Outcome - safely reduce the need for care re-entry, Improve reunification

Authors	Year of publication	Name of intervention	Country	Study Aims	Study design	Study population - Child or Young person Age (range/mean), Gender (% female), Care type, Other relevant characteristic	Study population - Family Relationship to child, Age (range/mean), Gender (% female), other relevant characteristic	Study population - Professional Age (range/mean), Gender (% female, Organsiation type, Professional role, other relevant characteristic	Study population - Other (e.g. community members) Describe,	Sample size (intervention; control/comparision)
Intervention type - Family or child skills building										
Ciliberti	1998	Family Preservation Program	USA	Mediators	Pre post test	Age: **2.57 years (int)** 3.47 years (comparison)				**Intervention n=46** Comparison n=107
Han & Osterling	2011	Generic - reunification intervention	USA	Effectiveness, mediators & moderators	Mixed Methods	Age: 0-16 years Gender: 56.3% Care type: Kinship, foster, group care	Relationship: Mother Age: 36.86 years Gender: 100% Other relevant: Info included on Marital status, Highest level of education, Language most often spoken at home, Current employment	Age: 40.38 years Gender: 50% Organisation type: Child Welfare Services Professional role: Child welfare worker	unknown	n=32 children, n=7 parents n=8 child welfare workers
Carlo	1993	Generic - parent education/involvement	USA	Mediators		Age: 4- 13 years Gender: 33.3% Other relevant: emotional and behavioural difficulties Care type: Separated from family by court order	Other relevant: 38.7% single parent			n=37 children n=51 parents
Huefner, J. C. James, S. Ringle, J. Thompson, R. W. Daly, D. L.	2010	Generic - service integration	USA	Mediators	Longitudinal/cohort	Age: 14.6 years Gender: 41.8% Other relevant: DSM IV diagnosis 81.5% Care type: Residential	n/a	n/a	n/a	Total sample n=701 **Intervention group 1 n=283 Intervention group 2 n=145 Intervention group 3 n=273**
Berry, McCauley & Lansing	2007	Generic - intensive reunification program	USA	Effectiveness	mixed methods	Care type: Multiple				**Intervention n=12** Comparison n=6
DeGarmo, Reid , Fetrow, Fisher & Antoine	2013	The Pathways Home Foster Care Reunification Intervention	USA	Mechanisms/Moderators	RCT	Age: 8.28/5.36 -11.74 years Gender: 49.51% Care type: Foster care	Relationship: Parents Age: Mothers' age 31.86/22.81-49.12 years. Fathers' age 36.62/20.10-49.32 years	Not known	Not known	n=101 children
Lenz-Rashid	2017	Generic -Supportive housing program	America. Sacramento, California	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	Alabama, USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experiemental	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
Intervention type - Family plus practice meeting										
Pennell, Edwards & Burford	2010	Family group engagement	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 42% 6 or younger, 27.1% 6-12 30.9% 12-18 Gender: 48% Care type: kinship, foster care, group homes, and institutions.	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=789 children
Chambers, Brocato, Fatemi & Rodriguez	2016	Family First	USA	Mechanisms/Moderators	Quasi-experiemental	Gender: **59% (int)**, 54% (comparison group) Care type: in care Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, age at removal, reason for removal, household composition and primary language	Relationship: Biological mothers Age: Average age was 29–30 years old. Gender: Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, household composition, primary language, economic needs and clinincal	Organisation type: Department of Children and Family Services Professional role: Case Workers Other relevant: Caseworkers at the time of the intervention had an average of 13 years of Department of Children and Family Services work experience. Staff included one	Description: Community Service providers and not-for-profit	**Intervention n=48 families** Comparison n=48 families
Sheets, Wittenstrom, Fong, James, Tecci, Baumann and Rodriguez	2009	Family Group Decision Making	USA	Acceptability/Moderators	Mixed methods	Age: 8 years Care type: Foster care or relative care Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, medical abuse allegations and physical abuse allegations for intervention and control groups	Relationship: Parents, relative caregivers and foster carers	Organisation type: Texas Department of Family and Protective Services	Unknown	**Intervention n=468** Comparison n=3,598
Wang, Lambert, Johnson, Boudreau, Baxidenbach &	2012	Family Group Decision Making	Texas, USA	Mechanisms	Cohort/Longitudinal	Age: 5.3 years Gender: 49.8%				n=80690
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%)				n=110 children
Intervention type - Practice										
Sharrock	2013	Generic - engaging parents	USA	Mechanisms/Moderators	Longitudunal	Age: 6.93 years Gender: 48.5% Care type: Out of home care Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity	Relationship: Parents	Organisation type: Children's Services Professional role: Case worker	Unknown	n=1329
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 (Comaprison)		n/a	**Intervention n=279 children** Comparison n=89 children

Author	Year	Intervention	Country	Focus	Design	Children	Parents/Carers	Professionals	Other	Sample size
Darnell & Schuler	2015	Functional Family Therapy	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 11 - 18 years Gender: **23.57% (int)**; 21.3% (comparison) Other relevant: 35% had contact with law enforcement				**Intervention n=1279** Comparison n=7434
Johnson & Wagner	2005	Michigan's foster care case management system	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: ≤1yr 23.7%; 2-4yrs **17.5%; 5-9yrs 27.7%; 10-14yrs 22.1%; ≥15yrs 8.3%; missing 0.7%; (int).** : ≤1yr 24%; 2-4yrs 18.9%; 5-9yrs 26.9%; 10-14yrs 21%; ≥15yrs 7%; missing 2.2% (Comparison)	n/a	n/a	n/a	**Intervention n=841 children** Comparison n=871 children
Dakof, Cohen & Duarte	2009	Generic - drug courts	USA	Effectiveness	Qualitative		Relationship: mothers Gender: 100% Other relevant: all held masters degrees/had ~6 yrs experience	Professional role: caseworkers Gender: 100% Other relevant:		n=80 families
Gill	2016	Taking Care	UK.	Effectiveness	unknown	Age: 8.1/utero - 18 years Gender: 50% (received a service) Care type: Foster and residential	Relationship: Parent/Carer Gender: 71%		unknown	n=47 case files
Cleaver H	2000	Generic - family contact	England	Mediators	Qualitative	Age: 7.8/5-12 years Gender: 52% Other relevant: child looked after for more than 3 months Care type: Foster care	n/a	Relationship: Mother, father, other	n/a	n=33 children
Administration for Children, Youth, & Families (DHHS)	1991	Family Reunification Project	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Gender: 53% Ethnicity: 82% white Other relevant: 29% placed due to neglect Care type: Foster care	Other relevant: 49% single parent			**Intervention n=57 children** Comparison n=47 children
Intervention type - Service integration_coordination										
Twomey, Caldwell, Soave, Fontaine & Lester	2010	Vulnerable infants program	Rhode Island, USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: Infants Gender: 45% Care type: Beyond medical need hospital stay	Relationship: Mothers (n=195) Age: 28.4/17-43 years Other relevant: Achieved high school diploma 61% Criminal conviction 28% On probation/parole 23% Experienced physical/sexual abuse 80% Substance abuse at time of		n/a	n=203 children n=95 mothers Subgroup comparator **Intervention n=79 mothers** Comparison n=58 mothers
Lewandowski & Pierce	2004	Family Centered out-of-home care	USA	Pilot	Quasi-experimental	Age: **9.9 years (int)**; 7.5 years (comparison) Gender: **52% (int)** Ethnicity: 90% White Care Type: Foster care				**Intervention n=294** Comparison n=178
Walton	2001	Intensive family preservation services	USA	Mechanism/moderator	post test only	Age: 8 years Gender: 45.4%	Relationship: mother/female caregiver Age: 35 Gender: 80%	Age: 30 Gender: 66% Organisation type: Child Protective Services Professional Role: Case workers		n=307 children
Huang & Ryan	2010	Generic- substance abuse reunification program	America. Illinois	Mediators	unknown	unknown	Relationship: Parent Age: 34.32 Gender: 100% Other relevant: Info on ethinicity, education, marital status, health problems, mental health problems, drug abuse etc.	unknown	unknown	n=160 mothers
Action for Children	2013	Intensive Family Support Services	UK	Effectiveness	mixed methods					n= 22 staff n=4 partner agency reps n=8 service users
Burrus, Mackin & Finigan	2011	Family Drug Court	USA	Effectiveness/Cost effectiveness	Quasi-experimental		Gender: **98% (int)** 100% (comparison)			**Intervention n=200 families** Comparison n=200 families
Ashford	2004	Generic - substance misuse services	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental		Relationship: Parents Gender: **82% (int)** 52% (refusal) 73% (comparison)			**Intervention n=33** Comparison n=87 (42 refusal; 45 treatment as usual)
Brook & McDonald	2007	Generic - Substance abuse intervention	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: <12 years Gender: **48% (int)**, 53% (comparison) Other relevant: child abuse or neglect referral that included reasons associated with AOD abuse Care type: Foster care				**Intervention n=60 children** Comparison n=79 children
Intervention type - Structure										
Gifford, Eldred, Acquah & Blevins	2013	Generic - speciality courts	USA	Effectiveness	Longitudinal	Care type: Foster care				n=61,540 children
Haight, Marshall & Woolmanb	2015	Child Protection Clinic	USA	Effectiveness & mediators	Mixed methods	Age: 0-17 years Gender: 50%	Relationship: Mother Gender: 100% Ethnicity: 44% White, 33% black, 23% Hispanic. Other relevant: All parents were qualified to have a court appointed attorney based on low-incomes	Organisation type: Law clinic Professional role: court professionals, law school faculty, student attorneys Other relevant: ethinic data provided. Other information for each role provided.	Parent mentors (n=2). Gender: 100% Ethnicity: African American Other relevant: Previous personal involvement with child protection. In addition, both mentors had previously served as parent advocates for the county's Department of Human Services.	n=39 adults (n=12 court professionals n= 5 law school faculty n=2 parent mentors n=11 students n=9 parent clients) n=38 children
Worcel, Furrer, Green, Burrus & Finigan	2008	Family Treatment Drug Courts	USA	Effectiveness/Moderators	Quasi-experimental		Relationship: Mother Gender: 100% History of substance misuse			n=301 families
McCombs-Thornton & Foster	2012	Generic - court	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 0-3 years Care type: Foster care				**Intervention n=298** Comparison n=511

Author	Year	Intervention	Country	Study focus	Design	Child characteristics	Parent/relationship	Organisation/professional		Sample
Bruns, Pullman, Weathers, Wiresham & Murphy	2012	Family treatment drug court	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: FTD group: **2.9 years (int)**; 3.3 years (comparison) Gender: **57% (int)**; 49% (comparison) Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity Care type: Out-of-home (not specified)	Relationship: Parents Age: 18+ Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity	Organisation type: Family treatment drug courts Professional role: Judge, parents attorney, childrens attorney, assistant attorney general, child welfare social workers, court appointed special advocates	n/a	**Intervention: n=76 parents, n=65 children** Comparison n=76 parents, n=76 children
Gifford, Eldred, Vernerey & Sloan	2014	Family drug treatment court	USA	Effectiveness	unknown	Gender: 47.4% (enrolled)	unknown	unknown	unknown	n=566 children
Harwin, Alrouh, Ryan & Tunnard	2013	Family Drug and Alcohol Court	England & Wales	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	unknown	Relationship: Parent Other relevant: Figures included for substance abuse and past history of involvement with children's services		unknown	**Intervention n=41 mothers** Comparison n=19 mothers
Children Now	2011	Generic - family courts	England	Effectiveness	Not known	Not known	Relationship: Parents Other relevant: Parents with substance misuse problems who are involved in a court care proceedings.	Not known	Not known	Not known

Intervention type - Therapeutic approach

Author	Year	Intervention	Country	Study focus	Design	Child characteristics	Parent/relationship	Organisation/professional		Sample
Osofsky, Kronenberg, Hammer, Lederman, Katz, Adams, Graham & Hogan	2007	Florida Infant Mental Health Pilot Program	Florida, USA	Pilot/feasibility	pre post test	Age: 19.39 months/1-52 months Gender: 43% Other relevant: maltreated or at risk of abuse/neglect Care type: At home and in foster care	n/a	Relationship: Predominanltly mother Age: 24.33/14-42 years	n/a	n=57 parents n=57 infants
Lee &Thompson	2008	Generic- treatment foster care vs family-style group care	USA	Effectiveness	Longitudinal/cohort	Age:**12.9/ 8+ years (int)**; 14.9/8+ years (comparison) Gender: **62% (int)**, 38% (comparison) Ethnicity: **51% (Int)** 60% (Comparison) white Other relevant:Legal delinquent status. Info also included on abuse history, number of prior placements, and some information on biological parent Care type: **Treatment foster care (n=112)**	Relationship: Foster parents Other relevant: Treatment foster parents completed training on model implementation. Supervision was provided to foster parents to promote model fidelity.	Organisation type: Not-for-profit Professional role: Group Care staff, clinical specialist Other relevant: All youth care providers completed training on model implementation. Supervision was provided to direct care staff to promote model fidelity. Clinical specialists were Masters-level professionals that had frequent contact with the youth, family, and substitute caregivers throughout placement.	n/a	**Intervention n=112** Comparison n=716

Intervention type - Increase_Descrease in family financial resource

Author	Year	Intervention	Country	Study focus	Design	Child characteristics	Parent/relationship	Organisation/professional		Sample
Wells & Guo	2006	Generic - welfare reform	Ohio, USA	Moderators	Longitudinal/Ccohort	Age: 0-16 years Gender: Pre-reform: 49.5% female, post-reform 1: 51.6% female, post-reform 2: 48.4% female Care type: With kin, unrelated parents (foster home), group home or hospital Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, child health status, reason for placement, type of placement, reason for leaving foster care	Relationship: Mothers Gender:100% Other relevant: Information included on employment, income, history of substance abuse, family violence, poor mental health and economic difficulty	Unknown	Unknown	n=1560 in total. Pre-reform n=378, Post-reform 1 n=525, Post-reform 2 n=657
Cancian, Cook, Seki & Wimer	2017	Generic - financial	USA	Mechanisms	Post test	Care type: Home and in care	Relationship: Mothers Gender: 100% Other relevant: Mothers did not live with the childrens identified father. Information also included on ethnicity and income	Organisation type: Child Protective Services Professional role: CPS Case Workers	Unknown	n=2,804 mothers; n=10,476 children

Intervention type - Mentor

Author	Year	Intervention	Country	Study focus	Design	Child characteristics	Parent/relationship	Organisation/professional		Sample
Ryan, Victor, Moore, Mowbray & Perron	2016	Generic - recovery coaches	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Other relevant: Temporary state custody	Relationship: Mothers Gender: 100% Other relevant: Information provided on ethnicity, employment, education, substance use, marital status	Professional role: Professional recovery coaches, child welfare caseworkers, substance abuse treatment staff Other relevant: The recovery coaches are not employees of child welfare or substance abuse treatment agencies, they are employed by a non-affiliated social service agency. They are intensive and specialised case managers and are required to participate in child welfare and substance abuse trainings that cover a variety of topics including addiction, relapse prevention, DSM diagnostics, fundamentals of assessment, ethics, service hours, client tracking	Unknown	**Intervention n=112 families** Control n=511 families

Intervention type - Multi component

Author	Year	Intervention	Country	Study focus	Design	Child characteristics	Parent/relationship	Organisation/professional		Sample
Pine & Spath	2007	Generic - reunification program	USA	Effectiveness	Qualitative	Care type: Multiple				n=254
Ryan, Marsh, Testa, & Louderman	2006	Illinois Alcohol and other Drug Abuse Waiver Denonstration	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: 2.7 years Gender: 48%	Relationship: Parents Age: 34.4 (mean age of youngest caregiver) Other relevant: Included in study due to substance misuse			n=1417 children n=738 families
Lewandowski & Pierce	2002	Family Centered out-of-home care	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: **10.7 years (int)**, 7.7 (comp) Gender: 52% Other relevant: prior placements **1.3 (int)**, 0.81 (compariosn).	Other relevant: Single parent families **53.8% (int)**, 46.2% (comparison)			**Intervention n=220** Comparison n=154
Akin, Brook, Lloyd & McDonald	2017	Generic - parenting intervention	USA	Effectiveness	quasi-experimental/ longitudinal design	Age: 3- 15 years Gender: 49.9% Ethnicity: 87.2% white Care type: reunified from foster care	Other relevant: substance abuser (72.2%); 56.0% single parent			**Intervention n=219 children** Comparison n=274 children

Author	Year	Programme	Country	Focus	Study design	Child characteristics	Caregiver characteristics	Professional/Organisation characteristics		Sample size
Walton, Fraser, Lewis, Pecora & Walton.	1993	In-home Family Focused Reunification	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental study	Age: 1-17 years Ethnicity: 82.7% White Other relevant: 32.7% neglect Care type: Out-of-Home (not specified)	Relationship: Primary caregiver Age: 34.6 years Gender: 86.4% Other relevant: 48.2% divorced or seperated	Age: mean 49 years Gender: 0% Organisation: Child welfare Professional role: FRS Treatment Workers Other relevant: 14 years of experience in child welfare; 19 years of formal education		**Intervention n= 57 families** Comparison n=53 families
Zeanah, Larrieu , Heller, Valliere, Hinshaw-Fuselier, Aoki & Drilling	2001	Generic - maltreatment prevention	USA	Effectiveness	quasi-experimental	Age: younger than 48 months Gender: 53% Ethnicity: 58% African American; 39% European American Care type: foster care				**Intervention n=95 children** Comparison n=145 children
Pierce & Geremia	1998	Family Reunion Services	USA	Moderators	Post test	Age: 8.2 years Gender: 56% female Other relevant: Avergae of 5.8 placements Care type: Out-of-home (not specified)	Other relevant: 65% single parent; 61% less than high school education; 64% of families less then $800 a month			n=312 children n=69 families.
Fein & Staff	1993	Last Best Chance	USA	Description of programme theory	Post test	Age: 78% five years or younger Gender: 56% Ethnicity: Caucasian (64%), Hispanic (16%), mixed-race (11%), and African American (9%) Care type: Foster care	Other relevant: 64% single mother; 30% substance abuse; 21% domestic abuse; 40% were in debt or did not have enough money to live on			n=110 children n=47 families
Chuang, Moore, Barrett , Scott &Young	2012	Integrated family dependency treatment court	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	unknown	Relationship: Caregiver Age: **29.6 years (intervention** and comparison) Gender: 78% (intervention and comparison) Other relevant: info included on ethnicity and criminal history		n/a	**Intervention n=91 families** Comparison = 91 families
Walton	2008	Intensive Family Preservation Services	Utah	Mediators	post test		unknown	Organisation type: Department of Human Services Professional role: Case workers, research assistants	unknown	n=110 families
Perry, Yoo, Spoliansky & Edelman	2013	Family Team Conferencing	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: n=**7.35 years (int group 1); 7.17 years (int group 2)** 7.78 years (comparison) Gender: **45.8% (int group 1); 45.5% (int group 2);**	n/a	Relationship: parent/caregiver Age: **32.24 years (int group 1); 32.28 years (int 2);** 31.53 years (comparison) Gender:**68.9% (int group 1); 72.2% (int group 2);** 80%	n/a	**Intervention 1: 266 families Intervention 2: 270 families** Comparison n=141 families
Landy & Munro	1998	Generic- Foster parent program	Canada	Effectiveness?moderators	Post test	unknown	Other relevant: Information included regarding parents education, emplyment status, health problems, mental health, childhood abuse/neglect		unknown	
Boles, Young, Moore & DiPirro-Beard	2007	Drug Dependency Court	Sacramento, CA USA	Comparison study of DDC reunification rates compared to those receiving standard services	Post test	Age: **6.2 years (int)** 7.9 (comparison) Gender: **51.6% (int)** 54.9% (comparison)	Relationship: Parent Age: 32.1 (int) 33.4 (comparison) Other relevant: drug dependancy			**Intervention: n=861** Comparison: n=173
Walton	1998	Intensive Family Based Services	USA	Effectiveness	Post-test	Age: 10.8 years Care type: Foster care	Age: 35 Gender: Mostly female Ethnicity: Mostly white			**Intervention n=62** Comparison n=58
Cohen, Remez, Edelman, Golub, Pacifici, Santillan & Wolfe	2016	Building Blocks Reflective Supervision and Parenting program	USA	Implementation	Qualitative	unknown		Professional role: Therapist	n/a	n=5 case studies
Trout, Tyler, Stewart & Epstein	2012	On the way home	USA	Description of programme theory	Mixed methods	Age: 15 /3-17 years Gender: 50% Care type: multiple (out of home, residential)				**Intervention n=24** Comparison n=20
Fraser, Walton, Lewis, Pecora and Walton	1996	Generic - reunification services	USA	Effectiveness/description of program theory	RCT	Age: 11/1-17 years (int) Gender: **57.9% (int)** Care type: Foster care Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, most frequent reason for placement, number and length of placements for intervention group	Relationship: Primary caretaker. 12.3% of intervention group contained both birth parents Age: Mean age for primary caretakers of intervention group was 33.7 years Gender: All but 5 primary caretakers of intervention group were female Other relevant: Information included on education, employment, income, religion	Professional role: Child welfare Other relevant: Skilled in building relationships with parents and in providing support	Unknown	**Intervention n=57 children** Comparison n=53 children
Harwin, Alrough, Ryan & Tunnard	2014	Family Drug and Alcohol Court	UK	Description of programme theory/cost effectiveness	Mixed methods	Age: Information in table Gender: Both groups had 49% female Care type: At home (38% v 40%), In hospital (26% v 21%), Foster care (19% v 23%), Family and friends (13% v 12%). Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, emotional and behavioural	Relationship: Mother/father Age: The largest cluster in each sample 30 to 39 years Gender: Intervention group: 104 mothers/84 fathers , Comparison group: 101 mothers/76 fathers Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, substance use, education, housing, health, crinimal history, household composition	Organisation type: Family Drug and Alcohol Court Professional role: Services Manager, Senior Practitioner, Clinical Nurse Specialist, Team administrator, Subtsance abuse Specialist, Parental Substance Misuse Specialist, Volunteer Parent Mentor Coordinator, Social Worker, Student Social Worker	Description: Volunteer parent mentors	**Intervention n=106 families n=149 children** Comparison n=101 families n=151 children
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 groups 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)
Lee, Hwang, Socha, Pau & Shaw	2013	Generic - reunification	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age:15 years (int) Gender: **34% (int)**; 35% (comparison) Care type: Child welfare group care settings (group homes, residential treatment centres) Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, reason for placement, other service involvement	Relationship: Biological parents, other family members, fictive kin or supportive adults, as well as possible foster family or treatment foster care homes.	Organisation type: Local child welfare agency Professional role: Child Welfare Staff Other relevant: Family Involvement Meetings also included professionals involved in the youths care (Court Appointed Special Advocate, therapist, caregiver)	Unknown	**Intervention n=231** Comparison group n=173

Rainville	2012	Generic - mentoring	USA	Unknown	Unknown	Age: 9-11 years Care type: Foster care	Unknown	Unknown	Description: Mentors	Approximately 50
Landy & Munro	1998	Shared Parenting Project	USA	Effectiveness/moderators	Unknown	Care type: Foster care Other relevant: Information included on child behaviour	Relationship: Foster parents and birth parents Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, education, employment, housing history, history of abuse/neglect, history	Organisation type: Child Welfare Agency Professional role: Child protection worker, and Shared Parenting Co-ordinator	Unknown	n=13 children
Madden, Maher, McRoy, Ward, Peveto & Stanley	2012	Generic - Family reunification	USA	Pilot	Mixed methods	Age: 10-17 years Gender: 33% Other relevant: All of the youth had at least one Axis I mental health diagnosis Care type: Foster care	Relationship: Primary caregiver (33% birth parent, 33% grandparent) Age: 33-67 years Gender: 100% Ethnicity: 50% African American; 33% Latino	Age: 22-49 years Gender: 82% Professional role: Child Protective Services caseworkers & program staff Ethnicity: 73% white		n=6 children n=6 caregivers n=11 CPS caseworkers and pilot program staff

Intervention type - Other

Leung	1996	Special Advocate Program	USA	Effectiveness/Mediator	Longitudinal	Age: 0-11 years Care type: at home	Age: 28.12	Professional role: CASA volunteers, child protection judges, CPS caseworkers	unknown	**Intervention n=66** Comparison n=155
Leon, Saucedo, & Jachymiak	2016	Family Finding	USA	Effectiveness	quasi-experimental	Age: 9.97/6-13 years Gender: 51.5% Ethnicity: 61.4% African American Other relevant: 76.6% entered care due to neglect Care type: 49.2% kinship care, 34.6% in shelter, 7% foster parent, 8.3% hospital	Other relevant: mean of 1.86 adults in the home; 49.2% home of relative; 7.0% traditonal foster parent	Professional role: Kin Connect Specialists	unknown	**Intervention n=196** Comparison n=262
Pergamit, Cunningham & Hanson	2017	Generic - housing vouchers	USA	Effectiveness	quasi-experimental	Age: 6.82 years Gender: 50.5% Ethnicity: Majority ethnic minority Care type: some at home, some in care	Age: 31.77 Gender: 83.5% Ethnicity: majority ethnic minority		unknown	n=828 children
Courtney & Blakey	2003	Generic- increased court review	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: <12 years Gender: 48% Other relevant: 60% of children removed from home due to neglect, 20% physical abuse, 5% domestic violence, 3% sexual abuse Care type: Out-of-home	n/a	unknown	n/a	**Intervention n=80 children n=62 families** Comparison n=77 children n=66 families
Choi, Huang & Ryan	2012	Generic - substance abuse treatment	USA	Moderators	quantitative	Age: 4.18 years Gender: 45.9%	Relationship: mothers Age: 32.14 Gender: 100%			n=1548 children n=858 mothers
Belanger & Stone	2008	Generic - social services	USA	Mediators	Qualitative	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown	unknown
Leon, Saucedo & Jachymiak	2016	Family Finding	USA	To evaluate a Family Finding Intervention.	Quasi-experimental	Age: **9.86/6-13 years (int)**; 10.05/6-13 years (comparison) Gender: **50.5% (int)**; 52.3% (comparison) Other relevant: info included on reason for care entry and sibling data Care type: Foster care	Not known	Not known	Not known	**Intervention n=196** Comparison group n=262
Courtney & Blakey	2003	Generic - court reviews	USA	Effectiveness	Quasi-experimental	Age: <12 years Gender: 48% Care type: out-of-home for at least 45 days (not specified)	Not known	Not known	Not known	**Intervention n=80 children n=62 families** Comparison n=77 children n=66 families
Brook, McDonald & Yan.	2012	Strengthening families program	USA	Acceptability	Pre and post test	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
D'Andrade	2009	Concurrent Planning	USA	Effectiveness	Mixed methods	Age: 0-10 years (35.0% under the age of 1, 22.2% aged 1-3, 16.3% aged 5-7, 14.5% aged 7-10). Gender: 45.8% Other relevant: info included about ethnicity, diability Care type: out-of-home care (not specified)	Other relevant: info included on reason for removal, criminal history, substance misuse, mental health history, visitation of child	Not known	Not known	**Intervention n=303** Comparison n=564 n=6 counties
Farmer, Wagner, Burns & Richards	2003	Treatment Foster Care	USA	Effectiveness	Longitudinal/Cohort	Age: 13.2/ 3-17 years Gender: 26.1% Other relevant: Young people with both psychiatric disorders and aggressive behaviour Care type: Treatment foster care	Relationship: Parents	Not known	Not known	n=184 children
Courtney, McMurtry, Zinn, Power & Maldre	2004	Generic - ongoing services	USA	The central goal of the evaluation was to determine if children and families benefit from the services they receive	Quasi-experimental	Age: 0-16+ years (more age info available in paper) Gender: **48.1% (int)**, 51.7% (comparison) Care type: Foster care, group care, other care Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, disanilities, behaviour problems, academic performance	Relationship: The biological mother was identified as the household's primary caregiver in more than 80 percent of cases. Age:Information in table Gender:atleast 80% Other relevant: Information included on ethnicity, education, health, employment, finances	Age: Mean age: 30 years Gender: 74% (intervention), 90% (comparison) Organisation type: Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare Professional role: Case Managers Other relevant: 58% were caucasian. Information also included on education, years of work experience, ethnicity	Unknown	**Intervention n=460** Comparison n=433