| Author, Year and Quality | Outcome | Timepoint  (months) | Group | Baseline | Results at Followup | Between Group Difference |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CBT or Related Interventions** | | | | | | |
| Cooper, 2003135  Good | Adverse outcome, behaviour-management problems, n (%) | 4.5 | IG2 | NR | 13 (32) | IG2 vs. CG: RR 0.83 (95% CI, 0.37 to 1.50), p=0.60\*  IG3 vs. CG: RR 0.91 (95% CI, 0.42 to 1.58), p=0.77\*  IG4 vs. CG: RR 1.21 (95% CI, 0.62 to 1.87), p=0.52\* |
| IG3 | NR | 15 (35) |
| IG4 | NR | 19 (44) |
| CG | NR | 13 (37) |
| Adverse outcome, infant attachment, n (%) | 18 | IG2 | NR | 22 (54) | IG2 vs. CG: RR 1.26 (95% CI, 0.78 to 1.70), p=0.30  IG3 vs. CG: RR 0.96 (95% CI, 0.54 to 1.46), p=0.89  IG4 vs. CG: RR 1.23 (95% CI, 0.76 to 1.68), p=0.86 |
| IG3 | NR | 16 (41) |
| IG4 | NR | 21 (52) |
| CG | NR | 20 (43) |
| Adverse outcome, relationship problems, n (%) | 4.5 | IG2 | NR | 16 (39) | IG2 vs. CG: RR 0.46 (95% CI, 0.20 to 0.81), p=0.002\*  IG3 vs. CG: RR 0.63 (95% CI, 0.32 to 0.97), p=0.03\*  IG4 vs. CG: RR 0.57 (95% CI, 0.28 to 0.92), p=0.01\* |
| IG3 | NR | 23 (53) |
| IG4 | NR | 20 (47) |
| CG | NR | 26 (74) |
| Behavioral Screening Questionnaire score, median (IQR) | 18 | IG2 | NR | 5 (4) | IG2 vs. CG: Chi-square 3.52 (1), p=0.06†  IG3 vs. CG: Chi-square 12.19 (1), p=0.001†  IG4 vs. CG: Chi-square 4.06 (1), p=0.03† |
| IG3 | NR | 4 (3) |
| IG4 | NR | 4 (5) |
| CG | NR | 6 (3) |
| Mental Development Index of Bayley scale, median (IQR) | 18 | IG2 | NR | 116 (24) | IG2 vs. CG: Median Difference 0 (95% CI, -7 to 7), p=NR  IG3 vs. CG: Median Difference -2 (95% CI, -11 to 6), p=NR  IG4 vs. CG: Median Difference 1 (95% CI, -6 to 7), p=NR |
| IG3 | NR | 114 (32) |
| IG4 | NR | 118 (19) |
| CG | NR | 116 (18) |
| Mother-infant interactions, maternal sensitivity, mean difference (95% CI) | 4.5 | IG2 | NR | 0.62 (95% CI, 0.35 to 0.90) | NR |
| IG3 | NR | 0.88 (95% CI, 0.65 to 1.12) |
| IG4 | NR | 0.71 (95% CI, 0.47 to 0.97) |
| CG | NR | 0.94 (95% CI, 0.71 to 1.16) |
| Reporting behaviour-management problems, n (%) | 4.5 | IG2 | 22 (54) | 9 (41) | IG2 vs. CG: % Difference 3 (95% CI, -28 to 34), p=NR  IG3 vs. CG: % Difference -3 (95% CI, -35 to 29), p=NR  IG4 vs. CG: % Difference -24 (95% CI, -54 to 6), p=NR |
| IG3 | 19 (47) | 9 (47) |
| IG4 | 22 (55) | 15 (68) |
| CG | 18 (58) | 8 (44) |
| Reporting relationship problems, n (%) | 4.5 | IG2 | 29 (71) | 12 (41) | IG2 vs. CG: % Difference 42 (95% CI, -18 to 66), p=NR  IG3 vs. CG: % Difference 11 (95% CI, -12 to 34), p=NR  IG4 vs. CG: % Difference 33 (95% CI, 8 to 58), p=NR |
| IG3 | 25 (63) | 18 (72) |
| IG4 | 24 (60) | 12 (50) |
| CG | 23 (74) | 19 (83) |
| **Other Behaviorally-based Interventions** | | | | | | |
| Horowitz, 2001141  Fair | Dyadic Mutuality Code score, mean (SD) | 1.5 | IG | 8.83 (1.76) | 9.73 (1.65) | T-test -3.15 (116), p=0.002 |
| CG | 8.67 (1.64) | 8.77 (1.72) |
| 2.5 | IG | 8.83 (1.76) | 9.55 (1.77) | T-test -2.22 (115), p=0.029 |
| CG | 8.67 (1.64) | 8.80 (1.86) |

\*Adjusted by behavioural management problems prior to treatment.

†Adjusted by social adversity and maternal age.

**Abbreviations:** CBT = cognitive behavioral therapy; CG = control group; CI = confidence interval; IG = intervention group; IQR = interquartile range; NR = not reported; OR = odds ratio; RR = relative risk; SD = standard deviation; vs = versus.