Appendix N: Clinical evidence – GRADE tables

N.1	Riolo	ogical factors
N.1	.1	Full GRADE profile for genes associated with attachment difficulties
N.1.		Full GRADE profile for concordance in gene expression and attachment een siblings
N.2	Inter	ventions for children on the edge of care
N.2		Full GRADE profile for video feedback versus control psychotherapy, for hment problems in children at risk of going into care
N.2		Full GRADE profile for video feedback versus control follow-up 1 for hment problems in children at risk of going into care
N.2		Full GRADE profile for video feedback versus control follow-up 2, for hment problems in children at risk of going into care11
N.2		Full GRADE profile for video feedback versus counselling hotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 12
N.2		Full GRADE profile for parent-child psychotherapy versus control hotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 12
N.2		Full GRADE profile for parent–child psychotherapy versus control w-up for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care
N.2		Full GRADE profile for parent–child psychotherapy versus home visiting hotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care 15
N.2		Full GRADE profile for parent–child psychotherapy versus home visiting w-up for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care
N.2	contr	Full GRADE profile for parent sensitivity and behaviour training versus rol psychotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going care17
N.2		Full GRADE profile for parent sensitivity and behaviour training versus rol follow-up for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care . 18
N.2		Full GRADE profile for home visiting versus control psychotherapy (GIV non-GIV outcomes) for attachment problems in children at risk of going care
N.2		Full GRADE profile for home visiting versus control follow-up (GIV and GIV outcomes) for attachment problems in children at risk of going into
N.2		Full GRADE profile for home visiting versus control follow-up 2 for homent problems in children at risk of going into care
N.2		Full GRADE profile for home visiting versus control follow-up 3 for homent problems in children at risk of going into care
N.2		Full GRADE profile for home visiting and parent-child psychotherapy

N.2.		Full GRADE profile for psychotherapy versus control psychotherapy for ment problems in children at risk of going into care?
N.2		Full GRADE profile for psychotherapy versus control follow-up for ment problems in children at risk of going into care?
N.2	.18	Full GRADE profile for CBT versus control for attachment problems in en at risk of going into care?25
N.2		Full GRADE profile for CBT versus psychotherapy for attachment ems in children at risk of going into care26
N.2		Full GRADE profile for CBT versus counselling for attachment problems dren at risk of going into care
N.2.		Full GRADE profile for psychotherapy versus counselling for attachment ems in children at risk of going into care26
N.2.		Full GRADE profile for counselling versus control for attachment ems in children at risk of going into care27
N.3		entions for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of maltreated27
N.3.		Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated
N.3.		Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 2-year follow-
N.3.	.3	Full GRADE profiles for home visiting versus control for children on the of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated at 7-year follow-
N.3.	.4 child	Full GRADE profiles for parent child psychotherapy versus control for en on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 30
N.3.	child	Full GRADE profiles for parent child psychotherapy versus control for en on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated month follow-up
N.3.	for c	Full GRADE profiles for parent child psychotherapy versus home visiting ildren on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being eated
N.3.	.7 for c	Full GRADE profiles for parent child psychotherapy versus home visiting ildren on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being ated at 12-month follow-up
N.3.		Full GRADE profiles for parent sensitivity and behaviour training en on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of being maltreated 35
N.3.		Full GRADE profiles for video feedback for children on the edge of care ave been or are at risk of being maltreated
N.3.	psyc	Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child otherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of maltreated
N.3.	psyc	Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child otherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of maltreated at 6-month follow-up38
N.3.	psyc	Full GRADE profiles for trauma focused CBT versus parent child otherapy for children on the edge of care who have been or are at risk of maltreated at 12-month follow-up

N.4	Interventions for children in care	40
N.4	.1 Full GRADE profile for the effects of parental education and training intervention for carers of children in care	40
N.4	.2 Full GRADE profile for the effects of video feedback intervention for carers of children in care	41
N.4	.3 Full GRADE profile for the effects of multicomponent foster care treatment on carers of children in care	43
N.4	.4 Full GRADE profile for the effects of parental sensitivity and behavioural training for carers of children in care	43
N.4	.5 Full GRADE profile for the effects of foster care (with support) versus Institutionalised children	44
N.4	.6 Full GRADE profile for the effects of parental education, training and support for carers (the following studies only reported placement disruption as a critical outcome [no attachment measures])	45
N.5	Interventions for children who have been adopted	48
N.5	.1 Full GRADE table for video feedback interventions for adopted children	48
N.5		49
N.5	.3 Full GRADE profile for parental education, training and support for adoptive parents	50

Abbreviations

5-HTTLPR serotonin transporter gene (long long/short long/short/short short allele carrier

(LL/SL/S/SS) variants)

AMBIANCE Atypical Maternal Behaviour Instrument for Assessment and Classification

BSID Bayley Scales of Infant and Toddler Development

CARE-Index a dyadic procedure that assesses adult sensitivity in a dyadic context

CBCL Child Behavior Checklist
CBT cognitive behavioural therapy

CI confidence interval

CIB Coding Interactive Behaviour

COMT GG catechol-O-methyltransferase GG genotype

DRD4 dopamine D4 receptor

EAS Emotional Availability Scales

GABRA6 GABA Subunit A Receptor Alpha 6

GIV generic inverse variance

GRADE Grades of Recommendation Assessment, Development and Evaluation

HOME Home Observation Measurement of the Environment

ITSEA Infant Toddler Social Emotional Assessment

MID Minimum important difference

OIS optimal information size

OR odds ratio RR risk ratio

SMD standardised mean difference SSP Strange Situation Procedure

N.1 Biological factors

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

i uli Oix	ADE PIOINE	ioi gei	iles associate	o with attac	illielit u	iiiicuities						
			Quality assess	sment			No. of	patients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Genes	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Disorganis	sed attachment -	DRD4 + ma	iternal unresolved l	oss								
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
Disorganis	sed + DRD4-7 repo	eat allele										
4	Observational studies	Serious ⁴	Serious ⁵	Serious ⁶	Serious ⁷	None		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
Disorganis	sed + DRD4/-521 (C	'		_		1					
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
Disorganis	sed + DRD4/5-HT1	LPR LL										
2	Observational studies	Serious ⁴	No serious inconsistency	Serious ⁶	Serious ²	None		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
Disorganis	sed + 5-HTTLPR L	L										
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

Disorgani	sed 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
Disorgani	sed 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
Disorgani	sed attachment +	521 + - COI	MT 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
Disorgani	sed attachment +	521 + - GAI	BRA6 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 at	tachment + DRD4	7 repeat all	ele									
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 at	tachment + 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 at	tachment + 5-HTT	LPR LL										
3	Observational studies	Serious ¹²	Serious⁵	Serious ⁹	Serious ⁷	None		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 att	achment + 5-HTTI	LPR 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 att	achment + - 5-HT	TLPR ss										
1	Observational studies			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 att	achment – -521 C	С										
1	Observational studies		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 att	achment – 521 TT											
1	Observational studies		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 att	achment – GABR	A6 cc										
1	Observational studies		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 att	achment – COMT	-gg										
1	Observational studies		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

Controlled only for maternal frightening behaviour.
 95% CI crossed 1 MID.
 Large effect OR >2.
 Did not adjust for potential confounders. Only Frigerio 2009 attempted to adjust for other gene effects, but the raw data is not adjusted.
 Heterogeneity, ₱ >55%.
 Cichetti 2011 was the only study in an at-risk population.
 95% CI crosses 2 MIDs.
 Bid not adjust for potential confounders. Frigerio 2000 attempted to adjust for attempted to adjust for potential confounders. Frigerio 2000 attempted to adjust for attempted to adjust for potential confounders.

⁸ Did not adjust for potential confounders. Frigerio 2009 attempted to adjust for other gene effects, but the raw data is not adjusted.

N.1.2 Full GRADE profile for concordance in gene expression and attachment between siblings

			Quality assessm	ent		No. of patients Effect				_		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Concordance	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Concordan	ice											
4	Observational studies		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 O'Connor 1991 adjusted confounders but the raw data is not adjusted. The remaining studies (Bokhorst 2003, Constantino 2006, Fearon 2014) did not adjust for potential confounders.

⁹ Not in an at-risk population.

Did not adjust for potential confounders.

10 Did not adjust for potential confounders.

11 Frigerio 2009 attempted to adjust for other gene effects, but the raw data is not adjusted.

12 Only Barry 2008 was a cohort study, but they provided only cross-sectional data. Only Frigerio 2009 adjusted for potential confounders, but the raw data was not adjusted.

 $^{^{13}}$ Heterogeneity, $\ensuremath{\beta}\xspace > 80\%,$ 14 Adjusted for confounders but the raw data is not adjusted.

Not in an at-risk population.
 95% CI crossed the line of no effect and 2 MIDs.

N.2 Interventions for children on the edge of care

N.2.1 Full GRADE profile for video feedback versus control psychotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

iiito ca	10								1			
			Quality ass	sessment		No.	of patients		Effect	Quality	Importance	
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Video feedback	Control psychotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
	y/responsiven by higher valu		w-up 1–30 months	s; measured with	h: mother-infan	t observation; Lar	ndry Parent-	-Child Interaction	Scale; NCATS	S; Maternal Behaviou	al Q-set; EA	S; better
	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 att	tachment (foll	ow-up 2–	5 months; assess	ed with: SSP)								
	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 a	attachment (fo	ollow-up 2	-5 months; asses	sed with: SSP)								
-	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
Disorgani	sed attachme	nt (follow-	-up 2–5 months; a	ssessed with: S	SP)							
-	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
Externalis	sing behaviou	r (follow-u	ıp 2 months; meas	sured with: CBC	L; better indicat	ted by lower value	es)					
	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

Internalis	Internalising behaviour (follow-up 2 months; measured with: CBCL; better indicated by lower values)													
1	Randomised trials	Serious ⁵		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 1 or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment, unclear reporting of participant dropout).
² Risk of bias (due to 1 or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment).
³ Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

Full GRADE profile for video feedback versus control follow-up 1 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into N.2.2 care

			Quality assess	sment			No. of patients Effect			Effect	- Quality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Video feedback	Control follow-up 1	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quanty	importance
Sensitivity	//responsivene	ess (follow-up	1-6 months; mea	sured with: Ains	worth's sens	sitivity scales; NC	ATS; EAS; b	etter indicate	ed by higher v	ralues)		
4	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	114	89	-	SMD 0.70 higher (0.4 to 0.99 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Secure att	achment (folio	w-up 3 montl	hs; assessed with	: SSP)								
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		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 att	achment (folio	w-up 6 montl	hs; measured with	: ASCT; better in	dicated by h	igher values)						
				No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	35	36	-	SMD 0.45 higher (0.02 lower to 0.93 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Externalis	ing behaviour	(follow-up 6 r	months; measured	I with: ITSEA; be	tter indicated	d by lower values)						

⁴ Inconsistency (ℓ >50%, p <0.05).

⁵ Risk of bias (due to lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes).

1	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	35	36	-	SMD 0.09 higher (0.38 lower to 0.55 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Internalisi	Internalising behaviour (follow-up 6 months; measured with: ITSEA; better indicated by lower values)													
1	Randomised trials			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 1 or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment).

² Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

³ Risk of bias (due to lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes).

Full GRADE profile for video feedback versus control follow-up 2, for attachment problems in children at risk of going into N.2.3 care

			Quality assess	ment		No. of	patients		Effect			
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Video feedback	Control follow-up 2	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Secure att	achment (follo	w-up 56 month	ns; measured with:	ASCT; better ind	icated by hig	gher values)						
1	Randomised trials		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
Externalis	ing behaviour	(follow-up 56 r	months; measured	with: CBCL; bette	er indicated	by lower values)						
1	Randomised trials		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
Internalisi	ng behaviour (follow-up 56 m	nonths; measured v	with: CBCL; bette	r indicated b	y lower values)						
1	Randomised trials		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 (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants). ² Risk of bias (due to lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes).

N.2.4 Full GRADE profile for video feedback versus counselling psychotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

			Quality asses	sment			No.	of patients		Effect	Quality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Video feedback	Counselling psychotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	quanty	portaneo
Insensitiv	ensitivity (follow-up 6 months; assessed with: author's own measure)											
		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 (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

N.2.5 Full GRADE profile for parent-child psychotherapy versus control psychotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

3 3 3	ig iiito oa											
			Quality asse	ssment			No. of p	atients		Effect	Quality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Control psychotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quanty	Importance
Sensitivit	y/responsiven	ess (follo	w-up 1–12 month	s; measured wit	th: CIB; auth	ors' own measure	; better indicated by	y 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 at	tachment (foll	ow-up 1–1	16 months; asses	sed with: SSP)								
2		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 at	ttachment (foll	ow-up 12	months; measure	ed with: Attachm	ent Q-set; G	lobal Relationship	Expectation Scale	; better indicated b	y higher val	ues)				
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	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	inconsistency indirectness to 0.17 lower) LOW insecure attachment (follow-up 1–16 months; assessed with: SSP)													
2		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		
Disorgan	ised attachme	nt (follow	-up 1–16 months;	assessed with:	SSP)									
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 (1 or more of the following: unclear allocation concealment, selective outcome reporting, use of non-validated assessment measures).

² Inconsistency (ℓ >50%, p <0.05). ³ Imprecision (OIS 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 1 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).

Full GRADE profile for parent-child psychotherapy versus control follow-up for attachment problems in children at risk of N.2.6 going into care

303	into care											
			Quality asse	ssment			No. of patie	nts		Effect	Quality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Control follow-up	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Secure at	ecure attachment (follow-up 12 months; assessed with: SSP)											
1	Randomised trials		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 a	attachment (fo	llow-up 12	2 months; assesse	ed with: SSP)								
1	Randomised trials	- , .	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
Disorgani	sed attachmer	nt (follow-	up 12 months; ass	sessed with: SSF	')							
1	Randomised trials	- , .	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 (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

Full GRADE profile for parent-child psychotherapy versus home visiting psychotherapy for attachment problems in children N.2.7 at risk of going into care

ut Hor	or going		<u> </u>									
			Quality asse	essment			No. of p	patients		Effect	Quality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Home visiting psychotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quanty	Importance
Secure at	tachment (fol	low-up 12	months)									
	Randomised trials	Very serious ¹		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 at	tachment (fol	low-up 16	months; better in	dicated by high								
	Randomised trials	Serious ³		No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	23	34	-	SMD 0.67 higher (0.12 to 1.21 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Less likel	y to have an i	nsecure a	ttachment (follow	-up 12 months)								
1	Randomised trials	Very serious ¹		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
Disorgani	sed attachme	nt (follow	-up 12 months)									
1	Randomised trials	Very serious ¹		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

Risk of bias (downgraded twice due to broken randomisation).
 Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).
 Risk of bias (due to unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment).

N.2.8 Full GRADE profile for parent-child psychotherapy versus home visiting follow-up for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

IISK OI	going int	o oarc											
			Quality asse	ssment			No. of pation	ents		Effect			
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Home visiting follow-up	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance	
Secure att	Secure attachment (follow-up 12 months)												
1	Randomised trials			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	y to have an ir	secure at	tachment (follow-	up 12 months)									
1	Randomised trials			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	
Disorgani	sed attachmer	nt (follow-	up 12 months)										
1	Randomised trials			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 (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

Full GRADE profile for parent sensitivity and behaviour training versus control psychotherapy for attachment problems in N.2.9 children at risk of going into care

Cilliare	ii at iisk	or gon	ig into care										
			Quality ass	sessment			No. of p	atients		Effect			
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent sensitivity and behaviour training		Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance	
	Sensitivity/responsiveness (follow-up 1–13 months; measured with: SSP; Nursing Child Assessment Feeding Scale; Parent/Caregiver Involvement Scale; Dyadic Mutuality Correnting Skills Observation Scale; Coding of Attachment Related Parenting; EAS; better indicated by higher values)												
	Randomised trials				No serious imprecision	None	537	543	-	SMD 0.25 higher (0.09 to 0.42 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL	
Externalis	sing behaviou	r (follow-ເ	up 3–4 months; m	easured with: C	BCL; better ind	icated by lower v	alues)						
2	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious ³	None	99	125	-	SMD 0.28 lower (0.55 to 0.01 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT	
Internalis	ing behaviour	(follow-u	p 3–4 months; me	easured with: Cl	BCL; better indi	cated by lower va	ilues)						
2	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious ³	None	99	125	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.16 lower to 0.38 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT	
Negative	egative parenting attitudes (follow-up 3–4 months; measured with: Child Abuse Potential Inventory; better indicated by lower values)												
2	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious³	None	99	127	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.33 lower to 0.2 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT	

Risk of bias (due to 1 or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment).
 Risk of bias (due to high participant dropout rate and lack of blinding for parent-reported outcomes).
 Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

N.2.10 Full GRADE profile for parent sensitivity and behaviour training versus control follow-up for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

at 113K	or going	into car	-										
			Quality asses	ssment			No. of patie	nts		Effect			
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent sensitivity and behaviour training	Control follow-up	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance	
Sensitivit	ensitivity/responsiveness (follow-up 5 months; better indicated by higher values)												
1	Randomised trials		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 at	ttachment (foll	ow-up 5 mo	nths; assessed w	vith: SSP)	•								
1	Randomised trials		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 like	ly to have an i	nsecure atta	chment (follow-u	p 5 months; ass	essed with:	SSP)							
1	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	126/156 (80.8%)	118/162 (72.8%)	RR 1.11 (0.98 to 1.25)	80 more per 1000 (from 15 fewer to 182 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL	
Less like	ly to have a dis	sorganised a	attachment (follow	w-up 5 months;	assessed wit	h: SSP)							
1	Randomised trials		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 (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

N.2.11 Full GRADE profile for home visiting versus control psychotherapy (GIV and non-GIV outcomes) for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

milare	en at risk	or gon	ng into care										
			Quality ass	sessment				No. of patients		Effect			
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control psychotherapy (GIV and non-GIV outcomes)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importanc	
			follow-up 1–36 m author's own me				Index; NC	CATS; Bayley Test Situation	on; Parent/C	aregiver Involveme	ent Scale; EA	S; Cowen	
-	Randomised trials	Serious ¹	Serious ²	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	4355	3954	1	SMD 0.24 higher (0.14 to 0.35 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL	
Secure attachment (follow-up 12–24 months; assessed with: SSP)													
	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	CRITICAI	
Secure at	ttachment (fol	low-up 1–	24 months; meas	sured with: Pare	nting Stress In	dex; SSP; Attach	ment Q-se	et; better indicated by low	er 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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAI	
Insecure	attachment (f	ollow-up 1	2-24 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 2.95)	79 fewer per 1000 (from 324 fewer to 809 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL	
Externali	sing behaviou	ır GIV (foll	ow-up 7–36 mont	ths; measured v	vith: ITSEA; CE	BCL; better indica	ted by low	ver 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)	0000	IMPORTAN	

Internalis	sing behaviou	r GIV (folio	ow-up 7–36 mont	hs; measured w	ith: ITSEA; CB	CL; better indicate	ed by low	er 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)		IMPORTANT		
	Mental development GIV (follow-up 9–36 months; measured with: BSID; 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 de	velopment (fo	llow-up 13	3–24 months; me	asured with: BS	ID; better indic	ated by higher va	lues)							
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	g attitudes GI\	/ (follow-u	p 24-25 months;	measured with	: Adult–Adoles	cent Parenting Inv	ventory; b	etter 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 1 or more of the following across several studies: unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment, unclear or high participant dropout rate, unclear or lack of blinding of outcome assessors).

² Inconsistency (ℓ >50%, p <0.05).

³ Risk of bias (due to unclear random sequence generation, unclear allocation concealment and unclear blinding of outcome assessors).

Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).
 Risk of bias (due to 1 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 1 or more of the following across several studies: unclear randomisation, unclear allocation concealment, unclear blinding of outcome assessors, unclear participant dropout rate).
⁸ Risk of bias (due to 1 or more of the following in the majority of studies: unclear allocation concealment and no method used to account for missing data).

Full GRADE profile for home visiting versus control follow-up (GIV and non-GIV outcomes) for attachment problems in N.2.12 children at risk of going into care

Jilliai C	ii al IISK	or going	into ourc									
			Quality asses	sment			1	No. of patients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control follow-up (GIV and non-GIV outcomes)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Secure at	tachment (foll	ow-up 1 mon										
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
Sensitivit	y/responsiven	ess GIV (follo	ow-up 1–10 month	ns; measured wit	th: HOME Inv	entory; better ind	icated 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	IMPORTAN
Mental de	velopment GI	V (follow-up 6	6-10 months; mea	sured with: BSII	D; Stanford-B	inet Test of Intelli	gence; be	etter 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	IMPORTAN
Motor dev	/elopment (fol	low-up 6 mor	nths; measured w	ith: BSID; 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	IMPORTAN

¹ Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants). ² Risk of bias (due to 1 or more of the following across some studies: unclear allocation concealment, high participant dropout 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 1 or more of the following across some studies: unclear allocation concealment and high or unclear participant dropout rate).

N.2.13 Full GRADE profile for home visiting versus control follow-up 2 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

			_							idi oii di iloit oi gi			
			Quality asses	ssment			No. of	patients		Effect	Ouglity	Importance	
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control follow-up 2	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quanty	importance	
Sensitivity	Sensitivity/responsiveness (follow-up 22 months; measured with: HOME Inventory; better indicated by higher values)												
	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	19	30	-	SMD 0.38 higher (0.2 lower to 0.96 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL	
Less likely	to have extern	alising be	haviour (follow-up	48 months; asses	sed with: CE	BCL)							
	Randomised trials	Serious ³		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 intern	alising bel	naviour (follow-up 4	8 months; asses	sed with: CB	CL)							
	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 dev	ental development (follow-up 22 months; measured with: Stanford-Binet Test of Intelligence; better indicated by higher values)												
	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	

Risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment, high participant dropout rate).
 Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).
 Risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment, lack of blinding of parent-reported outcomes and no method used to account for missing data).

Full GRADE profile for home visiting versus control follow-up 3 for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

			Quality asses	ssment			No. of	patients		Effect	Quality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control follow-up 3	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Less likely	to have extern	alising be	haviour (follow-up	84 months; asses	sed with: CE	BCL)						
	Randomised trials			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 intern	alising bel	haviour (follow-up 8	34 months; asses	sed with: CB	CL)						
	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		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 (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

N.2.15 Full GRADE profile for home visiting and parent-child psychotherapy versus control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

			Quality asse	ssment			No. of patients			Effect	Ouality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting and parent– child psychotherapy	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quanty	Importance
Sensitivity	y/responsivene	ess (follov	w-up 4 months; as	sessed with: AM	BIANCE sca	le)						
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		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 at	tachment (folio	ow-up 12	months; assessed	with: SSP)								
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		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

Disorgani	sed attachmen	t (follow-	up 12 months; ass	sessed with: SSF	P)						
1	Randomised trials			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)	 CRITICAL

Full GRADE profile for psychotherapy versus control psychotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into N.2.16 care?

			Quality asses	y assessment No. of patients Effect								
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Psychotherapy		Relative (95% CI)		Quality	Importance
Sensitivity	/responsivenes	ss (follow-u	up 3 months; better	indicated by high	er values)				•			
1	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	23	24	-	SMD 0.58 higher (0 to 1.17 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Risk of bias (due to lack of blinding of outcome assessors).
² Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

¹ Risk of bias (due to unclear random sequence generation and allocation concealment). ² Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

Full GRADE profile for psychotherapy versus control follow-up for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care?

care:												
			Quality asses	ssment			No. of pa	tients		Effect	Quality	l man a réama a
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Psychotherapy	Control follow-up	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Sensitivity	/responsivene	ss (follow-	up 1 months; bette	er indicated by high	gher values)						T	
	Randomised trials		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 a	ttachment (foll	ow-up 14	months; assessed	with: SSP)								
	Randomised trials		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

N.2.18 Full GRADE profile for CBT versus control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care?

			Quality asses	sment			No. of p	oatients		Effect	Ouglity	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	СВТ	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quanty	Importance
Insecure at	tachment (follo	w-up 14 m	onths; assessed wit	h: SSP)								
	Randomised trials			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 (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

¹ Risk of bias (due to unclear allocation concealment and use of non-validated outcome measures). ² Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

Full GRADE profile for CBT versus psychotherapy for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

			Quality asses	ssment			No	. of patients		Effect	Quality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	СВТ	Psychotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	quanty	Importance
Insecure at	ttachment (follo	ow-up 14 n	nonths; assessed v	vith: SSP)								
	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	22/41 (53.7%)		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).

N.2.20 Full GRADE profile for CBT versus counselling for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

			Quality asses	sment			No. o	of patients		Effect	Quality	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	СВТ	Counselling	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	quanty	Importance
Insecure at	ttachment (follo	w-up 14 m	nonths; assessed wi	th: SSP)								
	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		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 (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

N.2.21 Full GRADE profile for psychotherapy versus counselling for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

			Quality asses	ssment			No. of pa	ntients		Effect	Quality	Importance	
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Psychotherapy	Counselling	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quanty	importance	

² Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

Inse	cure attachment (fo	low-up 14	months; assessed	with: SSP)								
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).

N.2.22 Full GRADE profile for counselling versus control for attachment problems in children at risk of going into care

	,		- unicoming 10	1000 00110	· · · · · · ·	erminerit pres		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	on at mon	or going into ourc		
			Quality asses	sment			No. of par	tients		Effect	Quality Impor	Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Counselling	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Insecure at	ttachment (follo	w-up 14 m	onths; assessed wi	th: SSP)								
	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	16/39 (41%)	20/47 (42.6%)		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).

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

N.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

|--|

² Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

² Imprecision (OIS for dichotomous outcomes = 300 events, and for continuous outcomes = 400 participants).

No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
Parenting •	outcomes: ser	nsitivity/re	sponsiveness (follo	ow-up 2–3 years;	measured with:	NCATS, HOME, EA	S; better i	ndicated	l by lower valu	es)		
-	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	624	554	-	SMD 0.19 higher (0.08 to 0.31 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Parent out	comes: parent	ing attitud	les (follow-up 2–3 y	/ears; measured \	with: Adult–Adol	escent Parenting I	nventory, 4	19-item _l	parenting ques	stionnaire (better indicate	ed by lower v	alues)
	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	IMPORTANT
Child outc	omes: externa	lising beha	aviour (follow-up 2	-3 years; measur	ed with: CBCL; k	petter indicated by	lower valu	es)				
-	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	IMPORTANT
Child outc	omes: internal	ising beha	viour (follow-up 2-	-3 years; measure	ed with: CBCL; b	etter indicated by	ower value	es)			•	
	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	IMPORTANT
Child outc	omes: mental	developme	ent (follow-up 2–3 y	/ears; measured v	with: BSID; bette	er indicated by low	er values)	•			•	
	Randomised trials		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	IMPORTANT
Child outc	omes: motor d	levelopme	nt (follow-up 2 yea	rs; measured with	n: BSID; better in	ndicated by lower v	alues)					
	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	IMPORTANT
Maltreatme	ent outcomes:	child abus	se report (12 month	ns mid treatment)	(follow-up mean	2 years; assessed	with: chile	d protec	tive services r	eports)		
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹	No serious inconsistency		Very serious ³	None	18/151		RR 1.18 (0.62		⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Maltroatm	ont outcomes:	child abus	so roport (follow us	2-2 voare: 2000	seed with: child	protective services	roports n	arent re	port of contac	t with child, youth and fa	mily sorvice	

2	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ³	None		58/357 (16.2%)	,	11 fewer per 1000 (from 55 fewer to 50 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Maltreatme	ent outcomes:	severe ph	ysical assault (follo	ow-up 3 years; as	sessed with: par	ent report of conta	ct with ch	ild, youtl	h and family se	ervice)		
1	Randomised trials				No serious imprecision	None		24/207 (11.6%)		72 fewer per 1000 (from 22 fewer to 96 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

¹ Unclear risk of bias in several domains.

N.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 ass	sessment			No. o	f patients		Effect			
Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control (2- year follow- up)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance	
Less likely to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL)												
Randomised : trials					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	IMPORTANT	
to have interr	nalising b	ehaviour (follow-u	p mean 3 years;	assessed with:	CBCL)							
Randomised trials					None	151/169 (89.3%)	158/176 (89.8%)	RR 1 (0.93 to 1.07)		0000	IMPORTANT	
R	to have exter Randomised rials to have interr Randomised	to have externalising be rials Serious to have internalising be randomised Sandomised Serious Serious	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency to have externalising behaviour (follow-underials Serious Inconsistency to have internalising behaviour (follow-underials Serious Inconsistency Inco	to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; Randomised rials Serious¹ No serious inconsistency indirectness to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; Randomised Serious¹ No serious No serious	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: Randomised rials No serious inconsistency indirectness imprecision to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: Randomised Serious No serious No serious No serious	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials No serious inconsistency No serious indirectness No serious imprecision None to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised Serious ¹ No serious No serious No serious None	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Visiting to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials No serious inconsistency No serious indirectness imprecision None (98.8%) to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised Serious No serious No serious No serious None (151/169)	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Visiting Control (2-year follow-up) to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials No serious inconsistency indirectness imprecision None 167/169 (98.8%) (97.2%) to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised Serious No serious No serious No serious None 151/169 158/176	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Home visiting Vear follow-up) Relative (95% CI) to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials No serious inconsistency No serious indirectness No serious imprecision None (98.8%) (97.2%) RR 1.02 (0.99 to 1.05) to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised Serious No serious	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Plane visiting User follow-up (95% CI) Absolute to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials Serious Inconsistency Indirectness Inconsistency Indirectness Indi	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Cother considerations Visiting Vi	

¹ Unclear risk of bias across 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).

N.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 ass	essment			No. o	f patients		Effect		
Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Home visiting	Control (7- year follow- up)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
to have exter	nalising b	ehaviour (follow-u	ıp mean 3 years;	assessed with:	CBCL)						
Randomised trials					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	IMPORTANT
to have inter	nalising b	ehaviour (follow-u	p mean 3 years;	assessed with:	CBCL)						
Randomised trials					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)		IMPORTANT
F t	to have external control contr	to have externalising bear andomised rials to have internalising bear andomised Serious 1	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency to have externalising behaviour (follow-underials inconsistency) Randomised Serious No serious inconsistency to have internalising behaviour (follow-underials inconsistency)	to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; Randomised rials No serious inconsistency indirectness No serious indirectness to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; Randomised Serious No serious No serious	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: Randomised rials Serious¹ No serious inconsistency No serious indirectness imprecision to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: Randomised Serious¹ No serious No serious	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials No serious inconsistency No serious indirectness No serious imprecision None to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised Serious ¹ No serious No serious No serious None	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Home visiting to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) No serious inconsistency No serious indirectness None 133/138 (96.4%) to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) No serious No serious No serious No serious None 129/138	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Visiting Vear follow-up) to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials Serious¹ No serious inconsistency indirectness imprecision None 133/138 (96.4%) (92.1%) to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised Serious¹ No serious No serious No serious None 129/138 148/165	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Figure 17 (95% CI) to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials Serious No serious inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision None 133/138 (96.4%) (92.1%) (0.99 to 1.11) to have internalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised Serious No serious No serious No serious No serious None 129/138 148/165 RR 1.04	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Visiting Visi	Design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other considerations Visiting Very follow-up) to have externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 years; assessed with: CBCL) Randomised rials Serious No serious inconsistency No serious indirectness indirectness No serious indirectness indirectness imprecision No serious indirectness indirectness imprecision No serious indirectness imprecision No serious indirectness imprecision No serious indirectness imprecision No serious No serious imprecision No serious No ser

¹ Unclear risk of bias across several domains.

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

			Quality asse	ssment			No. of patient	s		Effect				
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent–child psychotherapy	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance		
Secure att	Secure attachment (follow-up mean 1 year; measured with: Global Relationship Expectation Scale; better indicated by lower values)													
	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	CRITICAL		

Child ou	tcomes: Secure	attachme	nt (follow-up mea	n 1 year; assesse	ed with: SSP)							_
	Randomised trials	Very serious ³	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	11/28 (39.3%)	53/54 (98.1%)		589 fewer per 1000 (from 353 fewer to 736 fewer)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Child ou	tcomes: Insecu	re attachm	nent (assessed wit	h: SSP)								
	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	CRITICAL
hild ou	tcomes: Disorg	anised atta	achment (follow-u	p mean 1 year; a	ssessed with:	SSP)						
	Randomised trials	Very serious³	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	9/28 (32.1%)	42/54 (77.8%)		459 fewer per 1000 (from 218 fewer to 591 fewer)		CRITICAL
Maternal	maladaptive re	presentati	ons (follow-up me	ean 1 year; meas	ured with: cod	ling manuals; bett	er indicated by lowe	r values				1
l	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	IMPORTAN

Unclear randomisation and allocation concealment.
 Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb).
 Serious 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). ⁵ Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb).

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

			Quality asse	essment			No. of pa	tients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent-child psychotherapy	Control (12- month follow- up)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Child out	comes: Secure	attachm	ent (follow-up me	an 1 year; asses	sed with: SSI	P)						
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
Child out	comes: less lil	kely to hav	ve insecure attach	ment (follow-up	mean 1 year	; assessed with: S	SSP)					•
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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Child outo	comes: Disorg	janised at	tachment (follow-	up mean 1 year;	assessed wi	th: SSP)						
	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	CRITICAL

¹ Serious attrition bias.

Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb).
 S5% 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).

N.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 asse	essment			No. of patier	nts		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent–child psychotherapy	Home visiting	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Secure at	tachment (follo	ow-up 1 ye	ar; assessed with	: SSP)				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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Secure at	tachment (follo	ow-up 1 ye	ear; measured with	n: Global Relation	nship Expect	ation Scale; better	indicated by lower	values)				
	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	CRITICAL
Less likel	y to have an in	secure att	achment (follow-u	ıp mean 1 year; a	assessed witl	n: SSP)						
	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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Disorgani	sed attachmer	nt (follow-u	up mean 1 year; as	ssessed with: SS	6P)							
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	CRITICAL
Parent ou	tcomes: Mater	nal malad	aptive representa	tions (follow-up ı	mean 1 year;	measured with: co	oding manuals; bette	er indicated	d by lower val	ues)	1	
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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

N.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 asse	essment			No. of pa	atients		Effect			
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	Quality	Importance	
Secure at	tachment (foll	ow-up me	an 1 year; assess	ed with: SSP)				<u>, </u>					
		Very serious ¹		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)		CRITICAL	
Less likely to have an insecure attachment (follow-up mean 1 year; assessed with: SSP)													
		Very serious ³			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	CRITICAL	
Disorgani	sed attachme	nt (follow-	-up mean 1 year; a	assessed with: S	SSP)								
		Very serious ³		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 Serious risk of bias.

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).

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).

N.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

	marti oato											
			Quality ass	sessment			No. of patients			Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parent sensitivity and behavioural training	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Parent ou values)	itcomes: sensi	itivity and	responsiveness (follow-up 2–6 m	onths; measure	d with: positive pa	rent behaviour, parent	ing shills	s observation	n scale, EAS; better in	dicated b	y lower
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	CRITICAL
Parent ou	tcomes: nega	tive paren	ting behaviour (fo	llow-up mean 6	months; measu	red with: Dyadic P	arent-child Interaction	Coding	System-II; b	etter indicated by lowe	er 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	IMPORTANT
Parent att	titudes: negati	ve parenti	ng attitudes (follo	w-up mean 6 mc	onths; measured	with: Child Abus	e Potential Inventory; b	etter ind	licated by lo	wer 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	IMPORTANT
Child out	comes: interna	alising bel	naviour (follow-up	mean 6 months	; measured with	: CBCL, Behaviou	ır Assessment System	for Child	ren; better i	ndicated by lower valu	ies)	
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	IMPORTANT
Child out	comes: extern	alising be	haviour (measure	d with: CBCL, Be	ehaviour Assess	sment System for	Children; better indicat	ed by lo	wer 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	IMPORTANT

Maltreat	ment outcomes	: re-report	t of physical abus	e (follow-up 6 m	onths)					
1	Randomised trials	- ,		No serious indirectness	Serious ⁵	None	8/42 (19%)	RR 0.39 (0.19 to 0.8)	296 fewer per 1000 (from 97 fewer to 393 fewer)	IMPORTANT

¹ Risk of bias in several domains across studies.

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

			Quality asse	ssment			No. of pa	tients		Effect				
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Video feedback	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance		
Sensitivity	ensitivity/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	CRITICAL		
Secure att	Secure attachment (follow-up 2–3 months; assessed with: SSP)													
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	CRITICAL		
Insecure a	ttachment (foll	ow-up 2–3	months; assessed	with: SSP)										
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	CRITICAL		
Disorganis	sed attachment	(follow-up	mean 2-3 months	; assessed with: S	SSP)									

Risk of bias in Several domains across statios.
 Heterogeneity 50%.
 Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb).
 High attrition bias.
 Total number of events is less than 300 (a threshold rule-of-thumb).

2	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Serious⁴	None	26/95 (27.4%)	52/92 (56.5%) 56.5%	RR 0.49 (0.33 to 0.73)	288 fewer per 1000 (from 153 fewer to 379 fewer) 288 fewer per 1000 (from 153 fewer to 379 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Externalis	ing behaviour (follow-up	mean 2-3 months; ı	measured with: C	BCL; better ir	ndicated by lower v	/alues)			•		
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{2,3}	None	35	32	-	SMD 0.03 higher (0.45 lower to 0.51 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Internalisi	ng behaviour (f	ollow-up n	nean 2-3 months; n	neasured with: CE	BCL; better in	dicated by lower v	alues)					
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{2,3}	None	35	32	-	SMD 0.12 lower (0.6 lower to 0.36 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

¹ Unclear risk of bias across several domains.

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

			Quality asse	ssment				No. of patients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	СВТ	Parent–child psychotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Parental ou	ıtcomes: Sens	itivity/resp	onsiveness (follow	-up mean 3 month	ns; measured	with: PSQ; better i	ndica	ted by lower values)				
	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	88	91	-	SMD 0.32 higher (0.02 to 0.61 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

² Total population size is less than 400 (a threshold rule-of-thumb).
³ 95% Cl 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).

1	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	88	91	-	SMD 0.42 lower (0.71 to 0.12 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Child outco	omes: external	ising beha	viour (follow-up me	an 3 months; mea	sured with: C	BCL; better indica	ted b	y lower values)				
1	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{2,3}	None	88	91	-	SMD 0.29 lower (0.58 lower to 0.01 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

¹ Unclear risk of bias in several domains.

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 N.3.11

			omig manaca									
			Quality asse	ssment				No. of patients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	СВТ	Parent-child psychotherapy (6-month follow-up)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Parental o	arental outcomes: parenting practices (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: PSQ; better indicated by lower values)											
	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{2,3}	None	76	67	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.25 lower to 0.4 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Child outo	omes: Internal	ising beh	aviour (follow-up n	nean 3 months; n	neasured with	n: CBCL; better inc	licate	ed by lower values)				
	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{2,3}	None	75	67	-	SMD 0.11 lower (0.43 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Child outo	Child outcomes: externalising behaviour (follow-up mean 3 months; measured with: CBCL; better indicated by lower values)											
	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{2,3}	None	75	67	-	SMD 0.09 lower (0.42 lower to 0.24 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

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).

N.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 asse	ssment				No. of patients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	СВТ	Parent–child psychotherapy (12-month follow-up)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Parental c	outcomes: pare	enting prac	ctices (follow-up m	ean 3 months; m	neasured with	: PSQ; better indi	ated	by lower values)				
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹			Very serious ^{2,3}	None	79	69	-	SMD 0.1 lower (0.42 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Child outo	comes: Interna	lising beh	aviour (follow-up n	nean 3 months; r	measured witl	h: CBCL; better in	dicate	ed by lower values)				
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹			Very serious ^{2,3}	None	78	68	-	SMD 0.3 lower (0.63 lower to 0.02 higher)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Child outo	comes: externa	alising beh	aviour (follow-up ı	mean 3 months;	measured wit	h: child behaviour	ched	cklist; better indicated by lowe	er values)		
1	Randomised trials	Serious ¹			Very serious ^{2,3}	None	78	68	-	SMD 0.12 higher (0.21 lower to 0.44 higher)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

¹ Unclear risk of bias across several domains.

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).

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).

N.4 Interventions for children in care

N.4.1 Full GRADE profile for the effects of parental education and training intervention for carers of children in care

			Quality asses	ssment			No. of patients			Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parental education training and support	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Reactive a	ttachment disc	order – prir	mary school (follow	-up mean 3 days;	better indic	ated by lower value	es)					
1	Randomised trials		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 a	ttachment disc	order – foll	ow-up – primary sc	hool (follow-up m	ean 9 month	ns; better indicated	by lower values)					
1	Randomised trials		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 pi	oblems –	follow-up – primary	school (follow-u	p mean 9 mc	onths; better indica	ted by lower values)	•				
1	Randomised trials		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 we	ll-being – follo	w-up – prir	mary school (follow	-up mean 9 mont	hs; better in	dicated by higher v	values)					
1	Randomised trials		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 1 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.

N.4.2 Full GRADE profile for the effects of video feedback intervention for carers of children in care

	<u>.</u>		enecis or via									
			Quality assessr	ment			No. of pa	tients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Video feedback	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Secure att	achment (follow	w-up 4–10 week	s; 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 att	achment - pres	school (follow-u	p mean 10 weeks;	better indicated b	y higher valu	ues)					_	
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 att	achment – prin	nary school (fol	low-up mean 1 mor	nth; better indicat	ed 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	– preschool (f	ollow-up 1–2.5	months; better indi	cated by higher v	alues)							
3	Randomised trials	Serious ⁶	Serious ⁷	No serious indirectness	Serious ⁵	None	154	165	-	SMD 0.33 higher (0.11 to 0.55 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Attachmer	nt problems – p	rimary school (follow-up mean 1 n	nonth; better indi	cated by low	er values)						
1	Randomised trials	No serious risk of bias ³	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious⁵	None	22	24	-	SMD 0.67 lower (1.26 to 0.07 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Parenting	stress/mental v	well-being – pre	school (follow-up n	nean 10 weeks; b	etter indicate	ed by higher values	s)		•		•	
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 a	ttitude/knowled	lge/behaviour –	preschool (follow-	up 2.5–6 months;	better indica	ated by higher valu	es)					
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 at	tachment – folle	ow-up – presch	ool (follow-up mear	n 6 months; better	indicated by	y 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	CRITICAL		
Sensitivity	y – follow-up –	preschool (follo	ow-up 6–12 months	better indicated	by higher va	lues)								
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	arenting stress/mental well-being – follow-up – preschool (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/knowle	edge/behaviou	- follow-up – prese	chool (follow-up n	nean 6 montl	ns; better indicated	by higher va	alues)						
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	IMPORTANT		
Emotiona	l/Behavioural p	roblems – follo	w-up – preschool (f	ollow-up mean 9	months; bett	er indicated by low	er 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 2009 was triple blinded, but in Speiker 2012 only assessors were blinded.

² For continuous outcomes, the OIS (that is, a total number of 400 participants) was not met.

³ Study was triple blinded.

⁴ Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Assessors were blinded, but it was unclear whether investigators or participants were blinded.

⁵ The 95% CI crossed 1 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 2013; whilst in Groeneveld 2011 and Spieker 2012 the assessors were blinded, but it was unclear if anyone else was blinded.

⁷ Heterogeneity was detected, l^2 >50%.

⁸ Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Assessors were blinded in Spieker 2012 but not in Bick 2013 and it was unclear if investigators or participants were blinded.

⁹ Heterogeneity was detected, $l^2 > 80\%$.

¹⁰ Unclear if allocation concealment was performed. Investigators were blinded, but it was unclear if assessors or participants were blinded.

Full GRADE profile for the effects of multicomponent foster care treatment on carers of children in care

			Quality asses	sment			No. of patients			Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Multicomponent foster care treatment	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Secure at	tachment – pr	eschool (fol	low-up mean 12 n	nonths)								
			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 atta	achment prob	lems – preso	chool (follow-up n	nean 12 months)							
			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. Investigators and assessors were blinded, but it was unclear if participants were blinded. ² The 95% CI crossed 1 MID (0.75 or 1.25).

N.4.4 Full GRADE profile for the effects of parental sensitivity and behavioural training for carers of children in care

	•		Quality asses	ssment			No. of patients			Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Parental sensitivity and behavioural training	Usual Care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Attachmei	nt (follow-up m	ean 12 we	eks; better indicat	ed by higher valu	ıes)							
1	Randomised trials		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			No serious indirectness	Serious ³	None	34	29	-	SMD 0.03 lower (0.53 lower to 0.47 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

Parenting	attitude/knowl	edge/beha	viour (follow-up r	nean 12 weeks; b	etter indicate	ed by lower values)						
	Randomised trials		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 beha	avioural proble	ems (follov	v-up mean 12 wee	ks; better indicate	ed by lower v	values)							
	Randomised trials		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	Quality of life (follow-up mean 12 weeks; better indicated by higher values)												
	Randomised trials		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 nor assessors were blinded. ² They used an unvalidated tool to measure attachment. ³ The 95% CI crossed 1 MID for continuous variable (-0.5 to 0.5).

N.4.5 Full GRADE profile for the effects of foster care (with support) versus Institutionalised children

			Quality asse	ssment			No. of patients			Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Foster care and parent education/support	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Secure at	tachment – pre	eschool (f	ollow-up 13–36 m	onths)								
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
Attachme	nt problem – p	reschool	(follow-up 13–36 ı	months)				•			•	
1	Randomised trials	Serious¹		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 a	eactive attachment disorder – preschool (follow-up 11-36 months; better indicated by lower values)													
	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Serious ⁴	None	68	68	•	SMD 0.71 lower (1.06 to 0.36 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Reactive a	attachment dis	sorder – p	rimary school (fol	low-up 5.5-7.5 ye	ears; better i	ndicated by lower	values)							
	Randomised trials	Serious ¹		No serious indirectness	Serious ⁴	None	68	68	-	SMD 0.54 lower (0.88 to 0.19 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Social ski	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	Serious⁵	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 OIS (that is, a total number of 300 events) was not met.

³ The 95% CI crossed 1 MID (0.75 or 1.25).

N.4.6 Full GRADE profile for the effects of parental education, training and support for carers (the following studies only reported placement disruption as a critical outcome [no attachment measures])

piacon	one alora	ption a	o a orreioar o	atoonic [iic	attaomine	it illeasures	//					
			Quality as:	sessment	No. of patients			Effect				
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Foster carer training	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Placemen	t disruptions (f	ollow-up 1	1–9 months)									
3	randomised trials	Serious ¹	Serious ²		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
Placemen	Placement disruptions – primary school (follow-up 1–9 months)											
2	randomised trials	Serious ¹	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ³	None	5/102 (4.9%)	14/88 (15.9%)		21 more per 1000 (from 3 more to 40 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

 ⁴ The 95% CI for continuous outcomes crossed 1 MID (-0.5 or 0.5).
 ⁵ For continuous outcomes, the OIS (that is, a total of 400 participants) was not met.

acemen	t disruptions –	primary -	- secondary schoo 	ol (follow-up mea	in 3 months)			I							
	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			
acemen	t disruption – p	orimary so	hool (follow-up m	ean 9 months)											
	Randomised trials	Serious ⁴	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ⁵	None	-	-	Not estimable	-	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL			
sitive e	sitive exits from care – primary school (follow-up mean 4 months)														
	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			
gative e	exits from care	(inverted)) – primary schoo	l (follow-up mear	n 4 months)										
	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			
change	e in placement	– primary	school (follow-up	mean 4 months	;)										
	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			
cemen	t disruptions –	secondar	y school (follow-u	up mean 12 mont	hs; better indicat	ted by lower values)								
	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			
ality of	parenting (foll	ow-up 1–3	3 months; better in	ndicated by lowe	r values)										
	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	IMPORTAN			
ality of	parenting – pr	imary sch	ool (follow-up me	an 5 weeks; bette	er indicated by lo	wer values)									
	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	IMPORTAN			
uality of		imary to s			3 months; better	indicated by lower	values)			··· ····g···-·,					

	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	IMPORTAN			
elinque	ncy – secondar	y school (follow-up mean 30	6 months; better	indicated by low	er values)									
	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	IMPORTAN			
nternalis	rnalising/externalising symptoms – primary school (follow-up mean 5 weeks; better indicated by lower values)														
	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	IMPORTAN			
nternalis	rernalising/externalising symptoms – primary to secondary school (follow-up mean 3 months; better indicated by lower values)														
	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	IMPORTAN			
nternalis	ing/externalisir	ng sympto	ms secondary scl	nool (follow-up 1	2–24 months; be	tter indicated by lo	wer values)								
	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	IMPORTAN			
ewer pla	cement disrup	tions – fol	low-up primary so	thool											
	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 unlikely that participants and investigators were blind.
2 Heterogeneity was detected, *β* >50%.
3 For dichotomous outcomes, the OIS (that is, a total number of 300 events) was not met.
4 Adequate randomisation, but unclear whether allocation concealment was performed. Participants and investigator were unlikely to be blinded.
5 The 95% CI crossed 1 MID (0.75 or 1.25).
6 Unclear randomisation methods and whether allocation concealment was performed. Participants and investigator were unlikely to be blinded.

⁷ The 95% CI crossed 1 MID (-0.5 to 0.5).

⁸ For continuous outcomes, the OIS (that is, a total of 400 participants) was not met.

N.5 Interventions for children who have been adopted

N.5.1 Full GRADE table for video feedback interventions for adopted children

un Oit	ADL table	TOI VIG	eo leeuback	intervent	10113 101	adopted citi	aren							
			Quality assessn	nent			No. of par	tients		Effect		/ Importance		
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Video feedback	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality			
Secure atta	ecure attachment – preschool (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 se	ensitivity – pres	school (foll	ow-up mean 6 mon	ths; better inc	dicated by hi	gher 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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL		
Less likely	to have disorg	anised atta	chment - preschoo	l (follow-up n	nean 6 mont	hs)		<u>'</u>						
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	CRITICAL		
Parental be	haviour – pres	chool (follo	ow-up mean 6 mont	hs; better ind	licated by lov	wer 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	IMPORTANT		
Behavioura	al functioning -	preschoo	(follow-up mean 6	months; bette	er 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	IMPORTAN		

¹ Unclear methods for randomisation and unclear whether allocation concealment was performed. Participants and assessor were, however, blinded.

² Children in the UK are rarely adopted during infancy – the mean age is 3 years 8 months.

³ 95% CI crossed 1 MID (0.75 or 1.25).

N.5.2 Full GRADE profile for parental sensitivity and behaviour training for adoptive parents

	<u> </u>	с. р				ii tiaiiiiig io	шаорито	pa. c.	1			
			Quality asses	ssment			No. of pati	ents		Effect		Importance
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Sensitivity Training	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	
Secure att	achment – pre	school (fol	low-up mean 6 mo	nths)								
	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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Maternal s	ensitivity – pre	school (fo	ollow-up mean 6 mc	onths; better indic	ated by high	ner 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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Less likely	to have disor	ganised at	tachment - presch	ool (follow-up me	an 6 months)		1				
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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Parental b	ehaviour – pre	school (fol	llow-up mean 6 mo	nths; better indic	ated by lowe	r 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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Behaviour	al/Emotional p	roblems- F	Preschool (follow-u	p 6 months; bette	er indicated b	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)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

⁴ 95% CI crossed 1 MID (-0.5 or 0.5).

⁵ Unclear methods for randomisation and unclear whether allocation concealment was performed. Participants and assessor were, however, blinded. Also added an additional group from another RCT.

Empathy (Empathy (follow-up mean 10 weeks; better indicated by lower values)													
	Randomised trials		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	Total Child Behaviour Check List (follow-up mean 10 weeks; better indicated by lower values)													
	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Serious ⁷	None	32	29	-	SMD 1.67 lower (2.28 to 1.07 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT		

N.5.3 Full GRADE profile for parental education, training and support for adoptive parents.

			Quality assessm	nent			No. of patients		Effect				
No. of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision		Education training	Usual care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance	
Improveme	mprovement in attachment (>50%) – primary school (follow-up mean 2.5 months)												
	Randomised trials		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	
Behavioura	al/Emotional pro	oblems- Pri	imary school (follow	/-up mean 2.5	months; be	tter indicated by lo	wer values)					
1	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	Serious ²	Serious ⁴	None	19	18	<u>-</u>	SMD 0.03 higher (0.62 lower to 0.67 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	IMPORTANT	
Placement	lacement problems – primary school (follow-up mean 2.5 months; better indicated by lower values)												

Children in the UK are rarely adopted during infancy, the mean age is 3 years 8 months.
 The 95% CI crossed 1 MID (0.75 or 1.25).
 Unclear methods for randomisation and unclear whether allocation concealment was performed. Participants and assessor were blinded.

⁴ The 95% CI crossed 1 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 waitlist

⁷ Study did not include the optimal study size of n=400 participants for a continuous outcome.

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 – prin	nary schoo	ol (follow-up mean 2.	5 months; be	etter indicate	ed 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 behavioura	al problems	s – follow-up – prima	ary school (fo	ollow-up mea	an 6 months; better	indicated b	y lower v	alues)			
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 – follo	ow-up – pri	mary school (follow	-up mean 6 n	nonths; bette	er indicated by lowe	er 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 – fol	low-up – pi	imary school (follow	v-up mean 6	months; bet	ter indicated by low	er 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 2 different intervention groups. The results could not be separated.

³ The 95% CI crossed 1 MID (0.75 or 1.25).

⁴ The 95% CI crossed 1 MID (-0.5 or 0.5).