

Grade tables

Parent Management Training Oregon (PMTO) vs Care as Usual (CAU)

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Placement instability rate over 6-month observation: assessed using administrative data (annualised placement rate = (number of placements/days in foster care)*365)								
1 (Akin 2015)	Parallel RCT	121	MD -0.30 (-0.60 to -0.00)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Serious ³	Very low
Number of placement breakdowns over 4-month follow up: unclear how assessed								
1 (Maaskant 2017)	Parallel RCT	88	OR 0.52 (0.09 to 3.06)	Very Serious ⁴	N/A	Serious ⁵	Very Serious ⁶	Very low
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Downgrade two levels due to very serious risk of bias. Subjects were aware of their assignment group prior to agreeing to study participation. Few baseline characteristics reported. Some differences but unclear if significant. 1:1 Randomisation resulted in considerably more in the intervention group. Unclear if there were deviations from assigned intervention, this is likely since more participants were assigned to the intervention group than control group despite 1:1 randomisation (in order to fill PMTO case load). Though missing data did occur, this study is not clear how much data was missing and proportion between groups. Low risk for placement stability that was determined using administration data. Information on conduct of trial was insufficient and there was no protocol cited. 2. Downgrade one level for serious indirectness since study was based in USA. 3. Downgrade one level for serious imprecision since estimate of effect crossed 1 line of MID (defined as 0.5*SD in the control group = 0.4). 4. Downgrade two levels due to very serious risk of bias. In the intervention arm, 5 participants dropped out because they wished for 'other kind of help'. There was also 'no need for help' in 7 instances. These reasons were not evident in the control arm. Also, the number of participants dropping out in the intervention arm was greater. The number of participants who dropped out in the intervention arm is relatively large 								

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
(approximately 1/3). Foster parents from the control group were free to ask for more intensive or specialised support, including every available form of treatment or intervention except PMTO. It's not clear that participants in the intervention arm had this too. Investigators who collected data were not blinded.).								
5. Downgrade one level for serious indirectness since study was based in Netherlands.								
6. Downgrade two levels for very serious imprecision since estimate of effect crossed two lines of MID (defined as OR 0.8 and 1.25).								

Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care for preschoolers (MTFC-P) vs CAU

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Time to placement disruption over 12 months: placement disruption defined as exiting the current placement for a negative reason e.g. removal deemed in the best interest of the child/requested by the caregiver (not including nonnegative reasons for placement disruptions e.g. changing circumstances in the home unrelated to child behaviour, clinical transitions, permanent foster placements, adoptions, and biological family reunifications- placement records from child welfare system)								
1 (Fisher 2011)	Parallel RCT	137	MD -0.63 (-1.85 to 0.59)	Not Serious	N/A	Serious ¹	Serious ²	Low
Number of children who experienced placement disruption over 12 months: placement disruption assessed as above								
1 (Fisher 2011)	Parallel RCT	137	OR 0.53 (0.18 to 1.61)	Not Serious	N/A	Serious ¹	Very Serious ³	Very Low
Number of placement disruptions over 12 months: placement disruption assessed as above								
1 (Fisher 2011)	Parallel RCT	137	MD 0.00 (-0.11 to 0.11)	Not Serious	N/A	Serious ¹	Not Serious	Moderate

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
----------------	--------------	-------------	----------------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	-------------	---------

1. Downgrade one level for serious indirectness since study was based in USA.
2. Downgrade 1 level for serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 1 line of MID (defined as $0.5 \times SD$ in the control group = 1.32)
3. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 2 lines of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios)

Multi-dimensional Treatment Foster Care for adolescents (MTFC-A) vs CAU

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
----------------	--------------	-------------	----------------------	--------------	---------------	--------------	-------------	---------

Number of out-of-home placements at 1-year follow up: assessed using data from social case record (changes in out-of-home placement e.g., foster home or residential care)

1 (Bergstrom 2016)	Parallel RCT	46	MD -0.10 (-0.54 to 0.34)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Serious ³	Very low
--------------------	--------------	----	--------------------------	---------------------------	-----	----------------------	----------------------	----------

Number of out-of-home placements at 3-years follow up: change in out-of-home placement assessed as above

1 (Bergstrom 2016)	Parallel RCT	46	MD -0.30 (-1.64 to 1.04)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Serious ⁴	Very low
--------------------	--------------	----	--------------------------	---------------------------	-----	----------------------	----------------------	----------

Negative treatment exit at 1-year follow up: assessed using data from social case record (placement breakdown or exiting a minor treatment facility to enter a more secure one e.g. leaving foster care and entering institutional care)

1 (Bergstrom 2016)	Parallel RCT	46	OR 0.24 (0.04 to 1.25)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Serious ⁵	Very low
--------------------	--------------	----	------------------------	---------------------------	-----	----------------------	----------------------	----------

Negative treatment exit at 3-years follow up: negative treatment exit assessed as above

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
1 (Bergstrom 2016)	Parallel RCT	46	OR 0.78 (0.24 to 2.56)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Very Serious ⁶	Very low
<p>1. Unclear if allocation concealment. the MTFC group had significantly more families with an immigrant background. Few baseline characteristics reported other than those on which randomisation was performed. No information provided about whether there were deviations from treatment, or whether intent-to-treat analysis was used. Unclear if missing outcome data, approach to missing outcome data and whether missing data varied between comparison groups. Unclear information about the conduct of trial and no protocol cited. Participants were juveniles at risk for immediate out-of-home placement (awaiting placement in out of home care). However, all but one participants (treatment/control group) were in out of home care during the course of the study.</p> <p>2. Downgrade one level for serious indirectness since study was based in Sweden.</p> <p>3. Downgrade one level for serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 1 line of MID (defined as 0.5*SD in the control group = 0.5)</p> <p>4. Downgrade one level for serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 1 line of MID (defined as 0.5*SD in the control group = 1.2)</p> <p>5. Downgrade 1 levels for serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed one line of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios)</p> <p>6. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 2 lines of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios)</p>								

Family Group Decision Making (FGDM) vs CAU

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Mean number of placement moves over 5-year observation period: assessed using administrative records (mean number of placement moves)								
1 (Berzin 2008)	Parallel RCT	50	MD -0.01 (-0.84 to 0.82)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Very Serious ³	Very low
<p>1. Downgrade two levels for very serious risk of bias: No information with regards to the randomization method. No information with regards to the baseline characteristics comparisons for each arm of the 2 studies. Allocation concealment was not possible.</p> <p>2. Downgrade one levels for serious indirectness since study was based in USA</p>								

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
3. Downgrade two levels for very serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed two lines of MID (defined as $0.5 \times \text{SD}$ in the control group = 0.76)								

Middle School Success (MSS) vs CAU

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Number of placement changes over 36 months: assessed using child welfare system record (any placement disruptions)								
1 (Kim 2011/Kim 2013)	Parallel RCT	100	MD -0.43 (-0.94 to 0.08)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Serious ³	Very low
<p>1. Downgrade two levels for very serious risk of bias: unclear if allocation concealment; approximately 10% loss to follow up by 2 years; analysis of outcomes at various time points appeared to be decided post-hoc; results (apart from results for substance use and delinquency) appear to have been selected on the basis of results across multiple time points.</p> <p>2. Downgrade one level for serious indirectness since study was based in USA.</p> <p>3. Downgrade one level for serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 1 line of MID (defined as $0.5 \times \text{SD}$ in the control group = 0.6)</p>								

Family Finding Intervention (FFI) vs CAU

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Number of placement breakdowns over 3 year observation period: placement disruptions assessed using case records and administrated data								
1 (Landsman 2014/Boel-studt 2017)	Parallel RCT	243	MD -0.08 (-0.67 to 0.51)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Not Serious	Very low
<p>1. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious risk of bias: No details of the randomization method. There are slight differences in gender between the arms. No allocation concealment. No blinding. Although randomization was prospective, data collection was retrospective via records. Some of the outcomes are subjective.</p> <p>2. USA-based study, mark down once for indirectness</p>								

CBT-informed Parent Training Programme (CBT-PTP) vs CAU

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Number of unplanned placement breakdowns over 6 months: caregiver-reported number of unplanned breakdowns								
1 (Macdonald 2005)	Parallel RCT	89	OR 0.80 (0.19 to 3.42)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Not Serious ²	Very Serious ³	Very low
<p>1. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious risk of bias: Baseline characteristics not compared between study groups, however there were considerable differences between the numbers assigned to either group after randomisation (50 vs 67). No information was reported about adherence to the interventions or whether a per-protocol approach was used for analysis. >10% of missing data for placement breakdown outcome. Intervention group almost twice the missing data of the control group. Unclear reasons for missing data. Unclear research protocol in study, and no protocol cited.</p>								

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
2. UK-based 3. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 2 lines of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios)								

Promoting First Relationships (PFR) vs Early Education Support (EES)

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Placement stability at 2 years: assessed using child welfare administrative database (remained with the study caregiver with no temporary intermediate moves)								
1 (Pasalich 2016/Spieker 2014)	Parallel RCT	210	OR 1.19 (0.63 to 2.27) ¹	Very Serious ²	N/A	Serious ³	Very Serious ⁴	Very low
1. Adjusted for foster/kin placement, age of child, months in child welfare, number of prior placements, multiple removals, foster carer commitment. 2. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious risk of bias: Unclear if allocation concealment. participants in PFR were more likely to have been removed from birthparents home more than once. Fidelity outcomes reported and appears to be modified intention to treat analysis. A significant proportion of attrition was as a result of change in caregiver which could be directly related to child outcomes. However, the proportion of attrition was similar between groups. Particularly large loss to follow up. 3. Downgrade 1 level for serious indirectness since study was based in USA 4. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 2 lines of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios)								

KEEP foster parent training (KEEP) vs Training As Usual (TAU)

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Negative exits from care over 6.5 months: foster-parent reported negative reasons for the child's exit from the home e.g. moved to another foster placement, a more restrictive placement, or child runaways								
1 (Price 2008)	Parallel RCT	700	OR 0.83 (0.54 to 1.29) ¹	Very Serious ²	N/A	Serious ³	Very Serious ⁴	Very low
Number experiencing no change over 6.5 months: foster parent reported no change in placement								
1 (Price 2008)	Parallel RCT	700	OR 0.73 (0.52 to 1.03) ¹	Very Serious ²	N/A	Serious ³	Serious	Very low

- Odds ratios were estimated from reported percentages for these outcomes (unclear amount of missing data)
- Downgrade 2 levels for very serious risk of bias: unclear how randomisation was performed and whether allocation was concealed. Children in the intervention group were more likely to be Spanish-speaking than control group children, but no further differences were found between groups for age, type of care, gender, or ethnicity; Unclear if significant deviations between intervention groups. Of the 700 parents who completed the baseline interview, 81% (n = 564) provided data at termination. Comparisons of missing and non-missing cases on baseline measures showed a significant difference in foster parents' proportion positive reinforcement, $t(696) = -2.95$, $p = .003$; cases with missing data at termination were higher on this variable at baseline. There were no significant differences between the intervention group and the control group on attrition and missing data rates. many aspects of the trial protocol and methods are unclear such as: method of randomisation, allocation concealment, drop out, number who successfully completed placements, whether intent to treat analysis was used, and whether assessors of the outcomes were aware of the intervention group.
- Downgrade 1 level for serious indirectness since study was based in USA
- Downgrade 2 levels for very serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 2 lines of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios)
- Downgrade 1 levels for serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 1 lines of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios)

Fostering Healthy Futures (FHF) vs CAU

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Incidence of placement change over 18-month observation period: assessed using administrative records (change in placement)								
1 (Taussig 2012)	Randomised Controlled Trial	156	OR 0.68 (0.40 to 1.16) ¹	Serious ²	N/A	Serious ³	Serious ⁴	Very low
Negative placement change over 18-month observation period: assessed using administrative records (new placement in a residential treatment centre)								
1 (Taussig 2012)	Randomised Controlled Trial	156	OR 0.29 (95%CI 0.09 to 0.98) ⁵	Serious ²	N/A	Serious ³	Serious ⁴	Very low
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Adjusted for number of foster care placements before the intervention, whether a child had been placed in a RTC before the intervention, type of baseline placement, and baseline externalizing behaviour problems. Downgrade 1 level for serious risk of bias: There was no blinding. However, the outcomes are not particularly subjective. Insufficient information to say that the trial was analysed in accordance with a pre-specified plan. Downgrade 1 level for serious indirectness since study was based in USA Downgrade 1 level for serious imprecision since estimate of effect crossed 1 line of MID (defined as 0.5*SD in the control group) Adjusted for number of foster care placements before the intervention, whether a child had been placed in a RTC before the intervention, type of baseline placement, and baseline externalizing behaviour problems. 								

Social Learning Theory-based Training (SLT) vs CAU

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Breakdown in placement over 3 months: foster-carer reported temporary (e.g. short stay at child psychiatric unit) or permanent (move to other care) breakdown over follow up)								
1 (Van Hoen 2017)	Randomised controlled trial	63	OR 0.52 (0.09 to 3.06)	Very Serious ¹	N/A	Serious ²	Very Serious ³	Very low
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious risk of bias: No baseline characteristics of both arms to assess the success of randomisation. No blinding. Outcomes were measured by foster parents. This could lead to bias particularly since they were likely aware of the interventions. 2. Downgrade 1 level for serious indirectness since study was based in Belgium 3. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 2 lines of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios) 								

Non-Violent Resistance training vs treatment as usual

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
Breakdown in placement over 3 months: foster-carer reported (unclear how defined)								
1 (Van Hoen 2018)	Randomised controlled trial	62	OR 0.77 [0.19, 3.19]	No concerns	N/A	Serious ¹	Very Serious ²	Very low
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Downgrade 1 level for serious indirectness since study was based in Belgium 2. Downgrade 2 levels for very serious imprecision since confidence intervals crossed 2 lines of MID (defined as 0.8 and 1.25 for odds ratios) 								