

APPENDIX A

Table 3. Study design.

Program Name	Age Child	Total Sample (N)	Subsamples (n) = Experiment group (n) = Control group	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow up	Reference Study
1. VIPP-SD	1-3 y	237	120 VF 117 six telephone calls	X	X		Van Zeijl et al., 2006
2. VIPP-SD	1-3y	157	83 VF 74 six telephone calls	X	X	X	Bakermans-Kranenburg, van IJzendoorn, Pijlman, Mesman, and Juffer, 2008
		130	66 VF 64 six telephone calls	X	X		Bakermans-Kranenburg, van IJzendoorn, Mesman, Alink, and Juffer, 2008
3. Pre-VIPP	6 m	130	50 VF + book 30 book only 50 no intervention	X	X	X	Juffer et al., 2005
4. Pre-VIPP	6 m	90	30 VF + book 30 book 30 no intervention	X	X		Juffer et al., 1997
5. VIPP and VIPP-R	7 m	81	28 VF (VIPP) 26 VF + discussions (VIPP-R) 27 one video recorded home visit	X	X	X	Klein Velderman, Bakermans-Kranenburg, Juffer, and van IJzendoorn, 2006
		77	27 VF (VIPP) 24 VF + discussions (VIPP-R) 26 one video recorded home visit	X	X	X	Klein Velderman, Bakermans-Kranenburg, Juffer, and van IJzendoorn, Mangelsdorf, et al., 2006
6. VIPP-AUTI	1-5	78	40 VF 38 TAU (care as usual: five home-visits)	X	X		(Poslawsky et al., 2014)
7. VIPP-TM	1,5-3 y	76	36 VF 40 six telephone calls	X	X		(Yagmur et al., 2014)

(continued)

(continued)

Program Name	Age Child	Total Sample (N)	Subsamples (n) = Experiment group (n) = Control group	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow up	Reference Study
8. VIPP	6 m	54	26 VF 28 five telephone calls	X	X		(Kalinauskiene et al., 2009)
9. VIPP-SD	1-4 y	43	22 VF 21 six telephone calls	X	X		(Negrão et al., 2014) (Pereira et al., 2014)
10. Pre-VIPP	7 m	30	10 VF 10 VF+ discussion 10 one home visit	X	X		(Bakermans-Kranenburg et al., 1998)
11. PALS	6 m	264	133 VF 131 Developmental Assessment Screening (DAS), ten home visits	X	X	X	(Landry et al., 2006)
12. VF	5 m	162	81 VF 81 one home visit: general discussion	X			(Magill-Evans et al., 2007)
13. VIP	2-3 y	99	52 VF 47 TAU (well-child care)	X	X	X	(Mendelsohn et al., 2007)
14. VF	6 m	99	49 VF 50 one home visit	X	X	X	(Moran et al., 2005)
15. VF	1 m	87	43 VF + individual sessions and group sessions 44 TAU (normal support from the medical team)		X ¹		(Brisch et al., 2003)
16. VF	4 m	80	40 (38) VF 40 (39) supportive counseling	X	X		(Stein et al., 2006)
17. IG	>30 m	75	33 VF 42 psychodynamic therapy	X	X	X	(Robert-Tissot et al., 1996)

(continued)

(continued)

Program Name	Age Child	Total Sample (N)	Subsamples (n) = Experiment group (n) = Control group	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow up	Reference Study
18. VF	3-5 m (average)	74	25 VF 23 TAU (standard care) 26 discussion	X	X		(Bilszta et al., 2012)
19. VF	1 m	71	35 VF 36 (three telephone calls)	X	X	X	(Van Doesum et al., 2008)
20. VF	1-5 y	67	35 VF+ discussion 32 TAU	X	X		(Moss et al., 2011)
21. VF	1 m	31	15 VF 16 two home visits + discussion	X	X	X	(Koniak-Griffin et al., 1992)
22. VF	3 m	191	134 VF + reflective discussion 58 TAU (routine care)	X	X		(Svanberg et al., 2010)
23. VHT (Orion)	3-6 y	126	52 VF 74 no intervention (two home visits)	X	X	X	(Weiner et al., 1994)
24. VHT/VIG	18 m	97	39 VF 58 TAU (regular guidance)	X	X	X	(Eliëns, 2005)
25. VF	2 y	79	23 VF + Family Check Up (FCU) 56 Family Check Up only	X	X		(Smith et al., 2013)
26. Marte Meo	4-12 y	49	33 VF 16 TAU	X	X		(Axberg et al., 2006)
27. VF	8 m (average)	40	23 VF + TAU (ten month program) 17 TAU (ten month program)	X	X		(Seifer et al., 1991)
28. IG (modified)	0-1 y	28	13 VF 14 feeding focused intervention	X	X		(Benoit et al., 2001)

(continued)

(continued)

Program Name	Age Child	Total Sample (N)	Subsamples (n) = Experiment group (n) = Control group	Pre-test	Post-test	Follow up	Reference Study
29. RFI	3-8 y	18	10 VF 8 TAU (Civic Special Education Institute)	X	X		(Kim & Mahoney, 2005)

Note. No. 1-21 were RCT:s, and no. 22-29 were quasi-experimental studies; Age child = age at program start;
 [-] = data not available; TAU = treatment as usual; 1 = the primary outcome variable was not used in the pre-test.

