Appendix N: GRADE Tables

Contents

Appendix N: GRADE Tables 1
A.1 Biological Factors 5
A.1.1 Full GRADE profile for genes associated with attachment difficulties 5
A.1.2 Full GRADE profile for Concordance in gene expression and attachment between siblings 8
A.2 Interventions for children on the edge of care 8
A.2.1 Full GRADE profile for Video feedback versus control PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 8
A.2.2 Full GRADE profile for Video feedback vs Control FU 1 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 9
A.2.3 Full GRADE profile for Videofeedback vs Control FU 2 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 10
A.2.4 Full GRADE profile for Videofeedback vs Counselling PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 11
A.2.5 Full GRADE profile for Parent-child psychotherapy vs Control PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 12
A.2.6 Full GRADE profile for Parent-child psychotherapy vs Control FU for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 13
A.2.7 Full GRADE profile for Parent-child psychotherapy vs Home visiting PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 13
A.2.8 Full GRADE profile for Parent-child psychotherapy vs Home visiting FU for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 14
A.2.9 Full GRADE profile for Parent sensitivity and behaviour training vs Control PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 15
A.2.10 Full GRADE profile for Parent sensitivity and behaviour training vs Control FU for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 16
A.2.11 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting vs Control PT (GIV and non GIV outcomes) for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 17

A.2.12 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting vs Control FU (GIV and non GIV outcomes) for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 18

A.2.13 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting vs Control FU 2 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 19

A.2.14 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting vs Control FU 3 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 20

A.2.15 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting and Parent-child psychotherapy vs Control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 21

A.2.16 Full GRADE profile for Psychotherapy vs Control PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care? 21

A.2.17 Full GRADE profile for Psychotherapy vs Control FU for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care? 22

A.2.18 Full GRADE profile for CBT vs Control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care? 22

A.2.19 Full GRADE profile for CBT vs Psychotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 23

A.2.20 Full GRADE profile for CBT vs Counselling for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 23

A.2.21 Full GRADE profile for Psychotherapy vs Counselling for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 23

A.2.22 Full GRADE profile for Counselling vs Control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 24

A.3 Interventions for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 24

A.3.1 Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 24

A.3.2 Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 2 year follow up 26

A.3.3 Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 7 year follow up 27

A.3.4 Full GRADE profiles for Parent child psychotherapy versus control for for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 27

A.3.5 Full GRADE profiles for Parent child psychotherapy versus control for for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 12 month follow up 28

A.3.6 Full GRADE profiles for Parent child psychotherapy versus home visiting for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 29

A.3.7 Full GRADE profiles for Parent child psychotherapy versus home visiting for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 12 month follow up 30

A.3.8 Full GRADE profiles for parent sensitivity and behaviour training children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 31

A.3.9 Full GRADE profiles for video feedback for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 32

A.3.10 Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child psychotherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 34

A.3.11 Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child psychotherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 6 month follow up 34

A.3.12 Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child psychotherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 12 month follow up 35

A.4 Interventions for children in care 36

A.4.1 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Parental Education and Training Intervention for carers of children in-care. 36

A.4.2 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Video Feedback Intervention for carers of children in-care 37

A.4.3 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Multicomponent Foster Care Treatment on carers of children in care. 39

A.4.4 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Parental Sensitivity and Behavioural Training for carers of children in care. 39

A.4.5 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Foster Care (with support) versus Institutionalised children 40

A.4.6 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Parental Education, Training and Support for carers. Following studies only reported placement disruption as a critical outcome (no attachment measures). 41

A.5 Interventions for children who have been adopted 44

A.5.1 Full GRADE table for Video Feedback Interventions for adopted children.... 44

A.5.2 Full GRADE profile for Parental Sensitivity and Behaviour Training for adoptive parents. 45

A.5.3 Full GRADE profile for Parental Education, Training and Support for adoptive parents. 46

A.1 Biological Factors

A.1.1 Full GRADE profile for genes associated with attachment difficulties

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Genes	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Disorganised attachment - DRD4 + maternal unresolved loss												
1	observational studies	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	strong association[3]	-	-	OR 2.97 (1.19 to 7.42)	-	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised + DRD4-7 repeat allele												
4	observational studies	serious[4]	serious[5]	serious[6]	serious[7]	none	56/174 (32.2%)	89/280 (31.8%)	OR 1.13 (0.71 to 1.81)	27 more per 1000 (from 69 fewer to 140 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised + DRD4/-521 cc												
2	observational studies	serious[8]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	5/38 (13.2%)	42/169 (24.9%)	OR 0.46 (0.17 to 1.26)	116 fewer per 1000 (from 195 fewer to 46 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised + DRD4/5HTTLPR ll												
2	observational studies	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	serious[6]	serious[2]	none	86/131 (65.6%)	32/114 (28.1%)	OR 1.75 (0.9 to 3.4)	125 more per 1000 (from 21 fewer to 290 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised + 5-HTTLPR ll												
4	observational studies	serious[4]	serious[5]	serious[6]	serious[7]	none	57/182 (31.3%)	73/215 (34%)	OR 0.97 (0.59 to 1.59)	7 fewer per 1000 (from 107 fewer to 110 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

Disorganised attachment + - 521 CT/TT												
2	observational studies	serious[10]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	28/41 (68.3%)	76.1%	OR 0.67 (0.31 to 1.44)	80 fewer per 1000 (from 264 fewer to 60 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment + -521 cc												
2	observational studies	serious[10]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	13/41 (31.7%)	36/150 (24%)	OR 1.49 (0.69 to 3.2)	80 more per 1000 (from 61 fewer to 263 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment + 521 + - COMT gg												
1	observational studies	serious[11]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	9/21 (42.9%)	23/93 (24.7%)	OR 2.28 (0.85 to 6.11)	181 more per 1000 (from 29 fewer to 420 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment + 521 + - GABRA6 cc												
1	observational studies	serious[11]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	2/19 (10.5%)	16/91 (17.6%)	OR 0.55 (0.12 to 2.63)	71 fewer per 1000 (from 151 fewer to 184 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment + DRD4 7 repeat allele												
2	observational studies	serious[4]	serious[5]	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	35/119 (29.4%)	25/82 (30.5%)	OR 1 (0.54 to 1.86)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 113 fewer to 144 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment + DRD4/-521 cc												
1	observational studies	serious[9]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	12/51 (23.5%)	13/51 (25.5%)	OR 0.9 (0.36 to 2.22)	19 fewer per 1000 (from 145 fewer to 177 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment + 5HTTLPR ll												
3	observational studies	serious[12]	serious[5]	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	61/169 (36.1%)	38/123 (30.9%)	OR 1.24 (0.76 to 2.02)	48 more per 1000 (from 55 fewer to 166 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment + 5-HTTLPR ss/sl												

2	observational studies	serious[12]	serious[13]	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	70/108 (64.8%)	64/91 (70.3%)	OR 0.78 (0.44 to 1.41)	54 fewer per 1000 (from 193 fewer to 66 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment + - 5-HTTLPR ss												
1	observational studies	serious[14]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness[9]	serious[7]	none	10/40 (25%)	8/29 (27.6%)	OR 0.88 (0.3 to 2.59)	25 fewer per 1000 (from 173 fewer to 221 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment - -521 cc												
1	observational studies	serious[10]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	18/71 (25.4%)	6/32 (18.8%)	OR 1.47 (0.52 to 4.15)	66 more per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 302 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment - 521 TT												
1	observational studies	serious[10]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	16/71 (22.5%)	21.9%	OR 1.04 (0.38 to 2.84)	7 more per 1000 (from 123 fewer to 224 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment - GABRA6 cc												
1	observational studies	serious[11]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	11/62 (17.7%)	7/49 (14.3%)	OR 1.29 (0.46 to 3.63)	34 more per 1000 (from 72 fewer to 234 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment - COMT-gg												
1	observational studies	serious[11]	no serious inconsistency	serious[9]	serious[7]	none	18/62 (29%)	15/53 (28.3%)	OR 1.04 (0.46 to 2.33)	8 more per 1000 (from 129 fewer to 196 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Controlled only for maternal frightening behaviour.
[2] 95% CI crossed 1 MID
[3] Large effect OR >2
[4] Did not adjust for potential confounders. Only Frigerio attempted to adjust for other gene effects, but the raw data is not adjusted.
[5] Heterogeneity, I squared >55%
[6] Cichetti was the only study in an at risk population.
[7] 95% CI crosses 2 MIDs
[8] Did not adjust for potential confounders. Frigerio attempted to adjust for other gene effects, but the raw data is not adjusted.
[9] Not in an at risk population.
[10] Did not adjust for potential confounders.

[11] Frigerio attempted to adjust for other gene effects, but the raw data is not adjusted.
[12] Only Barry was a cohort study but they provided only cross-sectional data. Only Frigerio adjusted for potential confounders but the raw data was not adjusted.
[13] Heterogeneity, I squared >80%
[14] Adjusted for confounders but the raw data is not adjusted.

A.1.2 Full GRADE profile for Concordance in gene expression and attachment between siblings

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Concordance	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Concordance												
4	observational studies	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	none	225/435 (51.7%)	185/409 (45.2%)	OR 1.3 (0.98 to 1.72)	65 more per 1000 (from 5 fewer to 135 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] OConnor adjusted confounders but the raw data is not adjusted. The remaining studies did not adjust for potential confounders.
[2] Not in an at risk population
[3] 95% CI crossed the line of no effect and 2 MIDs

A.2 Interventions for children on the edge of care

A.2.1 Full GRADE profile for Video feedback versus control PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Videofeedback	Control PT	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 1-30 months; measured with: Mother-infant observation; Landry parent-child interaction scale; Nursing child assessment teaching scale; Maternal behavioural Q-set; Emotional availability scale; Better indicated by higher values)												

6	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	205	237	-	SMD 0.47 higher (0.29 to 0.65 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 2-5 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
3	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	82/144 (56.9%)	48/142 (33.8%)	RR 1.66 (1.27 to 2.19)	223 more per 1000 (from 91 more to 402 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Insecure attachment (follow-up 2-5 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
3	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	55/144 (38.2%)	76/142 (53.5%)	RR 0.72 (0.57 to 0.91)	150 fewer per 1000 (from 48 fewer to 230 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment (follow-up 2-5 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
3	randomised trials	serious[2]	serious[4]	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	54/144 (37.5%)	81/142 (57%)	RR 0.62 (0.35 to 1.1)	217 fewer per 1000 (from 371 fewer to 57 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Externalising behaviour (follow-up 2 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	35	32	-	SMD 0.03 higher (0.45 lower to 0.51 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Internalising behaviour (follow-up 2 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	35	32	-	SMD 0.12 lower (0.6 lower to 0.36 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment, unclear reporting of participant drop out)
[2] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment)
[3] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).
[4] inconsistency (I2>50%, p<0.05)
[5] risk of bias (due to lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes)

A.2.2 Full GRADE profile for Video feedback vs Control FU 1 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment						No of patients		Effect	Quality	Importance

No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Videofeedback	Control FU 1	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 1-6 months; measured with: Ainsworth's sensitivity scales; Nursing child assessment teaching scale; Emotional availability scale; Better indicated by higher values)												
4	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	114	89	-	SMD 0.70 higher (0.4 to 0.99 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 3 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	36/54 (66.7%)	15/27 (55.6%)	RR 1.20 (0.82 to 1.77)	111 more per 1000 (from 100 fewer to 428 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 6 months; measured with: Attachment story completion task; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	35	36	-	SMD 0.45 higher (0.02 lower to 0.93 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Externalising behaviour (follow-up 6 months; measured with: Infant Toddler Social and Emotional Assessment; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	35	36	-	SMD 0.09 higher (0.38 lower to 0.55 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Internalising behaviour (follow-up 6 months; measured with: Infant Toddler Social and Emotional Assessment ; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	35	36	-	SMD 0.3 higher (0.17 lower to 0.77 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).
[3] risk of bias (due to lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes)

A.2.3 Full GRADE profile for Videofeedback vs Control FU 2 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Videofeedback	Control FU 2	Relative (95%	Absolute		

									CI)			
Secure attachment (follow-up 56 months; measured with: Attachment story completion task; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	29	29	-	SMD 0.42 higher (0.1 lower to 0.95 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Externalising behaviour (follow-up 56 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	29	29	-	SMD 0.14 lower (0.65 lower to 0.38 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Internalising behaviour (follow-up 56 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	29	29	-	SMD 1.79 higher (1.17 to 2.4 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)
[2] risk of bias (due to lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes)

A.2.4 Full GRADE profile for Videofeedback vs Counselling PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Videofeedback**	**Counselling PT**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Insensitivity (follow-up 6 months; assessed with: Author's own measure)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	17/38 (44.7%)	26/39 (66.7%)	RR 0.67 (0.44 to 1.02)	220 fewer per 1000 (from 373 fewer to 13 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).

A.2.5 Full GRADE profile for Parent-child psychotherapy vs Control PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Control PT	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 1-12 months; measured with: Coding interactive behaviour scale; Authors' own measure; Better indicated by higher values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	81	60	-	SMD 0.14 higher (0.91 lower to 1.18 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 1-16 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
2	randomised trials	very serious[4]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	48/74 (64.9%)	10/108 (9.3%)	RR 9.55 (1.09 to 83.42)	792 more per 1000 (from 8 more to 1000 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 12 months; measured with: Attachment Q-set; Global relationship expectation scale; Better indicated by higher values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[5]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	53	53	-	SMD 0.27 higher (0.51 lower to 1.05 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Insecure attachment (follow-up 12 months; measured with: Attachment Q-set; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[6]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	30	23	-	SMD 0.74 lower (1.3 to 0.17 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Insecure attachment (follow-up 1-16 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
2	randomised trials	very serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	12/74 (16.2%)	34/108 (31.5%)	RR 0.48 (0.27 to 0.86)	164 fewer per 1000 (from 44 fewer to 230 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment (follow-up 1-16 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
2	randomised trials	very serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	14/74 (18.9%)	64/108 (59.3%)	RR 0.37 (0.23 to 0.59)	373 fewer per 1000 (from 243 fewer to 456 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (one or more of the following: unclear allocation concealment, selective outcome reporting, use of non-validated assessment measures)
[2] inconsistency (I2>50%, p<0.05)
[3] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).
[4] risk of bias (downgraded twice due to broken randomisation and selective outcome reporting)
[5] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment, use of non-validated assessment measures)
[6] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment, use of non-validated assessment measures)

A.2.6 Full GRADE profile for Parent-child psychotherapy vs Control FU for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Control FU	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Secure attachment (follow-up 12 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	15/27 (55.6%)	6/49 (12.2%)	RR 4.54 (1.99 to 10.32)	433 more per 1000 (from 121 more to 1000 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Insecure attachment (follow-up 12 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	5/27 (18.5%)	19/49 (38.8%)	RR 0.48 (0.2 to 1.14)	202 fewer per 1000 (from 310 fewer to 54 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment (follow-up 12 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	7/27 (25.9%)	24/49 (49%)	RR 0.53 (0.26 to 1.06)	230 fewer per 1000 (from 362 fewer to 29 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (downgraded twice due to broken randomisation and selective outcome reporting)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).

A.2.7 Full GRADE profile for Parent-child psychotherapy vs Home visiting PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment	No of patients	Effect	Quality	Importance

No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Home visiting PT	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Secure attachment (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	17/28 (60.7%)	12/22 (54.5%)	RR 1.11 (0.69 to 1.81)	60 more per 1000 (from 169 fewer to 442 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 16 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	23	34	-	SMD 0.67 higher (0.12 to 1.21 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Less likely to have an insecure attachment (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	26/28 (92.9%)	22/22 (100%)	RR 0.93 (0.82 to 1.06)	70 fewer per 1000 (from 180 fewer to 60 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	9/28 (32.1%)	10/22 (45.5%)	RR 0.71 (0.35 to 1.43)	132 fewer per 1000 (from 295 fewer to 195 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (downgraded twice due to broken randomisation)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).
[3] risk of bias (due to unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment)

A.2.8 Full GRADE profile for Parent-child psychotherapy vs Home visiting FU for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Home visiting FU	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		

Secure attachment (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	15/27 (55.6%)	5/22 (22.7%)	RR 2.44 (1.05 to 5.67)	327 more per 1000 (from 11 more to 1000 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Less likely to have an insecure attachment (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	22/27 (81.5%)	18/22 (81.8%)	RR 1 (0.76 to 1.3)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 196 fewer to 245 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment (follow-up 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	7/27 (25.9%)	13/22 (59.1%)	RR 0.44 (0.21 to 0.91)	331 fewer per 1000 (from 53 fewer to 467 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (downgraded twice due to broken randomisation)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).

A.2.9 Full GRADE profile for Parent sensitivity and behaviour training vs Control PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Parent sensitivity and behaviour training**	**Control PT**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 1-13 months; measured with: Strange situation; Nursing child assessment feeding scale; Parent-caregiver involvement scale; Dyadic mutuality code; Nursing child assessment teaching scale; Parenting skills observation scale; Coding of attachment related parenting; Emotional availability scale; Better indicated by higher values)												
9	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	537	543	-	SMD 0.25 higher (0.09 to 0.42 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Externalising behaviour (follow-up 3-4 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	99	125	-	SMD 0.28 lower (0.55 to 0.01 lower)	⊕⊕OO	IMPORTANT

											LOW	
Internalising behaviour (follow-up 3-4 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	99	125	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.16 lower to 0.38 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Negative parenting attitudes (follow-up 3-4 months; measured with: Child abuse potential inventory; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	99	127	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.33 lower to 0.2 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment)
[2] risk of bias (due to high participant drop out rate and lack of blinding for parent-reported outcomes)
[3] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).

A.2.10 Full GRADE profile for Parent sensitivity and behaviour training vs Control FU for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Parent sensitivity and behaviour training**	**Control FU**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 5 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	153	165	-	SMD 0.26 higher (0.04 to 0.48 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 5 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	116/156 (74.4%)	102/162 (63%)	RR 1.18 (1.02 to 1.37)	113 more per 1000 (from 13 more to 233 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Less likely to have an insecure attachment (follow-up 5 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	serious[1]	none	126/156	118/162	RR 1.11	80 more per 1000	⊕⊕⊕O	CRITICAL

	trials	risk of bias	inconsistency	indirectness			(80.8%)	(72.8%)	(0.98 to 1.25)	(from 15 fewer to 182 more)	MODERATE	
Less likely to have a disorganised attachment (follow-up 5 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	146/156 (93.6%)	146/162 (90.1%)	RR 1.04 (0.97 to 1.11)	36 more per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 99 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).

A.2.11 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting vs Control PT (GIV and non GIV outcomes) for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Home visiting**	**Control PT (GIV and non GIV outcomes)**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness GIV (follow-up 1-36 months; measured with: HOME inventory; CARE index; Nursing child assessment teaching scale; Bayley test situation; Parent-caregiver involvement scale; Emotional availability scale; Cowen&Cowen 1992 rating scales; Author's own measure; Better indicated by higher values)												
20	randomised trials	serious[1]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	4355	3954	-	SMD 0.24 higher (0.14 to 0.35 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 12-24 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
2	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	41/60 (68.3%)	34/53 (64.2%)	RR 1.05 (0.61 to 1.78)	32 more per 1000 (from 250 fewer to 500 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 1-24 months; measured with: Parenting stress index; Strange situation; Attachment q-set; Better indicated by lower values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[5]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	141	143	-	SMD 0.81 higher (0.15 to 1.47 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Insecure attachment (follow-up 12-24 months)												
2	randomised trials	serious[6]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	19/60 (31.7%)	22/53 (41.5%)	RR 0.81 (0.22 to	79 fewer per 1000 (from 324 fewer to	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

									2.95)	809 more)		
Externalising behaviour GIV (follow-up 7-36 months; measured with: Infant Toddler Social and Emotional Assessment (ITSEA); Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
7	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	3518	3127	-	SMD 0.11 lower (0.19 to 0.03 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Internalising behaviour GIV (follow-up 7-36 months; measured with: Infant Toddler Social and Emotional Assessment (ITSEA); Child behaviour checklist ; Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	serious[1]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	1760	1731	-	SMD 0.13 lower (0.32 lower to 0.06 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Mental development GIV (follow-up 9-36 months; measured with: Bayley scales of infant development; Kaufman assessment battery for children; Stanford-Binet test of intelligence; Developmental profile II; Better indicated by higher values)												
12	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	3526	3079	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.03 to 0.13 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Motor development (follow-up 13-24 months; measured with: Bayley scales of infant development; Better indicated by higher values)												
6	randomised trials	serious[7]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	506	454	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.02 lower to 0.24 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Parenting attitudes GIV (follow-up 24-25 months; measured with: Adult-adolescent parenting inventory; Better indicated by higher values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[1,8]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	668	394	-	SMD 0.18 higher (0.06 to 0.31 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT

[1] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following across several studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment, unclear or high participant drop out rate, unclear or lack of blinding of outcome assessors)
[2] inconsistency (I2>50%, p<0.05)
[3] risk of bias (due to unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment and unclear blinding of outcome assessors)
[4] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)
[5] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear allocation concealment and unclear blinding of outcome assessors)
[6] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment and unclear blinding of outcome assessors)
[7] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following across several studies: unclear randomisation, unclear allocation concealment, unclear blinding of outcome assessors, unclear participant drop out rate)
[8] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear allocation concealment and no method used to account for missing data)

A.2.12 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting vs Control FU (GIV and non GIV outcomes) for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect	Quality	Importance

No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control FU (GIV and non GIV outcomes)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Secure attachment (follow-up 1 months; measured with: Parenting stress index; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	111	113	-	SMD 0.72 higher (0.34 lower to 1.78 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Sensitivity/Responsiveness GIV (follow-up 1-10 months; measured with: HOME inventory ; Better indicated by higher values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	130	139	-	SMD 0.46 higher (0.22 to 0.71 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Mental development GIV (follow-up 6-10 months; measured with: Bayley scales of infant development; Stanford-Binet test of intelligence; Better indicated by higher values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	40	53	-	SMD 0.15 higher (0.27 lower to 0.57 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Motor development (follow-up 6 months; measured with: Bayley scales of infant development; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[1]	none	21	23	-	SMD 0.36 higher (0.23 lower to 0.96 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants).
[2] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following across some studies: unclear allocation concealment, high participant drop out rate and no method used to account for missing data)
[3] risk of bias (due to unclear random sequence generation and unclear allocation concealment)
[4] risk of bias (due to one or more of the following across some studies: unclear allocation concealment and high or unclear participant drop out rate)

A.2.13 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting vs Control FU 2 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control FU 2	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 22 months; measured with: HOME inventory; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised	serious[1]	no serious	no serious	serious[2]	none	19	30	-	SMD 0.38 higher (0.2 lower	⊕⊕OO	CRITICAL

	trials		inconsistency	indirectness						to 0.96 higher)	LOW	
Less likely to have externalising behaviour (follow-up 48 months; assessed with: Child behaviour checklist)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	167/169 (98.8%)	171/176 (97.2%)	RR 1.02 (0.99 to 1.05)	19 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 49 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Less likely to have internalising behaviour (follow-up 48 months; assessed with: Child behaviour checklist)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	151/169 (89.3%)	158/176 (89.8%)	RR 1 (0.93 to 1.07)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 63 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Mental development (follow-up 22 months; measured with: Stanford-Binet test of intelligence; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	19	30	-	SMD 0.19 higher (0.4 lower to 0.79 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment, high participant drop out rate)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)
[3] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment, lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes and no method used to account for missing data)

A.2.14 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting vs Control FU 3 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Home visiting**	**Control FU 3**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Less likely to have externalising behaviour (follow-up 84 months; assessed with: Child behaviour checklist)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	133/138 (96.4%)	151/164 (92.1%)	RR 1.05 (0.99 to 1.11)	46 more per 1000 (from 9 fewer to 101 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Less likely to have internalising behaviour (follow-up 84 months; assessed with: Child behaviour checklist)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	129/138 (93.5%)	148/165 (89.7%)	RR 1.04 (0.97 to 1.12)	36 more per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 108 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment, lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes and no method used to account for missing data)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.2.15 Full GRADE profile for Home visiting and Parent-child psychotherapy vs Control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting and Parent-child psychotherapy	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 4 months; assessed with: AMBIANCE scale)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	25/45 (55.6%)	22/31 (71%)	RR 0.78 (0.55 to 1.11)	156 fewer per 1000 (from 319 fewer to 78 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment (follow-up 12 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	26/41 (63.4%)	15/41 (36.6%)	RR 1.73 (1.09 to 2.76)	267 more per 1000 (from 33 more to 644 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Disorganised attachment (follow-up 12 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	11/30 (36.7%)	13/30 (43.3%)	RR 0.85 (0.45 to 1.58)	65 fewer per 1000 (from 238 fewer to 251 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to lack of blinding of outcome assessors)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.2.16 Full GRADE profile for Psychotherapy vs Control PT for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care?

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Psychotherapy	Control PT	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 3 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised	serious[1]	no serious	no serious	serious[2]	none	23	24	-	SMD 0.58 higher (0 to	⊕⊕OO	CRITICAL

	trials		inconsistency	indirectness						1.17 higher)	LOW	

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear random sequence generation and allocation concealment)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.2.17 Full GRADE profile for Psychotherapy vs Control FU for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care?

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Psychotherapy	Control FU	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up 1 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	23	24	-	SMD 0.71 higher (0.12 to 1.3 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Insecure attachment (follow-up 14 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	21/40 (52.5%)	20/47 (42.6%)	RR 1.23 (0.79 to 1.92)	98 more per 1000 (from 89 fewer to 391 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment and use of non-validated outcome measures)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.2.18 Full GRADE profile for CBT vs Control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care?

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Insecure attachment (follow-up 14 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	22/41 (53.7%)	20/47 (42.6%)	RR 1.26 (0.81 to 1.95)	111 more per 1000 (from 81 fewer to 404 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment and use of non-validated outcome measures)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.2.19 Full GRADE profile for CBT vs Psychotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT	Psychotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Insecure attachment (follow-up 14 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	22/41 (53.7%)	21/40 (52.5%)	RR 1.02 (0.68 to 1.54)	10 more per 1000 (from 168 fewer to 283 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment and use of non-validated outcome measures)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.2.20 Full GRADE profile for CBT vs Counselling for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT	Counselling	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Insecure attachment (follow-up 14 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	22/41 (53.7%)	16/39 (41%)	RR 1.31 (0.82 to 2.1)	127 more per 1000 (from 74 fewer to 451 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment and use of non-validated outcome measures)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.2.21 Full GRADE profile for Psychotherapy vs Counselling for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Psychotherapy	Counselling	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		

Insecure attachment (follow-up 14 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	21/40 (52.5%)	16/39 (41%)	RR 1.28 (0.79 to 2.06)	115 more per 1000 (from 86 fewer to 435 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment and use of non-validated outcome measures)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.2.22 Full GRADE profile for Counselling vs Control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Counselling**	**Control**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Insecure attachment (follow-up 14 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	16/39 (41%)	20/47 (42.6%)	RR 0.96 (0.58 to 1.59)	17 fewer per 1000 (from 179 fewer to 251 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

[1] risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment and use of non-validated outcome measures)
[2] imprecision (optimal information size for dichotomous outcomes=300 events, and for continuous outcomes=400 participants)

A.3 Interventions for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated

A.3.1 Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of	**Design**	**Risk of**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other**	**Home**	**Control**	**Relative**	**Absolute**		

studies		bias				considerations	visiting		(95% CI)			
Parenting outcomes: sensitivity/responsiveness (follow-up 2-3 years; measured with: nursing child assessment teaching scale, HOME, Emotional availability scale; Better indicated by lower values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	624	554	-	SMD 0.19 higher (0.08 to 0.31 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Parent outcomes: Parenting attitudes (follow-up 2-3 years; measured with: Adult-adolescent parenting inventory, 49-item parenting questionaire (Block, 1981); Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	310	330	-	SMD 0.25 higher (0.1 to 0.41 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Child outcomes: Externalising behaviour (follow-up 2-3 years; measured with: CBCL; Better indicated by lower values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	488	540	-	SMD 0.20 lower (0.32 to 0.08 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Child outcomes: Internalising behaviour (follow-up 2-3 years; measured with: CBCL; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	310	330	-	SMD 0.27 lower (0.43 to 0.11 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Child outcomes: Mental development (follow-up 2-3 years; measured with: Bayley scales of infant development; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	304	333	-	SMD 0.15 higher (0.05 lower to 0.36 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Child outcomes: Motor development (follow-up 2 years; measured with: Bayley scales of infant development; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	126	123	-	SMD 0.18 higher (0.07 lower to 0.43 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Maltreatment outcomes: Child abuse report (12 months mid-treatment) (follow-up mean 2 years; assessed with: Child protective services reports)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[3]	none	18/151 (11.9%)	16/158 (10.1%)	RR 1.18 (0.62 to 2.22)	18 more per 1000 (from 38 fewer to 124 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								10.1%		18 more per 1000 (from 38 fewer to 123 more)		
Maltreatment outcomes: Child abuse report (follow-up 2-3 years; assessed with: Child protective services reports, Parent report of contact with child, youth and family service)												
2	randomised	serious[1]	no serious	no serious	serious[3]	none	49/331	58/357	RR 0.93 (0.66	11 fewer per 1000 (from 55	⊕⊕OO	

	trials		inconsistency	indirectness			(14.8%)	(16.2%)	to 1.31)	fewer to 50 more)	LOW	
								15.3%		11 fewer per 1000 (from 52 fewer to 47 more)		
Maltreatment outcomes: Severe physical assult (follow-up 3 years; assessed with: Parent report of contact with child, youth and family service)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	8/184 (4.3%)	24/207 (11.6%)	RR 0.38 (0.17 to 0.81)	72 fewer per 1000 (from 22 fewer to 96 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
								11.6%		72 fewer per 1000 (from 22 fewer to 96 fewer)		

[1] Unclear risk of bias in several domains
[2] OIS violated- Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)/ Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)
[3] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)

A.3.2 Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 2 year follow up

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Home visiting**	**Control (2 year follow-up)**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Less likely to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	167/169 (98.8%)	171/176 (97.2%)	RR 1.02 (0.99 to 1.05)	19 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 49 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
								97.2%		19 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 49 more)		
Less likely to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	151/169 (89.3%)	158/176 (89.8%)	RR 1 (0.93 to 1.07)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 63 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
								89.8%		0 fewer per 1000 (from 63 fewer to 63 more)		

[1] Unclear risk of bias across several domains

A.3.3 Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 7 year follow up

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control (7 year follow-up)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Less likely to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	133/138 (96.4%)	151/164 (92.1%)	RR 1.05 (0.99 to 1.11)	46 more per 1000 (from 9 fewer to 101 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
								92.1%		46 more per 1000 (from 9 fewer to 101 more)		
Less likely to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	129/138 (93.5%)	148/165 (89.7%)	RR 1.04 (0.97 to 1.12)	36 more per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 108 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
								89.7%		36 more per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 108 more)		

[1] Unclear risk of bias across several domains

A.3.4 Full GRADE profiles for Parent child psychotherapy versus control for for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Secure attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; measured with: Global relationship expectation scale; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	23	34	-	SMD 0.67 higher (0.12 to 1.21 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Child outcomes: Secure attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												

1	randomised trials	very serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	11/28 (39.3%)	53/54 (98.1%)	RR 0.40 (0.25 to 0.64)	589 fewer per 1000 (from 353 fewer to 736 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								1.9%		11 fewer per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 14 fewer)		
Child outcomes: Insecure attachment (assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,4]	none	2/28 (7.1%)	11/54 (20.4%)	RR 0.35 (0.08 to 1.47)	132 fewer per 1000 (from 187 fewer to 96 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								20.4%		133 fewer per 1000 (from 188 fewer to 96 more)		
Child outcomes: Disorganised attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	9/28 (32.1%)	42/54 (77.8%)	RR 0.41 (0.24 to 0.72)	459 fewer per 1000 (from 218 fewer to 591 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								77.8%		459 fewer per 1000 (from 218 fewer to 591 fewer)		
Maternal maladaptive representations (follow-up mean 1 years; measured with: Coding manuals; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[4,5]	none	23	34	-	SMD 0.39 lower (0.93 lower to 0.14 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	

[1] Unclear randomisation and allocation concealment
[2] Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb
[3] Serious risk ofattrition bias
[4] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)
[5] Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)

A.3.5 Full GRADE profiles for Parent child psychotherapy versus control for for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 12 month follow up

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Parent-child psychotherapy**	**Control (12 month follow-up)**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Child outcomes: Secure attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	15/27 (55.6%)	6/49 (12.2%)	RR 4.54 (1.99 to 10.32)	433 more per 1000 (from 121 more to 1000 more)	⊕OOO VERY	

								12.2%		432 more per 1000 (from 121 more to 1000 more)	LOW	
Child outcomes: less likely to have insecure attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	22/27 (81.5%)	30/49 (61.2%)	RR 1.33 (1 to 1.77)	202 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 471 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								61.2%		202 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 471 more)		
Child outcomes: Disorganised attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	7/27 (25.9%)	24/49 (49%)	RR 0.53 (0.26 to 1.06)	230 fewer per 1000 (from 362 fewer to 29 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								49%		230 fewer per 1000 (from 363 fewer to 29 more)		

[1] Serious attrition bias
[2] Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb
[3] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)

A.3.6 Full GRADE profiles for Parent child psychotherapy versus home visiting for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Parent-child psychotherapy**	**Home visiting**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Secure attachment (follow-up 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	17/28 (60.7%)	12/22 (54.5%)	RR 1.11 (0.69 to 1.81)	60 more per 1000 (from 169 fewer to 442 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								54.6%		60 more per 1000 (from 169 fewer to 442 more)		
Secure attachment (follow-up 1 years; measured with: Global relationship expectation scale; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	23	30	-	SMD 0.67 higher (0.11 to 1.23 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	

Less likely to have an insecure attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	26/28 (92.9%)	22/22 (100%)	RR 0.93 (0.82 to 1.06)	70 fewer per 1000 (from 180 fewer to 60 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								100%		70 fewer per 1000 (from 180 fewer to 60 more)		
Disorganised attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	9/28 (32.1%)	10/22 (45.5%)	RR 0.71 (0.35 to 1.43)	132 fewer per 1000 (from 295 fewer to 195 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								45.5%		132 fewer per 1000 (from 296 fewer to 196 more)		
Parent outcomes: Maternal maladaptive representations (follow-up mean 1 years; measured with: Coding manuals; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[3,5]	none	23	34	-	SMD 0.39 lower (0.93 lower to 0.14 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	

[1] Serious attrition bias
[2] Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)
[3] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)
[4] Unclear randomisation and allocation concealment
[5] Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)

A.3.7 Full GRADE profiles for Parent child psychotherapy versus home visiting for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 12 month follow up

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Parent-child psychotherapy**	**Home visiting (12 month follow-up)**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Secure attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	15/27 (55.6%)	5/22 (22.7%)	RR 2.44 (1.05 to 5.67)	327 more per 1000 (from 11 more to 1000 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								22.7%		327 more per 1000		

										(from 11 more to 1000 more)		
Less likely to have an insecure attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[4]	none	22/27 (81.5%)	18/22 (81.8%)	RR 1 (0.76 to 1.3)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 196 fewer to 245 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								81.8%		0 fewer per 1000 (from 196 fewer to 245 more)		
Disorganised attachment (follow-up mean 1 years; assessed with: Strange situation)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	7/27 (25.9%)	13/22 (59.1%)	RR 0.44 (0.21 to 0.91)	331 fewer per 1000 (from 53 fewer to 467 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								0%		-		

[1] Serious risk of bias
[2] Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)
[3] Seious risk of attrition bias
[4] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)

A.3.8 Full GRADE profiles for parent sensitivity and behaviour training children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Parent sensitivity and behavioural training**	**Control**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Parent outcomes: Sensitivity and responsiveness (follow-up 2-6 months; measured with: Positive parent behaviour, parenting shills observation scale, emotional availability scale; Better indicated by lower values)												
4	randomised trials	serious[1]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	157	162	-	SMD 0.46 higher (0.12 to 0.8 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Parent outcomes: negative parenting behaviour (follow-up mean 6 months; measured with: Dyadic Parent-Child Interaction Coding System (DPICS-II); Better indicated by lower values)												

1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	42	35	-	SMD 0.75 lower (1.22 to 0.29 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Parent attitudes: Negative parenting attitudes (follow-up mean 6 months; measured with: Child abuse potential inventory; Better indicated by lower values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	99	127	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.33 lower to 0.2 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Child outcomes: internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 6 months; measured with: Child Behavior Checklist, Behaviour Assessment System for Children ; Better indicated by lower values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	141	160	-	SMD 0.09 higher (0.14 lower to 0.31 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Child outcomes: externalising behaviour (measured with: Child Behavior Checklist, Behaviour Assessment System for Children; Better indicated by lower values)												
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	141	160	-	SMD 0.22 lower (0.45 lower to 0.01 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Maltreatment outcomes: re-report of physical abuse (follow-up 6 months)												
1	randomised trials	very serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	8/42 (19%)	17/35 (48.6%)	RR 0.39 (0.19 to 0.8)	296 fewer per 1000 (from 97 fewer to 393 fewer)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
								48.6%		296 fewer per 1000 (from 97 fewer to 394 fewer)		

[1] Risk of bias in several domains across studies
[2] Heterogeneity 50%
[3] Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)
[4] High attrition bias
[5] Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)

A.3.9 Full GRADE profiles for video feedback for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Videofeedback**	**Control**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Sensitivity/Responsiveness (follow-up mean 2 months; measured with: Maternal behavioural Q-sort; Better indicated by lower values)												

1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	35	32	-	SMD 0.48 higher (0.01 lower to 0.97 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Secure attachment (follow-up 2-3 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	54/95 (56.8%)	29/92 (31.5%)	RR 1.8 (1.22 to 2.65)	252 more per 1000 (from 69 more to 520 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								30.7%		246 more per 1000 (from 68 more to 507 more)		
Insecure attachment (follow-up 2-3 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	34/95 (35.8%)	45/92 (48.9%)	RR 0.74 (0.54 to 1)	127 fewer per 1000 (from 225 fewer to 0 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								41.2%		107 fewer per 1000 (from 190 fewer to 0 more)		
Disorganised attachment (follow-up mean 2-3 months; assessed with: Strange situation)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	26/95 (27.4%)	52/92 (56.5%)	RR 0.49 (0.33 to 0.73)	288 fewer per 1000 (from 153 fewer to 379 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
								56.5%		288 fewer per 1000 (from 153 fewer to 379 fewer)		
Externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 2-3 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	35	32	-	SMD 0.03 higher (0.45 lower to 0.51 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 2-3 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	35	32	-	SMD 0.12 lower (0.6 lower to 0.36 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	

[1] Unclear risk of bias across several domains
[2] Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)
[3] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)
[4] Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)

A.3.10 Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child psychotherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT	Parent-child psychotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Parental outcomes: sensitivity/responsiveness (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: Parental Support Questionnaire; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	88	91	-	SMD 0.32 higher (0.02 to 0.61 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Child outcomes: Internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	88	91	-	SMD 0.42 lower (0.71 to 0.12 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Child outcomes: externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	88	91	-	SMD 0.29 lower (0.58 lower to 0.01 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	

[1] Unclear risk of bias in several domains
[2] Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)
[3] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)

A.3.11 Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child psychotherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 6 month follow up

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT	Parent-child psychotherapy (6 month follow-up)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Parental outcomes: parenting practices (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: Parental Support Questionnaire; Better indicated by lower values)												

1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	76	67	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.25 lower to 0.4 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Child outcomes: Internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	75	67	-	SMD 0.11 lower (0.43 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Child outcomes: externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	75	67	-	SMD 0.09 lower (0.42 lower to 0.24 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	

[1] Unclear risk of bias across several domains
[2] Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)
[3] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)

A.3.12 Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child psychotherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 12 month follow up

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**CBT**	**Parent-child psychotherapy (12 month follow-up)**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Parental outcomes: parenting practices (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: Parental Support Questionnaire; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	79	69	-	SMD 0.1 lower (0.42 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Child outcomes: Internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: Child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												

1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	78	68	-	SMD 0.3 lower (0.63 lower to 0.02 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Child outcomes: externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: child behaviour checklist; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious[2,3]	none	78	68	-	SMD 0.12 higher (0.21 lower to 0.44 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	

[1] Unclear risk of bias across several domains
[2] Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb)
[3] 95% CI crosses both line of no effect and measure of appreciable benefit or harm (SMD -0.5/0.5 or RR 0.75/1.25)

A.4 Interventions for children in care

A.4.1 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Parental Education and Training Intervention for carers of children in-care.

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Parental Education Training and Support**	**Control**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Reactive attachment disorder - Primary school (follow-up mean 3 days; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	50	50	-	SMD 0.47 higher (0.07 to 0.86 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Reactive attachment disorder _Follow-up - Primary school (follow-up mean 9 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	62	88	-	SMD 0.35 higher (0.02 to 0.67 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Emotional/Behavioural problems_Follow-up - Primary school (follow-up mean 9 months; Better indicated by lower values)												

1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	62	88	-	SMD 0.12 higher (0.2 lower to 0.45 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Child's well being_follow-up - Primary school (follow-up mean 9 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	62	88	-	SMD 0.18 lower (0.5 lower to 0.15 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Investigators were blinded, but not the participants. It was unclear if the assessors were blinded.
[2] For continuous outcomes,the 95% CI crossed one MID (-0.5 or 0.5).
[3] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Participants were not blinded and some chose which group they preferred to attend. It was unclear if Investigator and outcome assessors were blinded.

A.4.2 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Video Feedback Intervention for carers of children in-care

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Video Feedback**	**usual care**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Secure attachment (follow-up 4 - 10 weeks; Better indicated by higher values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	108	113	-	SMD 0.16 higher (0.1 lower to 0.43 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Secure attachment - Pre-school (follow-up mean 10 weeks; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	86	89	-	SMD 0.14 higher (0.16 lower to 0.43 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Secure attachment - Primary school (follow-up mean 1 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	22	24	-	SMD 0.27 higher (0.31 lower to 0.85 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Sensitivity - Pre-school (follow-up 1 to 2.5 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
3	randomised	serious[6]	serious[7]	no serious	serious[5]	none	154	165	-	SMD 0.33 higher (0.11 to	⊕OOO	CRITICAL

	trials			indirectness						0.55 higher)	VERY LOW	
Attachment problems - Primary school (follow-up mean 1 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias[3]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	22	24	-	SMD 0.67 lower (1.26 to 0.07 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Parenting stress/mental well being - Pre-school (follow-up mean 10 weeks; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	86	89	-	SMD 0.1 higher (0.2 lower to 0.4 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Parental attitude/knowledge/behaviour - Pre-school (follow-up 2.5-6 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	110	113	-	SMD 0.36 higher (0.1 to 0.63 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Secure attachment _ Follow-up - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	59	70	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.41 lower to 0.29 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Sensitivity _ Follow-up - Pre-school (follow-up 6-12 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
2	randomised trials	serious[8]	very serious[9]	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	103	122	-	SMD 0.61 higher (0.34 to 0.89 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Parenting stress/mental well being_Follow-up - Pre school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	59	70	-	SMD 0.12 higher (0.22 lower to 0.47 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Parenting attitude/knowledge/behaviour_Follow-up - Pre school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	59	70	-	SMD 0.32 higher (0.03 lower to 0.67 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Emotional/Behavioural problems_Follow-up - Pre-school (follow-up mean 9 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[10]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	50	70	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.27 lower to 0.42 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Dozier was tripled blinded, but the other study only assessors were blinded.
[2] For continuous outcomes, the optimal information size (that is a total number of 400 participants) was not met.

[3] Study was tripled blinded.
[4] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Assessors were blinded, but unclear if investigators or participants were blinded.
[5] The 95% CI crossed one MID for continuous outcomes (-0.5 or 0.5).
[6] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. It was unclear if anyone was blinded in Bick, the other two studies had assessors blinded, but unclear if anyone else.
[7] Heterogeneity was detected, I squared >50%
[8] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Assessors were blinded in Spieker but not in other study and unclear if investigators or participants were blinded..
[9] Heterogeneity was detected, I squared >80%
[10] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Investigators were blinded, but unclear if assessors or participants were blinded.

A.4.3 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Multicomponent Foster Care Treatment on carers of children in care.

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Multicomponent foster care treatment	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Secure attachment - Pre-school (follow-up mean 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	40/57 (70.2%)	40/60 (66.7%)	RR 1.05 (0.82 to 1.35)	33 more per 1000 (from 120 fewer to 233 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Fewer attachment problems - Pre-school (follow-up mean 12 months)												
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	12/57 (21.1%)	18/60 (30%)	RR 1.13 (0.91 to 1.4)	39 more per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 120 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

[1] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. But investigators and assessors were blinded, but unclear if participants,
[2] The 95% CI crossed one MID (0.75 or 1.25).

A.4.4 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Parental Sensitivity and Behavioural Training for carers of children in care.

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parental Sensitivity and Behavioural Training	Usual Care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Attachment (follow-up mean 12 weeks; Better indicated by higher values)												

1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	none	34	29	-	SMD 0.53 higher (1.03 to 0.03 lower)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Behavioural and emotional problems (follow-up mean 12 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	34	29	-	SMD 0.03 lower (0.53 lower to 0.47 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Parenting attitude/knowledge/behaviour (follow-up mean 12 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	32	23	-	SMD 0.24 lower (0.78 lower to 0.3 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Child behavioural problems (follow-up mean 12 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	34	27	-	SMD 0.74 lower (1.26 to 0.22 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of life (follow-up mean 12 weeks; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	34	29	-	SMD 0.27 lower (0.77 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Unclear methods of randomisation, but allocation concealment was performed. Neither the patients, investigator, or assessors were blinded.
[2] They used an unvalidated tool to measure attachment.
[3] The 95% CI crossed one MID for continouous variable (-0.5 to 0.5).

A.4.5 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Foster Care (with support) versus Institutionalised children

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Foster Care and Parent education/support**	**Control**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Secure attachment - Pre-school (follow-up 13-36 months)												

1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[2]	none	30/61 (49.2%)	10/57 (17.5%)	RR 2.8 (1.51 to 5.2)	316 more per 1000 (from 89 more to 737 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Attachment problem - Pre-school (follow-up 13-36 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	31/61 (50.8%)	47/57 (82.5%)	RR 0.62 (0.47 to 0.81)	313 fewer per 1000 (from 157 fewer to 437 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Reactive attachment disorder - Pre-school (follow-up 11-36 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	68	68	-	SMD 0.71 lower (1.06 to 0.36 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Reactive attachment disorder - Primary school (follow-up 5.5-7.5 years; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[4]	none	68	68	-	SMD 0.54 lower (0.88 to 0.19 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Social skills - Primary school (follow-up 5.5-7.5 years; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	50	44	-	SMD 2.36 higher (1.83 to 2.89 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Unclear if participants, investigator and outcome assessor were blinded.
[2] For dichotomous outcomes, the optimal information size (that is a total number of 300 events) was not met.
[3] The 95% CI crossed one MID (0.75 or 1.25)
[4] The 95% CI for continuous outcomes crossed 1 MID (-0.5 or 0.5).
[5] For continuous outcomes, the optimal information size (that is a total of 400 participants) was not met.

A.4.6 Full GRADE profile for the effects of Parental Education, Training and Support for carers. Following studies only reported placement disruption as a critical outcome (no attachment measures).

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of	Design	Risk of	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other	Foster_Carer	Control	Relative	Absolute		

studies		bias				considerations	Training		(95% CI)			
Placement disruptions (follow-up 1 - 9 months)												
3	randomised trials	serious[1]	serious[2]	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision[3]	none	7/146 (4.8%)	16/123 (13%)	RR 1.09 (1.01 to 1.18)	12 more per 1000 (from 1 more to 23 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Placement disruptions - Primary school (follow-up 1 to 9 months)												
2	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	5/102 (4.9%)	14/88 (15.9%)	RR 1.13 (1.02 to 1.25)	21 more per 1000 (from 3 more to 40 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Placement disruptions - Primary - Secondary school (follow-up mean 3 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	2/44 (4.5%)	2/35 (5.7%)	RR 1.01 (0.91 to 1.12)	1 more per 1000 (from 5 fewer to 7 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Placement disruption - Primary school (follow-up mean 9 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	-	-	Not estimable	-	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Positive exits from care - Primary school (follow-up mean 4 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[6]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	62/359 (17.3%)	31/341 (9.1%)	RR 1.9 (1.27 to 2.85)	82 more per 1000 (from 25 more to 168 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Negative exits from care (Inverted) - Primary school (follow-up mean 4 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[6]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[3]	none	44/359 (12.3%)	49/341 (14.4%)	RR 1.02 (0.97 to 1.09)	3 more per 1000 (from 4 fewer to 13 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
No change in placement - Primary school (follow-up mean 4 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[6]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	252/359 (70.2%)	261/341 (76.5%)	RR 0.92 (0.84 to 1)	61 fewer per 1000 (from 122 fewer to 0 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Placement disruptions - Secondary school (follow-up mean 12 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	48	52	-	SMD 0.38 lower (0.78 lower to 0.02 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of parenting (follow-up 1-3 months; Better indicated by lower values)												

2	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	99	80	-	SMD 0.84 higher (0.53 to 1.15 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of parenting - Primary school (follow-up mean 5 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	55	45	-	SMD 0.75 higher (0.35 to 1.16 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of parenting - Primary to secondary school (follow-up mean 3 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	44	35	-	SMD 0.96 higher (0.49 to 1.43 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Deliquency - Secondary school (follow-up mean 36 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	48	52	-	SMD 0.48 lower (0.88 to 0.08 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Internalising/Externalising symptoms - Primary school (follow-up mean 5 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	26	20	-	SMD 0.02 lower (0.6 lower to 0.57 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Internalising/Externalising symptoms - Primary to secondary school (follow-up mean 3 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[7]	none	44	35	-	SMD 0.67 lower (1.13 to 0.22 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Internalising/Externalising symptoms Secondary school (follow-up 12-24 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[4]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious[8]	none	48	52	-	SMD 0.03 higher (0.36 lower to 0.42 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Fewer placement disruptions_Follow-up Primary school												
2	randomised trials	serious[4]	serious inconsistency[2]	no serious indirectness	serious[5]	none	24/105 (22.9%)	31/94 (33%)	RR 1.13 (0.96 to 1.33)	43 more per 1000 (from 13 more to 109 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

1 One study used unclear randomisation methods. Allocation concealment was unclear. Unclear and unlikley that participants and investigators were blind.
2 Heterogeneity was detected, I squared >50%
3 For dichotomous outcomes, the optimal information size (that is a total number of 300 events) was not met.
4 Adequate randomisation but unclear if performed allocation concealment. Participants and investigator were unlikelty to be blinded.

5 The 95% CI crossed one MID (0.75 or 1.25),
6 Unclear randomisation methods and if performed allocation concealment. Participants and investigator were unlikely to be blinded.
7 The 95% CI crossed one MID (-0.5 to 0.5).
8 For continuous outcomes, the optimal information size (that is a total of 400 participants) was not met.

A.5 Interventions for children who have been adopted

A.5.1 Full GRADE table for Video Feedback Interventions for adopted children.

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Video Feedback	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Secure attachment - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	very serious[2]	serious[3]	none	27/30 (90%)	21/30 (70%)	RR 1.29 (0.99 to 1.67)	203 more per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 469 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Maternal sensitivity - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	30	30	-	SMD 0.39 higher (0.12 lower to 0.91 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Less likely to have disorganised attachment - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	none	46/49 (93.9%)	38/49 (77.6%)	RR 1.21 (1.02 to 1.43)	163 more per 1000 (from 16 more to 333 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Parental behaviour - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	30	30	-	SMD 0.86 higher (0.33 to 1.39 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Behavioural functioning - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by lower values)												

1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	30	30	-	SMD 0.34 lower (0.85 lower to 0.17 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	

[1] Unclear methods for randomisation and unclear if performed allocation concealment. Participants and assessor were however, blinded.
[2] Children in the UK are rarely adopted during infancy, the mean age is 3 years and 8 months.
[3] 95% CI crossed one MID (0.75 or 1.25)
[4] 95% CI crossed one MID (-0.5 or 0.5)
[5] Unclear methods for randomisation and unclear if performed allocation concealment. Participants and assessor were however, blinded .Also added an additional group from another RCT.

A.5.2 Full GRADE profile for Parental Sensitivity and Behaviour Training for adoptive parents.

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Sensitivity Training	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Secure attachment - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[2]	none	24/30 (80%)	21/30 (70%)	RR 1.14 (0.85 to 1.53)	98 more per 1000 (from 105 fewer to 371 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Maternal sensitivity - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[4]	none	30	30	-	SMD 0.12 higher (0.39 lower to 0.63 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Less likely to have disorganised attachment - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[2]	none	24/30 (80%)	38/49 (77.6%)	RR 1.03 (0.82 to 1.3)	23 more per 1000 (from 140 fewer to 233 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Parental behaviour - Pre-school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[4]	none	30	30	-	SMD 0.26 higher (0.25 lower to 0.77 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Behavioural/Emotional problems- Pre-school (follow-up 6 months; Better indicated by lower values)												

1	randomised trials	serious[3]	no serious inconsistency	serious[1]	serious[4]	none	30	30	-	SMD 0.29 lower (0.79 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Empathy (follow-up mean 10 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[5]	no serious inconsistency	serious[5]	serious [7]	none	31	27	-	SMD 1.67 lower (2.28 to 1.07 lower)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Total Child Behaviour Check List (follow-up mean 10 weeks; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[6]	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious [7]	none	32	29	-	SMD 1.67 lower (2.28 to 1.07 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

[1] Children in the UK are rarely adopted during infancy, the mean age is 3 years and 8 months.
[2] The 95% CI crossed one MID (0.75 or 1.25).
[3] Unclear methods for randomisation and unclear if performed allocation concealment. Participants and assessor were blinded.
[4] The 95% CI crossed one MID (-0.5 or 0.5)
[5] Maternal empathy tool is not a direct measure of attachment, sensitivity or responsiveness.
[6] Unclear randomisation methods and if allocation concealment was performed. Assessors were blinded to participants assignment to experimental or wait list
7 Study did not include the optimal study size of n=400 participants for a continuous outcome.

A.5.3 Full GRADE profile for Parental Education, Training and Support for adoptive parents.

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	**Design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Education training**	**Usual care**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute**		
Improvement in attachment (>50%) - Primary school (follow-up mean 2.5 months)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[3]	none	19/19 (100%)	17/18 (94.4%)	RR 1.06 (0.91 to 1.23)	57 more per 1000 (from 85 fewer to 217 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Behavioural/Emotional problems- Primary school (follow-up mean 2.5 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[2]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.03 higher (0.62 lower to 0.67 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

Placement problems - Primary school (follow-up mean 2.5 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.21 lower (0.86 lower to 0.43 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Quality of parenting - Primary school (follow-up mean 2.5 months; Better indicated by higher values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.22 higher (0.42 lower to 0.87 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Emotional and behavioural problems - follow-up - Primary school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.18 lower (0.83 lower to 0.46 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Quality of parenting - follow-up - Primary school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.47 higher (0.19 lower to 1.12 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Placement problems - follow-up - Primary school (follow-up mean 6 months; Better indicated by lower values)												
1	randomised trials	serious[1]	no serious inconsistency	serious[2]	serious[4]	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.35 lower (1 lower to 0.3 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL

[1] Allocation concealment was performed. However, the participants were not blinded and the outcome was parentally assessed so likely to be biased.
[2] The authors combined the results from two different intervention groups. The results could not be separated.
[3] The 95% CI crossed one MID (0.75 or 1.25).
[4] The 95% CI crossed one MID (-0.5 or 0.5).