaviour: A review. Int Rev Psychiatry. 2006 Jan 1;18(1):25–33.

32. Wason PC. On the failure to eliminate hypotheses in a conceptual task. Q J Exp Psychol. 1960 Jul 1;12(3):129–40.

33. Beck U. Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity. 1 edition. London ; Newbury Park, Calif: SAGE Publications Ltd; 1992. 272 p.

34. Haute Autorité de Santé. Borréliose de Lyme et autres maladies vectorielles à tiques : recommandations de bonnes pratiques [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 May 31]. Available from: https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/c_2857558/fr/borreliose-de-lyme-et-autres-maladies-vectorielles-a-tiques

35. CNGE. Borréliose de Lyme et autres maladies transmises par les tiques : Pourquoi les sociétés scientifiques et professionnelles refusent de cautionner la recommandation de bonne pratique élaborée par la HAS [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: https://www.cnge.fr/le_cnge/adherer_cnge_college_academique/cp_cnge_borreliose_de_lyme_et_autres_maladies_tran/

36. Webber BJ, Burganowski RP, Colton L, Escobar JD, Pathak SR, Gambino-Shirley KJ. Lyme disease overdiagnosis in a large healthcare system: a population-based, retrospective study. Clin Microbiol Infect Off Publ Eur Soc Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2019 Oct;25(10):1233–8.

37. Fassin D. Life: A Critical User's Manual [Internet]. cambridge ; oxford: Polity; 2018 [cited 2020 May 31]. 176 p. Available from: https://www.ias.edu/ideas/fassin-life

38. Drew D, Hewitt H. A qualitative approach to understanding patients' diagnosis of Lyme disease. Public Health Nurs Boston Mass. 2006 Feb;23(1):20–6.

39. Ali A, Vitulano L, Lee R, Weiss TR, Colson ER. Experiences of patients identifying with chronic Lyme disease in the healthcare system: a qualitative study. BMC Fam Pract. 2014 May 1;15:79.

40. Aurélie Chamoux, Catherine P, Xavier G. Modèles explicatifs des patients souffrant de Lyme chronique. Exercer. 2020 May;163:196–201.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

41. Jutel A, Nettleton S. Towards a sociology of diagnosis: Reflections and opportunities. Soc Sci Med. 2011 Sep;73(6):793–800.

42. García-Campayo J, Sanz-Carrillo C. The use of alternative medicines by somatoform disorder patients in Spain. Br J Gen Pract. 2000 Jun;50(455):487–8.

43. Lantos PM, Shapiro ED, Auwaerter PG, Baker PJ, Halperin JJ, McSweegan E, et al. Unorthodox alternative therapies marketed to treat Lyme disease. Clin Infect Dis Off Publ Infect Dis Soc Am. 2015 Jun 15;60(12):1776–82.

44. Davin-Casalena B, Lutaud R, Scronias D, Guagliardo V, Verger P. French General Practitioners Frequently Confronted With Long COVID-19 Cases? | American Board of Family Medicine. 2021 Sep [cited 2021 Sep 15];34(issue 5). Available from: https://www.jabfm.org/content/french-general-practitioners-frequently-confronted-long-covid-19-cases

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Table 1. Interview guide for biographic interviews

Themes	Questions
Introductory remark	We are interested in knowing your care history, particularly the history of diagnoses related to the symptoms that led you to consult at the IHU but also how you experienced this journey, and the role of the doctors who accompanied you. There is no right or wrong answer. Please do not feel like you have to answer in a certain way. The questions are also NOT specific about you, meaning all questions are hypothetical.
Clinical history and impact	1) What do you do in life? (career, family, education) 2) Symptom onset, clinical history / specific dates 3) if you had to prioritize symptoms in the way they most impact your daily life What would be the first? the following in the order? What impact have these symptoms had on your professional life? your entourage? are you currently on sick leave? 4) Are there any particular life events that you would like to talk about that may have had an impact on your symptoms? 5) If you had to prioritize the probable diagnoses that best explain all of your symptoms, which would you place first? which ones would you place next? 6) For this diagnosis that you placed first: how confident/certainty do you have in your answer? low (I am not sure)/ medium (50-50%), high (I am convinced) 7) For what reasons do you think of this diagnosis mentioned first? (let speak freely ++)
Genesis of the Lyme Hypothesis	1) Have you been exposed or even bitten by a tick? If so, can you tell us about the treatment/diagnosis that took place? Erythema Migrans? 2) When did you first hear about Lyme disease? 3) In what situations do you think you have been possibly exposed to the disease? 3) Under what circumstances has the hypothesis of Lyme disease been raised to explain your health problems? Who first brought it up or thought of it? (let the person speak freely if it comes up spontaneously) 4) Do you have an attending physician, or specialist doctor who regularly follows you for these symptoms? Have you discussed it with him/her? What did your doctor think about it? Has he or she encouraged you in this diagnostic process? 5) Have you used a Lyme diagnostic questionnaire on the internet? What was the result? 6) Did you do the serology? at the request of the doctor? 7) In which laboratory did you perform it? What was the result? 8) Have you received prolonged antibiotic therapy for chronic Lyme? Who prescribed it to you? Have you felt any improvement?
Care pathway	1) Let's go back over the history of the symptoms, can you give a precise account (chronology) of the doctors you have used in this context? 2) Who referred you to the IHU? 3) Did you consult a psychiatrist, for example? pain-centre? 4) Have you been hospitalized for these health problems? 5) Can we list all the diagnoses that have been mentioned by the doctors? 6) Did you have recourse to alternative medicine? (to be explained)

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

	7) Finally, have you met with professionals who are "specialists" in Lyme disease? 8) Do you regularly visit forums dedicated to Lyme disease? or are you a member of a patient association? 9) Generally speaking, have you felt that your doctors have listened enough to you about these health problems? How would you characterize the relationship with your GP?

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Table 2. Social and clinical characteristics of the 30 patients interviewed Between 1 May and 30 June 2019

Category	No.
Age, mean (SD), y	47.3
Female sex	25
Living in a couple	23
Educational level	
< Secondary school education	7
Secondary school education	6
≥ Tertiary education	17
Professional situation	
Active employment	22
Unemployed	3
Retired	4
Disability	1
Currently on sick leave	17
Geographical origin[a]	
Provence-Alpes Côte d'Azur	28
Clinical profile[a]	
Chronic pain[b]	15
Neurological symptoms[c]	8
Chronic fatigue syndrome[d]	7
Average duration of symptoms [min-max], y	8.5 [0.5-54]
Had an average duration of symptoms ≥ 5 years	15

[a] The clinical profile was defined according to patient's prioritisation of symptoms, in decreasing order of their impact on their quality of life.
[b] The "chronic pain" category included neuropathic, musculo-articular, diffuse, poorly characterised or headache-type pain.
[c] The "neurological profile" category included patients whose main complaint was vertigo or sensitive motor disorders or cognitive complaints.
[d] The "chronic fatigue syndrome" category included patients with predominant fatigue, often associated with concentration difficulties.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Table 3. The verbatims of the 30 patients consulting for presumed LD about their clinical and medical history

Themes	Verbatim
Diagnostic pathway	
On the road to the right diagnosis: "The feeling to be at a dead-end"	*"I would like to hear that I don't have Lyme, but we don't know everything (...) I want to leave with something that will take away this heavy feeling that prevents me from enjoying my grandchildren (...) I know I'm in pain, I'm tired, I'm exhausted, it's ruining my life and I'm less and less able to cope with it". (P4) "Lyme, this was a promising lead that we had started to explore and that we dropped, the doctor did not want to go any further and now we are in medical in des-errancy". (P19)"Fear of being left behind diagnostically". (P1) "The constant feeling of returning to zero point". (P11)*
Refusal of somatoform disorder diagnosis	*"I refuse to be told that all this does not exist, that it is a figment of the imagination ". (P13) "I'm tired of being told it's all in my head". (P2) "What weighs me down justifies that I have pai" even if appreciates the recognition of the diagnosis of fibromyalgia" it does not explain anything (P10)."We send young people to psychiatry when they have Lyme disease" (P14)*
Recourses to specialists: numerous and unsuccessful	*"The infectiologist doesn't take me seriously as soon as I say the word LYME, immediately closed the file, my neurologist even told me it would have been easier if you had Multiple Sclerosis". (P18) "I remember seeing a sign warning about tick attacks while in Michigan, it was immediately obvious!" (P6).*
Perceptions of the role of the GP	*"My doctor doesn't take my complaints seriously and won't help me find the diagnosis anyway". (P13) "I want to be listened to, I want to be in good hands, I want to be directed to the right specialty, but my GP can't deal with me, doesn't know how to handle me".(P9)"My GP got scared when we talk about Lyme or make fun of it".(P12) "My GP didn't even take the time to read the medical (...)I started on a good basis, it's violent to say that it is in my head when there is a documented record! you have to respect the medical record, the work of your colleagues". (P2) "I am fed up with the diagnosis of vagal discomfort and it bothers me to always see the GP for the same thing". (P16) "It's hard to get your doctor for a flu, so to follow a complex case". (P22)*
Diagnostic activity of the patient	*"I'm looking for myself (...) I don't accept that stress explains the whole picture (...) I find myself as I was at the beginning, without diagnosis, without treatment (...) I have to hold on". (P11) "I have driven my course, in private clinic, they are more attentive and at least they respond to our requests!"(P18) "Since I have been investigating lyme disease, I feel more involved in my health, and it is my business after all". (P22) "It's incredible to have to beg your doctor for a serology". (P1) "I had to send my blood to a lyme kit in Germany to confirm that I was infected with a chronic strain (...) some even have to send their blood to the vet!". (P23) "I took the online diagnostic test and my score is high". (P12) "I had to chose a Lyme doctor, a GP specializing in chronic lyme to be heard"! (P29) "the medical record I had brought with me was quite complete! it took me a lot of time to organize it, you understand". (P16).*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Genesis of the Lyme Disease diagnostic hypothesis	
Self-perception of exposure to LD risk	*"Do you remember a tick bite"?(I) "No, none". (P1) "And have you ever seen a tick around"?(I) "Yes, on my dogs and it happened to me to have to remove ticks". (P1)"And there were ticks, do you remember?" (I) "No, but I remember that as a child we used to spend our summers in the forests of the Ukraine, which was known to be a tick reservoir, but I never saw any". (P18)*
Origin of the "chronic Lyme" hypothesis	*"I stumbled upon forums of patients who suffered from the same symptoms. One thing leading to another, they directed me to therapists who were able to listen to your history and take into consideration the human being that you are, because for me, Lyme diagnosis is written in black and white so I don't allow anyone to discuss it". (P2) "In this TV show, I saw myself in one of the patients who described the same pain and fatigue that no one explains while the diagnosis is obvious". (P4)"Everything leads back to Lyme when you look for information on the fibromyalgia forums, all the "fibros" encourage you to have a Lyme test". (P4)*
Additional disease, a curable disease syndrome that unifies the different symptoms	*"I accept the diagnosis of fibromyalgia but I have something else in addition". (P4) "I know I have multiple sclerosis plus something else (…) my symptoms are not typical of multiple sclerosis, especially the pain". (P26) "I'm afraid (…) the bite activated my autoimmune disease!". (P13)"I know deep down that I have multiple sclerosis but I am afraid of its evolution. I prefer to have a phony disease like Lyme". (P30) "My rheumatologist also wants a diagnosis that we can treat!"(P17). "If I know what disease I have, I would know what to do, and follow the protocol rigorously". (P8)*
Patient's preferences and belief in the LD diagnosis	*"I am convinced that I have an unrecognized chronic Lyme". (P28) "I know I have lyme because the antibiotics worked". (P23) "After searching for other diagnoses: I only see this".(P4)"I recognize myself in the picture of Lyme disease, that's enough for me!" (P29) "My hand to cut that it is indeed the disease of Lyme". (P21)*

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Table 4. Characteristics of the diagnostic pathways of the 30 patients consulting for presumed LD

Pathway characteristics	No.
Average no. of specialties used in relation to the history of symptoms (excluding infectiology and psychiatry)	3.7
Referral to > 5 medical specialists in relation to the history of symptoms (excluding infectiology and psychiatry)	10
Referral to a psychiatrist in relation to the history of symptoms	15
Use of alternative medicine in relation to their symptoms	18
Patients treated in a pain-treatment centre	14
Fibromyalgia: diagnosis evoked by a doctor	23
Refusal of "psychiatrisation of their symptoms"	21
Main diagnostic pathway coordinator (typological approach)	
Primary care physician	4
Referring physician (other specialties)	3
Patient	23

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Table 5. Genesis of the Lyme Disease diagnostic hypothesis for the 30 patients

Clinical and medical events	Number of Patients
Reported tick bite	8
Nature of exposure from the patient's perspective (other than a tick bite)	22
Observed presence of ticks in their environment	6
History of unidentified insects bites	4
Contact with traditionally tick-carrying animals	5
Tick-bite episode in the entourage	2
Endemic region	5
Confirmed history of erythema migrans	3
Origin of the "chronic Lyme" hypothesis	
Identification with clinical narratives (TV, media, internet)	14
Physician	5
Entourage	5
Medical check-up	6
Lyme serology performed in private laboratories	30
Results of Lyme serology test	
negative	16
false-positive[a]	14
Serology performed in a non-approved laboratory	8
Internet diagnostic self-questionnaire	15
Received "anti-chronic Lyme disease" antibiotic treatment	14
Pro-Lyme caregiver intervention during their diagnostic pathway	8
Including medical doctors	6
Members of a pro-Lyme association ("Lyme disease activists")	3
Have requested and obtained a doctor's prescription for a Lyme disease serological test	17
Referring physician's position on the Lyme hypothesis	
Pro-active	5
Neutral	14
Sceptical	9
Absent	2
Patient's diagnostic hypotheses ranking	
Lyme disease hypothesis rank 1st	24
The degree of certainty associated with the diagnoses among patients ranking Lyme hypothesis first	
High degree of certainty	13
Moderate-low degree of certainty	11

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Supplement 1.

COREQ (COnsolidated criteria for REporting Qualitative research) Checklist

A checklist of items that should be included in reports of qualitative research. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
Domain 1: Research team and reflexivity			
Personal characteristics			
Interviewer/facilitator	1	Which author/s conducted the interview or focus group?	8
Credentials	2	What were the researcher's credentials? E.g. PhD, MD	8
Occupation	3	What was their occupation at the time of the study?	8
Gender	4	Was the researcher male or female?	8
Experience and training	5	What experience or training did the researcher have?	8
Relationship with participants			
Relationship established	6	Was a relationship established prior to study commencement?	8
Participant knowledge of the interviewer	7	What did the participants know about the researcher? e.g. personal goals, reasons for doing the research	Supplements
Interviewer characteristics	8	What characteristics were reported about the inter viewer/facilitator? e.g. Bias, assumptions, reasons and interests in the research topic	N/A
Domain 2: Study design			
Theoretical framework			
Methodological orientation and Theory	9	What methodological orientation was stated to underpin the study? e.g. grounded theory, discourse analysis, ethnography, phenomenology, content analysis	7-8
Participant selection			
Sampling	10	How were participants selected? e.g. purposive, convenience, consecutive, snowball	7
Method of approach	11	How were participants approached? e.g. face-to-face, telephone, mail, email	7
Sample size	12	How many participants were in the study?	7
Non-participation	13	How many people refused to participate or dropped out? Reasons?	N/A
Setting			
Setting of data collection	14	Where was the data collected? e.g. home, clinic, workplace	8
Presence of non-participants	15	Was anyone else present besides the participants and researchers?	8
Description of sample	16	What are the important characteristics of the sample? e.g. demographic data, date	9
Data collection			
Interview guide	17	Were questions, prompts, guides provided by the authors? Was it pilot tested?	7
Repeat interviews	18	Were repeat inter views carried out? If yes, how many?	6
Audio/visual recording	19	Did the research use audio or visual recording to collect the data?	8
Field notes	20	Were field notes made during and/or after the inter view or focus group?	8
Duration	21	What was the duration of the inter views or focus group?	8
Data saturation	22	Was data saturation discussed?	N/A
Transcripts returned	23	Were transcripts returned to participants for comment and/or	N/A

 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Topic	Item No.	Guide Questions/Description	Reported on Page No.
		correction?	
Domain 3: analysis and findings			
Data analysis			
Number of data coders	24	How many data coders coded the data?	8
Description of the coding tree	25	Did authors provide a description of the coding tree?	8/9
Derivation of themes	26	Were themes identified in advance or derived from the data?	8
Software	27	What software, if applicable, was used to manage the data?	8
Participant checking	28	Did participants provide feedback on the findings?	N/A
Reporting			
Quotations presented	29	Were participant quotations presented to illustrate the themes/findings? Was each quotation identified? e.g. participant number	N/A
Data and findings consistent	30	Was there consistency between the data presented and the findings?	9-10-11
Clarity of major themes	31	Were major themes clearly presented in the findings?	9-10-11
Clarity of minor themes	32	Is there a description of diverse cases or discussion of minor themes?	9-10-11

Developed from: Tong A, Sainsbury P, Craig J. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*. 2007. Volume 19, Number 6: pp. 349 – 357

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission. DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.

Preprints (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 27 May 2022 doi:10.20944/preprints202205.0350.v2

Supplement 2. Live-events calendar