

Outcome - safely reduce the need for care entry

Authors	Year of publication	Name of intervention	Country	Study Aims	Study design	Study population - Child or Young person (whole/intervention/comparison) Age (mean/range), Gender (% female), Care type, Other relevant	Study population - Family (whole/intervention/comparison) Relationship to child,	Study population - Professional Age (range/mean), Gender (% female, Organisation type, Professional role,	Study population - Other (e.g. community members) Describe, Age	Sample size (whole:intervention; control/comparison)
Intervention type - Family or child skills building										
Lenz-Rashid	2017	Generic -Supportive housing program	USA	Effectiveness/cost effectiveness	Longitudinal/cohort	Age: 9/9 months-18 years Other relevant: 71% had a history of foster or group care Care type: Supportive housing program serving homeless families	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=293 children n=150 families
Franks, Mata, Wofford, Briggs, LeBlanc, Carr & Lazarte	2013	Generic- Behavioral Parent Training	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	unknown	Relationship: Biological parent (mother or father) Age: 33.3/17-58 years(int) : 33.8 years/ 17-69 (comparison)			Intervention n=171 Comparison n=171
Biehal	2005	Generic - specialist adolescent teams	England		Quasi-experimental	Age: 88% were 12-15	Relationship: Parents (n=178)			Intervention n=144 in 6 authorities Comparison n=65 in 3 authorities
Brook, McDonald & Yan.	2012	Strengthening families program	USA	Acceptability	Mixed methods	Other relevant: Children of alcohol or drug involved parents. Care type: foster care.	Relationship: Parents Other relevant: Parents with children who have been placed in foster care and their alcohol/drug misuse is considered to be part of the case.	Not known	Not known	Intervention n=214 Comparison n=423
Hurley, Griffith, Ingram, Bolivar, Mason & Trout	2012	Intensive Family Preservation Program	USA	Effectiveness	Pre-post test	Age: 8.7yrs/ 5 - 16 Gender: 52% Other relevant: 83% had used at least one type of MH service Care type: 98% at home, 2% kinship	n/a	unknown	n/a	n=48
Intervention type - Family plus practice meeting										
Berzin, Cohen, Thomas & Dawson	2008	Family Group Decision Making	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 5.15 years Gender: 45.35% Ethnicity: White 34.65%, African American 15.65%, Hispanic 46.35%, other 6.7% Care type: Home (100% Fresno), foster care (22%), kinship (74%)				Intervention n=70 Comparison n=40
Crea, Crampton, Madden & Usher	2008	Team Decision Making	USA	Effectiveness	Mixed methods			Organisation type: Child Welfare Agencies Other relevant: number of facilitators, care entry statistics site wide		n=3 agencies
Sundell & Vinnerljung	2004	Family Group Conferencing	Sweden	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Care type: At home	Unknown		N/A	n=97 children n=67 families
Intervention type - Practice										
Hollinshead, Corwin, Maher, Merkel-Holguin, Allan & Fluke.	2017	Family Group Conferencing	USA	Effectiveness	RCT (intention-to-treat)	Age: 2.26 years (youngest child in family) Care type: at home	Relationship: Mother Age: 27.17 years Ethnicity: 37.6% White, 30.0% Hispanic, 32.4% African American		unknown	Intervention n=270 Comparison n=272
Kirk & Griffith	2008	Intensive Family Preservation Services	USA	Moderators	Longitudinal/Cohort	Age: 0-13+ years Ethnicity: 58.3% white, 36.5% black, 5.2% other Care type: Out-of-home (not specified)	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=30,060
Dagenais, Briere, Gratton & Dupont	2009	Brief and intensive family support program	Canada	Process	Mixed methods	Age: 14.7 years Other relevant: 16.8% had received services of any kind from the YPD in the 6 month period preceding their referral to the program, including 4.4% who had been placed, and 14.4% had been signalled.	Relationship: Mother, father, other Other relevant: Children were under maternal custody in 69.4% of cases and paternal custody in 12.5%	Organisation type: Youth Centre Professional role: Youth workers	n/a	n=160
Forrester, Copello, Waissbein & Pokhrel	2008	Intensive family preservation service	Wales	Effectiveness	Mixed methods	Age: 7.3 years (int) 6.1 years (comparison) Other relevant: 13% had a care order (int) ; 9% had a care order (comparison) Care type: At home	Relationship: Biological parent (mother or father) Other relevant: 39% mother only (int) 21% mother only (comparison). Substance use 61% alcohol; 17% amphetamine; 23% heroin; 10% other drug (int) ; 51% alcohol; 10% amphetamine; 34% heroin; 7% other drug (Comparison).		n/a	Intervention n=279 Comparison n=89
Veerman, de Kemp, Brink & ten	1997	Families First	The Netherlands	Acceptability	unknown	Age: 10.9 years Gender: 43% Other relevant: 78% referred for lack of parenting Care type: At home	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=320 children
Campbell	1998	Intensive Family Preservation Service	Australia	Adaptation	unknown	Care type: At home	Other relevant: info included on social security payments, housing stability, psychiatric illness, substance abuse, alcohol abuse, intellectual disability	Organisation type: Children's Services Professional role: one supervisor, two caseworkers, and an administrator.	unknown	n=152
Biehal	2005	Generic - specialist adolescent teams	England	Effectiveness/mediators	Quasi-experimental	Age: 11-16 years Gender: 45% Other relevant: Nearly three quarters past contact with social services and one quarter had been in foster or residential care Care type: At home	Other relevant: mental health poor (72%), half reported current marital conflict, 43% reported past or current domestic violence. One quarter socially isolated, 13% reported substance abuse problems. Reasons for referral info also included.		unknown	Intervention n=144 in 6 authorities Comparison n=65 in 3 authorities
Forrester, Holland, Williams & Copello.	2014	Option 2	Wales	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 9 years at time of referral (int) Gender: 30% (int) : 57% (comparison) Other relevant: Two-thirds of the families had been referred to prevent children from entering care and one third to prevent a child being placed on the Child Protection Register	Relationship: Parents or step-parents (predominately mothers (87%)) Age: 53% aged over 30 and 47% aged between 18-30 (at the time of referral). Other relevant: Families with serious child protection and	Not known	Not known	Intervention n=15 families n=46 children Comparison n=12 families n=28 children
Wells, Vanyukevych & Levesque	2015	Generic - engaging parents	USA	Mechanisms	Mixed methods	Care type: Home and Out of home care	Relationship: Mother/father	Organisation type: New Hampshire Child Welfare Agency Professional role: Staff and Supervisors Other relevant: Staff and supervisors, who provide all facets of child protection and juvenile justice casework to families. Workers represented various years of service and educational levels, with cases representative of the various demographic and geographic regions of the state.	Unknown	n=206

Barlow, Davis, McIntosh, Jarrett, Mockford & Stewart-Brown	2007	Intensive home visiting/Family Partnership Model	UK	Effectiveness/cost effectiveness	RCT	Age: Newborn Care type: Home Other relevant: Information included on disabilities, breastfeeding and hospital admissions	Relationship: Mothers Gender: 100% Other relevant: Information provided on ethnicity, employment, education, substance use, marital status and mental health	Professional role: Health Visitor Other relevant: health visitors were trained in understanding the processes of helping, skills of relating to parents effectively and methods of promoting parent-infant interaction using the Family Partnership Model	Unknown	Intervention=67 pregnant women Comparison=64 pregnant women
Prinz, Sanders, Shapiro, Whitaker & Lutzker	2009	Triple P	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 0-8 years		Age: 44.5 years Gender: 91.7% Organisations: Range Ethnicity: 57.0% European American (not Hispanic), 38.3% African American, 1.3% Hispanic, and 3.4% other Other relevant: 81% of the providers had already been engaged in parentconsultation work for at least 5 years prior to Triple P training, and 59% had over 10 years of such experience.	unknown	18 counties with population sizes of between 50,000 and 175,000 people (mean population size for intervention= 96,054; for control= 99,216); 649 service providers participated in the Triple P training programme; 8,883 and 13,560 families participated in Triple P
Intervention type - Service integration_coordination										
Stout & Holleran	2012	System of Care	USA	Implementation	Mixed methods	Care type: Juvenile correctional out-of-home placements.	Not known	Not known	Not known	n=14 court jurisdictions
Dauber, Neighbors, Dasaro, Riordan & Morgenstern	2012	Intensive case management	USA	Mechanisms/Moderators	Mixed methods	Age: 9.4/1- 18 years	Relationship: Female caregivers; 91% mothers, 5% grandmothers, 4% related or unrelated caregivers. Age: 36.3/18-54 years Gender: 100% Other relevant: DSM-IV substance dependence diagnosis, TANF eligible	Not known	Not known	n=302 mothers n=888 children
Action for Children	2013	Intensive Family Support Services	UK	Effectiveness	mixed methods					n=22 staff n=4 partner agency reps n=8 service users
Intervention type - Structure										
Kirk	2000	Intensive family preservation services	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 0-13+ years Gender: 50.42% Care type: At home	n/a	n/a	n/a	n=111,886
Gifford, Eldred, Vernerrey & Sloan	2014	Family drug treatment court	USA	Effectiveness	unknown	Gender: 47.4% (enrolled)	unknown	unknown	unknown	
Holden, O'Connell, Liao, Krivelyova, Connor, Blau & Long	2007	Title IV-E Waiver	USA	Mechanisms	RCT	Age: 12.1 /7-15 years Gender: 47% female Care type: 24.4% in home, 10.3% in foster homes, 11.5% in shelters, 24.4% in psychiatric hospitals, 13.5% in residential treatment centers, 4.5% in detention, and 4.5% in safe homes. Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, referral source, clinical symptoms, emotional and behavioural problems, history of abuse, child living arrangements, Mental health services utilization	Other relevant: History of family violence (62%), parental criminal conviction (61%), parental substance abuse (77%), and parental mental illness (63%)	Organisation type: Lead Service Agency	Unknown	Intervention: 78 children Comparison: 79 children
Worcel, Furrer, Green, Burrus & Finigan	2008	Family Treatment Drug Courts	USA	Effectiveness/Moderators	Quasi-experimental		Relationship: Mothers (n=1220) Gender: 100% Other relevant: Previous CPS referrals n=1119 Previous termination of parental rights n=1165 History of substance misuse			n=2522 children n=1220 mothers
Intervention type - Therapeutic approach										
Ogden and Halliday-Boykins	2004	Multisystemic Therapy	Norway	Adaption/effectiveness	RCT	Age: 14.95/12-18 years Gender: 37% Care type: Home, foster home, hospital or another institution Other relevant: Youth were referred due to serious antisocial behaviour. Information included on behaviour, social competence, satisfaction with treatment	Relationship: both of their parents (25%), with their mother only (29%), with their mother and another adult (21%), or with their father (9%). Other relevant: Almost all caregivers had a Norwegian background. Information included on family functioning	Organisation type: Intervention group: Unknown. Control group: Municipal and County Municipal Child Welfare Services Professional role: Each clinical team had three therapists and a clinical supervisor, and worked exclusively with MST (intervention) Other relevant: Intervention group: The MST therapists had a professional education equivalent to a masters or bachelors degree in social work, psychology or education and some of them also have additional training in family therapy. Three of the four MST clinical supervisors were licensed psychologists, while the fourth had a degree in social work.	Unknown	Intervention n=62 children and families Ccomparison n=38 children and families
Schoenwald, Ward, Henggeler & Rowland	2000	Multisystemic Therapy	USA	Adaption	RCT	Age: 13 years/10-17 (int). Age range 2-18 years (comparison) Gender: 35% female Care type: Home, foster care, shelter, hospital Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, household composition, behavioural and emotional problems, previous mental health treatment	Relationship: Biological parents, adoptive parents, relatives	Professional role: Intervention group: Crisis case workers, psychiatrists, therapists supervisors, mental health counselors, child psychiatry fellows, child psychologist, child psychiatrist. Comparison group: attending child psychiatrist, a child psychiatrist fellow, a general	Unknown	Intervention n=57 Comparison n=56
Swenson, Schaeffer, Henggeler, Faldowski & Mayhew	2010	Multisystemic Therapy	USA	Adaption	Quasi-experimental	Age: 13.88/10-17 years Gender: 55.8% Care type: at home In study due to physical abuse	Relationship: 44.2 (mothers), 29.15 (fathers), 16.25 (other female caregiver), 10.4 (other male caregiver) Age: 41.79 Gender: 65.1% Other relevant: Parent subject to abuse report, 23.3% had prior CPS report, and 80% physical abuse with at least			n=86 families
Letourneau, Henggeler, Borduin, Schewe, McCart, Chapman & Saldana	2009	Multisystemic therapy	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 11-17 years Gender: 2.4% Other relevant: charged with a sexual offense; 54% black; 3 months prior 11% received mental health services and 4% received substance abuse services Care type: 98% at home	Gender: 83% Other relevant: generally socio-economically deprived	Organisation: private community-based provider agency Professional role: Clinicians Other relevant: one pre-doctoral, three masters-level, and one bachelor-level clinicians	unknown	Intervention n=67 young people Comparison=60 young people
Henggeler, Pickrel & Brondino	1991	Multisystemic Treatment	USA	Effectiveness/Adaption	Post test	Ages: 12-17 years Gender: 21% Ethnicity: 50% African American, 47% Caucasian, 1% Asian, 1% Hispanic American, and 1% Native American Other relevant: juvenile offenders meeting DSM-III-R criteria for substance abuse or dependence Care type: Institution-based	Relationship: Parents Age: 40.6 years (mother); 43.5 years (father) Other relevant: mother - 32% had dropped out of high school, 28% were unemployed, and 53% were employed full-time; father - 22% had dropped out of high school, 21% were unemployed, and 53% were employed full-time. The median annual family income was between \$15,000 and \$20,000.	unknown	unknown	n=118 children
National Crime Prevention Centre	2013	Multisystemic Therapy	Canada	Process	Mixed methods	Age: 12- 17 years Other relevant: 75% referred for non-violent aggressive behaviour Care type: Out-of-home (not specified)	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=58 youth

Liddle, Rowe, Gonzalez, Henderson, Dakof & Greenbaum	2006	Multidimensional Family Therapy	unknown	Sustainability	Longitudinal/cohort	Age: 15.25 Gender: 23%		Gender: 80% Organisation type: The Adolescent Day Treatment Program Professional role: Program staff Other relevant: ethnic data provided, as well as professional background info	unknown	n=104 clients n=10 program staff
Fonagy, Butler & Cottrell	2018	Multisystemic therapy	England	Effectiveness/Cost effectiveness	RCT	Age: 13.7 (int) 13.9 (comparison) Gender: 37% (int) 36% (comparison) Other relevant: moderate to severe anti social behaviour indicated Care type: Out-of-home (not specified)				Intervention n=342 Comparison n=342
Ogden & Hagen	2006	Multisystemic therapy	Norway	Effectiveness & moderators	Quasi-experimental	Age: 15.07 Gender: 36% Care type: Kinship, foster, institutional	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=75 children
Stout & Holleran	2012	Multisystemic therapy and functional family therapy	USA	Effectiveness	Mixed methods	Care type: out-of-home (not specified)	Not known	Not known	Not known	Not known
Berry, Cash & Brook	2000	Intensive Family Preservation Services	USA	Mechanisms	Pre-post test	Care type: Home Other relevant: Information included on child's wellbeing, behaviour and quality of relationships	Other relevant: Information included on income, family history of maltreatment, social support. 23% of the sample was headed by a single parent	Organisation type: Intensive Family Preservation Unit within a Public child welfare agency Professional role: Family preservation caseworkers Other relevant: Majority had a masters degree in social work	Unknown	n=53
Glisson & Green	2006	Generic - Specialty Mental Health Care	America, Tennessee	Effectiveness	Longitudinal/cohort	Age: 4 - 18 Gender: 35% Other relevant: 60% referred to juvenile court for delinquency, 30% unruly behavior, about 10% dependency and neglect. Care type: Kinship	Relationship: Parent Other relevant: Approx 60% families' incomes were below the poverty line as defined by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services		unknown	Intervention n=1241
Ogden, Hagen & Andersen	2007	Multisystemic Treatment	Norway	Sustainability	Pre-Post test	Age: 14.7/12-17 years Gender: 35.2% Other relevant: Adolescents referred by the municipal child welfare services for serious behaviour problems Care type: 9% in foster care or youth group homes, the remaining with parent(s)	Relationship: primary care giver Age: 41.7 years Ethnicity: 100% Norwegian or Scandinavian descent Other relevant: 42% single parent; lower to lower-middle income	Other relevant: Each team consisted of three therapists and a supervisor.	unknown	n= 105 families (30 families from treatment group of previous RCT, 20 from control group of previous RCT and 55 treatment group of new adolescents from current study)
Intervention type - Increase/Decrease in family financial resource										
Fein & Lee	2003	A Better Chance Welfare Reform Program (ABC)	USA	Effectiveness	RCT	Care type: Home	Unknown	Organisation type: Delawares Division of Social Services (DSS) Professional role: DSS staff	Unknown	Intervention n=2,138 parents Control n=1,821 parents
Intervention type - Multi component										
Thelman & Dail	1992	Generic -Family Preservation Services	USA	Mediators	Pre-post test	Other relevant: info on gender, mental health history, age included in paper but difficult to extract due to grouping.	Relationship: mother Other relevant: info on gender, mental health history, age included in paper but difficult to extract due to grouping.			n=995 total Group 1 n=348 Group 2 n=460
Ford & Okojie	1999	Generic - family preservation programs	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 0-69 year(whole sample)	Age: 0-69 years (whole sample) Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, marital status, education, number of children	Organisation type: Family preservation services	Description: Community based partnerships with the Health Department, Mental Health Department, Department of Human Services, Community Action Agency, Educational Programs, Employment Agencies, Treatment Centers, Shelters, Medical Resources, Housing, Legal System, Community Resources	n=237 (children and parents)
Sagatun-Edwards & Saylor	2000	Generic - service integration	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 0-3 years Other relevant: Child of substance abusing parent referred to dependency division of the juvenile court.	Relationship: Mother, father Other relevant: substance abuse and referred to dependency division of juvenile court		Unknown	Intervention n=48 Comparison n=41
Rowland, Halliday-Boykins, Hengeller, Cunningham, Lee, Krusesi & Shapiro	2005	Multisystemic therapy	USA	Effectiveness	RCT	Age: 14.5/9-17 years Gender: 42% Care type: Out-of-home (not specified)	unknown	Professional role: research assistants Other relevant: graduate students or personnel with advanced degrees employed by the State of Hawaii	unknown	n=55 families
Walker	2008	Family Wellbeing Program	Canada	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	unknown	Relationship: primary care giver Age: 18-61 years Gender: 94.2% Other relevant: 24% single	Professional role: child and youth workers; social workers Other relevant: 28.6% very little training in FPS, 50% moderate and 21.4% a lot	unknown	Intervention n=171 families Comparison n=342 families
Smith, Fluke, Fallon, Mishna, Decker & Pierce.	2018	Generic - service integration	Canada	Moderators	Secondary data analysis	Other relevant: 23.3% cases due to neglect Care type: Out-of-home (not specified)	Other relevant: 35.7% single caregivers; 16% at risk of drug or alcohol abuse	Organisation: Child welfare organisations Professional role: child protection staff	unknown	n=5265 children
Littell	1997	Family Preservation Services	USA	Mediators	Post test	unknown	unknown	Professional role: case workers and parent aides	unknown	n=1911 families
Potocky & McDonald	1996	Family Preservation Services	USA	Pilot	Post test	Other relevant: Pre-natal drug exposure Care type: Foster care and at home	Relationship: Mother Age: 26.8 years/22-36 Gender: 100% Ethnicity: 75% ethnic minority Other relevant: 70% single mothers; 100% unemployed and receiving state benefits		unknown	n=27 families
Barton	1994	Generic - in-home treatment	USA	Acceptability	Post test	Other relevant: referred to Child Protective Services for abuse or neglect		Professional role: Therapist Other relevant: trained by Families First in family systems therapy	unknown	n=150 families (half control group)
Cameron	2002	Parent Mutual Aid Organisations	Canada	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Other relevant: 57% behaviour hard to manage, open child protection cases Care type: at home	Relationship: Primary care giver Age: 14% mother younger than age 20, 40% mother younger than age 25 Gender: 100% Other relevant: 60% single parent; 75% unemployed		unknown	Intervention n=97 primary care givers Comparison n=58 primary care givers (different phases to study with different samples)
McConkey, Gent & Scowcroft	2013	Generic - effective support services	UK	Acceptability	Qualitative	Age: majority teenagers Gender: 26% female accessed service	Relationship: Parents Gender: 65% Other relevant: 65% low incomes; 40% lone parents; 55% poor health; 60% rented accommodation; 55% welfare support benefits (of those who accessed the service, not of the chosen sample)	Professional role: Key workers; referrers (mainly social workers)	unknown	n=17 children n=11 mothers n=6 fathers n=17 key workers n=17 referrers

Vidal, Steeger, Caron Lasher and Connell	2017	Multisystemic Therapy	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 14.9 years Gender: 43% Ethnicity: 14% Black; 29% Hispanic; 49% White Other relevant: 36% history of maltreatment; 57% history of out-of-home placement; 26% previously been adjudicated; 27% had been placed in a juvenile training school	unknown	unknown	unknown	Intervention n=577 Comparison n=163
Marybeth Shinn, Scott R. Brown, and Daniel Gubits	2016	Generic - housing	USA	Effectiveness and mediators	Quasi-experimental	unknown	Relationship: Parent Age: 29 Gender: 92% Other relevant: info included on ethnicity, household income, number of children with them in shelter, history	unknown	unknown	n=2282 families n=12 sites
Walton	1997	Intensive Family Preservation Services	USA	Effectiveness	Post test	Age: 0-17/6.5 years (at time of referral) Gender: 50.7% Ethnicity: Caucasian (56%). Other relevant: reason for referral: neglect 49% For those old enough to attend school, 46% always attended. Care type: At home	Relationship: Caregiver (n=134), mothers 93.3% Age: 31/19-58 years Gender: 89.2% Ethnicity: Caucasian (64.2%) Other relevant: Married (45.5%), high school graduates (52.67)	Age: IFPS 35.1; Investigative workers 29.1 Gender: IFPS 42.9 Investigative workers 76.9 Organisation type: Lucas County Children's Services Professional role: IFPS caseworker (n=7) Investigative workers (n=26) Supervisors Other relevant: IFPS experience in child welfare = 8.9years Investigative workers experience in child welfare = 3.7years	n=304 children Intervention n=69 families Comparison n=65 families	
Department for Health and Human Services	2002	Family preservation and reunification programs	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	n/a	Relationship: Parent, Grandmother, Other relative Age (mean): Kentucky 32 New Jersey 39 Tennessee 33 Philadelphia 33	Professional role: Caseworkers Investigating worker	n/a	n=311
Cameron & Birnie-Lefcovitch	2000	Parent Mutual Aid Organisations	Canada	Effectiveness	Mixed methods	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=53 at time 1 n=81 at time 2 n=97 at time 3
Cohen, Remez, Edelman, Golub, Pacifici, Santillan & Wolfe	2016	Building Blocks Reflective Supervision and Parenting program	USA	Implementation	Qualitative	unknown	unknown	Professional role: Therapist	n/a	n=5 case studies
Turner, Robbins, Rowlands & Weaver	2017	FFT-CW	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 9.22 years (int) 8.75 years (comparison) Gender: 48% (int) 49% (comparison)	Relationship: mostly biological parents Age: 37.63 years (int) 36.75 years (comparison)	FFT-CW therapists n=62	Intervention n=1625 Comparison n=2250	
Berry	1996	Generic - substance misuse services	USA	Effectiveness	Pre-post test	unknown	Relationship: Primary caregiver Age: 29 years Gender: 90%			n=119
Green, Furrer, Worcel, Burrus & Finigan	2007	Family Drug Treatment Courts	US	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Other relevant: Across the four sites 68%-100% of children were in an out-of-home placement at some point during the case.	Relationship: Parent Age: 30/18-51 years (int) 30/15-51 (comparison) Gender: 89% (int) 88% (comparison) Other relevant: allegations of parental substance abuse that met the drug court eligibility criteria	Not known	Not known	Intervention n=250 families Comparison n=250 families
Buschters, van Vygt & Stams	2016	Delta Method Case management	The Netherlands	Mechanisms/Moderators	Mixed methods	Age: 10.9 years Gender: 49% Other relevant: Supervision of the Child Youth Protection Service	Not known	Organisation type: Child Youth Protection Service Professional role: Team managers and case managers Age:47.5 years (team managers); 39.6 years case managers Gender: Team managers 51.9%; case managers 70.2%	Not known	n=224 cases n=58 case managers n=30 team managers n=15 sites
Westat, Chapin Hall Center for Children University of Chicago, James Bell Associates	2002	Generic - family preservation and reunification programs	USA	Effectiveness	RCT	Age: Kentucky: 5-10 years, New Jersey: 7-13 years, Tennessee: 4-11 years, Philadelphia: 4-11 years Care type: Home Other relevant: Information included on child problem areas	Relationship: Birth mother, biological father, grandmother, other relative Age: Kentucky: 32 years, New Jersey: 39 years, Tennessee: 33 years, Philadelphia: 33 years Gender: Kentucky: 93%, New Jersey: 88%, Tennessee: 93%, Philadelphia: 95% Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, education, relationship status, household composition for all four states	Organisation type: Family preservation services provider Professional role: Case worker and investigating worker	Unknown	Intervention n=174 (Kentucky), n=275 (New Jersey), n=98 (Tennessee), n=209 (Philadelphia) Comparison: n=175 (Kentucky), n=167 (New Jersey), n=49 (Tennessee), n=144 (Philadelphia)
Huebner, Robertson, Roberts, Brock & Geremia	2012	Family Preservation Services	USA	Effectiveness/moderators	Quasi-experimental	Age: 7.2 years (int group 1) , 8.1 years (comparison). Unknown for group 2, 3 and 4 Care type: Family home Other relevant: 32.1% were identified as having an out of home care placement- some more figures were included re OOHC	Unknown	Organisation type: Family Preservation Program provider agencies	Unknown	n=1,510 families n=3,229 children (sample sized varied for each research question based on the match or completeness of the data)
Daleiden, Pang, Roberts, Slavin & Pestle	2010	Intensive Home Based Services	USA	Implementation/moderators	Unknown	Age: 11.1 years Gender: 45% female Care type: Home and in care with imminent reunification Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, mental health disorders	Unknown	Organisation type: Child and Adolescent Mental Health Division (CAMHD) Professional role: Mental health coordinator, treating therapist	Unknown	n=163
Mason, Ferguson, Morris, Munton & Sen	2017	Family Valued	UK	Implementation	Mixed methods	Care type: Home	Relationship: Parent and carers	Organisation type: Leeds City Council Professional role: Social Workers	Unknown	Multiple interventions (unknown sample size) n=1 organisation
Ryan & Schuerman	2004	Family Preservation Services (Homebuilders)	USA	Mechanisms/Moderators	Quasi-experimental	Age: 8.67 years Gender: 47% Care type: Home Other relevant: Information included on history of maltreatment and abuse and out of home care	Age: Average age was 36 years Gender: 89% Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, employment status, education, income	Professional role: Family preservation caseworkers	Unknown	n=292 families n=886 children
Community Care	2008	Generic - A short and intensive therapeutic and practical intervention	UK	Effectiveness	Unknown	Other relevant: Home and in care	Unknown	Professional role: Social Workers, Therapists, Service Manager Other relevant: Therapists are experienced, well qualified and receive strong training and supervision. The service manager is "experienced, qualified and dedicated in the provision of an excellent service".	Unknown	Intervention n=278 Comparison n=89

Lambert, Johnson & Wang	2017	Family Group Decision Making	USA	Mechanisms/Moderators	Unknown	Age: 7 years (eldest child in case) Care type: Home and in state care Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity (eldest child in case), rate of teen parents, risk assessment score and removal status	Relationship: Extended family members, friends, neighbors, and others identified by the family as potential sources of support Other relevant: Information included on household income and use of Family Team Meetings	Organisation type: Texas Department of Family and Protective Services	Description: Community members and other caregivers	n=613,180 cases (each investigation case included a single youth or multiple youths from the same family)
Huebner, Willauer & Lynn Posze	2012	Sobriety Treatment and Recovery Teams (START)	USA	Effectiveness	Mixed methods	Age: 2.7 years, 47% under 1 year of age at referral Care type: Home and state custody	Relationship: 76% were birth fathers, with 5% being adopted or presumed fathers, and 19% were unmarried partners. All mothers were birth mothers. Age: Father median age: 28 years, mother median age: 25 years Other relevant: Information included on education, ethnicity, relationship status, employment status, substance abuse habits, and history of foster care, reported childhood neglect/abuse, and history of adult physical or sexual abuse.	Organisation type: Child Protection Services Professional role: Social Service Worker Other relevant: Specially trained on START program	Description: Family mentors	n=322 families n=531 adults n=451 children
Oxford, Spieker, Lohr & Fleming	2016	Promoting First Relationships	USA	Implementation-outcome	RCT	Age: 15.97 months (int) ; 16.77 months (comparison) Gender: 50% (int) ; 42.3% (comparison) Other relevant: info included on ethnicity	Relationship: mother 90.3% (int) , 91.1% (comparison) Age: 26.41 year (int) , 27.04 years (comparison) Gender: 90.3% (int) 91.1% (comparison)			Intervention n =124 Comparison n=123
Dore & Doris	1998	Generic - research informed practice	USA	Effectiveness	Post test	Ages: 5.8 years Care type: At home or foster care	Relationship: Mother or other primary care giver Age: 22- 56 years; 31.5 years Gender: 98% Ethnicity: 100% African American Other relevant: substance abuser; 96% receive state benefits; 39.2% had at least one child in care; 20% mental health record		unknown	n=138 primary caregivers
Intervention type - Other										
Winokur, Ellis, Drury & Rogers	2015	Generic - differential response	USA	Effectiveness	RCT	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	Intervention n=3194 Comparison n=4996
Chartier, Brownell, Isaac, Chateau, Nickel, Katz, Sarkar, Hu and Taylor	2017	Families First Home Visiting	USA	Effectiveness	Longitudinal/Cohort	Age: 0-5 years Care type: At home, risk of care entry	Relationship: Mother Age: 21.09 year (int) , 20.75 years (comparison) at first birth	unknown	unknown	Intervention n=4562 Comparison n=5184
de Kemp, Veerman & ten Brink	2003	Families First	The Netherlands	Moderators	Pre-Post test	Age: 12/4.4-18.5 years Gender: 45% Care Type: At home, at risk of care entry				n=107
Turcotte & Helie	2012	Generic - Child protection policy reform	Canada	Effectiveness/moderators	Quasi-experimental	Age: pre-9.3/post 8.6 years Gender: 48% Care type: multiple (out of home, residential)				n=18614
Wildeman & Fallesen	2016	Generic - welfare payment	Denmark	Cost effectiveness	Longitudinal/cohort	Age: 0-17 years	Relationship: Mother Age 36.70 years (Unemployment uninsured), 37.7 years (Unemployment insured) Other relevant: info included on mother's educational		unknown	Eligible for unemployment insurance n=134,144 Not eligible for unemployment insurance n=70,818
Yoo & Brooks	2005	Generic - Organizational Variables	USA	Effectiveness	Mixed qualitative and quantitative	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=47972
Smith	1995	Family preservation program	USA	Pilot/feasibility	Post test	Age: 3/0-14 years	Age: 26.3 years Other relevant: Average number of children per family 2.3. Info included on ethnicity, household income and monetary, marital status	Professional role: Social worker Other relevant: average of 6.8 years experience in family intervention	unknown	n=26 families
Crampton & Yoon.	2016	Crisis nursery	USA	Effectiveness	Post test	Age: 31.05 months Gender: 46.58% Care type: respite care	Relationship: Mother Age: 26.06 years Gender: 100%	Not known	Not known	n=322 children
Little, Warner & Baker.	2017	Safer Families for Children	England	Effectiveness	Mixed methods/RCT	Other relevant: Children assessed as needing "early help"/family support including short periods of respite away from the primary carer (Category 1) or those on the edge of care (Category 2).	Relationship: Parents. Other relevant: Families needing "early help" (Category 1) or edge of care support (Category 2).	Organisation type: Local Authority	Volunteers. Three types of volunteers in the programme: host families who will take children into their homes to stay for a short period, family friends who offer support, and resource friends who will offer goods or support that the families need. Other relevant: Recruited from the Christian church.	n=558 children n=20 local authorities
English, Wingard, Marshall, Orme & Orme	2000	Generic - alternative responses	USA	Moderators	Pre-post test	Age: 0-17 years (breakdown of age brackets included) Gender: 46% Care type: At home Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, CPS history, maltreatment allegations	Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, marital status, income level	Organisation type: A private, non-profit social service agency Professional role: Social work professionals and Public health nurses Other relevant: Trained in the use of the Washington Risk Model. Qualified at Masters level	Description: Community resources	n=1263 referred to a service
Kirk & Griffith	2004	Intensive Family Preservation Services	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Gender: 51% (int) , 50% female (comparison) Care type: At home Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, history of maltreatment, prior placements, substantiated reports	Other relevant: All families were referred by a county DSS on the basis of a substantiated, high-risk maltreatment report	Organisation type: IFPS Service Providers	Unknown	Intervention n=542 families Comparison group n=25,722 families
Brännström, Vinnerljung & Hjern	2013	Contact Family Program	Sweden	Effectiveness	Longitudinal	Age: 2-5 years (at entry) Care type: Home	Relationship: Parents	Organisation type: Child Welfare	Description: Volunteer families	Intervention n=6693 Comparison n=6693 Unmatched control n=948,155
Russell & Summers	2013	Generic - reflective decision making	USA	Process	RCT/quasi experimental	Age: 6.4 years Gender: 57% Ethnicity: 40% Caucasian; 25% African American; 26% Hispanic	Relationship: Parents	Professional role: Judges Organisation: Family court		n=555 cases (note matched group random assignment) n=31 judges n=3 sites