The efficacy of psychological interventions for child and adolescent PTSD: a network meta-analysis

Thole H. Hoppen*[1], Ph.D., Lena Wessarges[1], B.Sc., Marvin Jehn[1], M.Sc., Julian Mutz[2], Ph.D., Ahlke Kip[1], Ph.D., Pascal Schlechter, Ph.D. [1], Richard Meiser-Stedman[3], Ph.D., & Nexhmedin Morina[1], Ph.D.

[1]Institute of Psychology, University of Münster, Münster, Germany

[2]Social, Genetic and Developmental Psychiatry Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology & Neuroscience, King's College London, London, United Kingdom

[3]Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychological Therapies, Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, United Kingdom

Short Title: Efficacy of psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD

*Corresponding Author
Thole H. Hoppen, Ph.D.
Institute of Psychology
University of Münster
Fliednerstr. 21
48149 Münster
Germany
Tel: +492518339415
Fax: +492518331331
e-Mail: thoppen@uni-muenster.de

Abstract

Pediatric post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is a common and debilitating mental disorder and its effective treatment constitutes a health priority. Numerous randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have examined the efficacy of psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD. Yet, a comprehensive network meta-analysis (NMA) is lacking. The present work addresses this gap. A total of 67 RCTs met the inclusion criteria comprising 5,297 children and adolescents with full or sub-threshold PTSD. Five families of intervention were evaluated: trauma-focused cognitive behavior therapy (TF-CBT), eye movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR), other trauma-focused interventions, non-trauma-focused (non-TF) interventions, and multi-disciplinary treatments (MDTs). Most RCTs (73%) examined TF-CBT followed by EMDR. Other trauma-focused interventions had too few trials for analysis. At treatment endpoint, TF-CBT, EMDR, MDTs, and non-TF interventions were all effective in treating pediatric PTSD when compared to passive control conditions in random-effect NMA with large pooled effects (all Hedges' *gs* ≥ 0.84, all *ps* < .001). TF-CBT, EMDR, and MDTs also yielded significant short-term treatment effects compared to active control conditions. In a sensitivity analysis including only high-quality trials, only TF-CBT and EMDR outperformed active control conditions. And in a sensitivity analysis including only trials with ≥ 50% of participants reporting multiple-event-related PTSD, only TF-CBT yielded significant short-term effects. Results for mid-term (up to 5 months posttreatment) and long-term efficacy (beyond 5 months posttreatment) were very similar. TF-CBT consistently yielded the highest treatment effects except being second to EMDR at mid-term. The present NMA is the most comprehensive NMA of psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD to date. Results confirm that TF-CBT can effectively treat PTSD in children and adolescents both in the short and long-term and also for multiple-event-related PTSD. More long-term data and multiple-event-related PTSD data are needed for EMDR, MDTs, and non-TF interventions to draw firmer conclusions regarding their efficacy. Results for TF-CBT are encouraging for clinical practice and may help to reduce common treatment barriers.

Keywords: PTSD, child, adolescent, youth, psychotherapy, network meta-analysis

Most children and adolescents experience at least one potentially traumatic event before reaching adulthood[1-3]. Even in countries not affected by war, between one to two thirds of the general child and adolescent population report exposure to at least one traumatic event[4,5]. While most of them remain resilient to trauma and do not develop long-lasting mental health consquences[6], between one-sixth and one-fourth of traumatized children and adolescents develop post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) as a result[4,7]. Risk is amplified for girls[7] and those experiencing interpersonal (vs. non-interpersonal) trauma[4,8] or a higher number and severity of traumatic events[9]. PTSD in children and adolescents – often referred to as *pediatric PTSD* – is a common, impairing[4], and often chronic[10] mental disorder characterized by vivid re-experiencing of the trauma (e.g., intrusions or nightmares), avoidance of trauma-related situations, thoughts, and emotions, lasting changes in cognitions (e.g., self-blame) and emotions (e.g., shame), as well as hyperarousal symptoms (e.g., hypervigilance)[11]. Given its high prevalence and chronicity, pediatric PTSD, if left untreated, is a substantial burden to the individual and society[12-15]. Particularly during sensitive developmental periods in childhood and adolescence, unaddressed PTSD can disrupt crucial developmental processes[16]. This underscores the critical importance of implementing effective treatment approaches and guidelines to mitigate adverse effects and impaired development caused by PTSD.

In the past four decades, numerous of psychological interventions targeting pediatric PTSD have been developed and investigated in randomized controlled trials (RCTs)[17]. International treatment guidelines for pediatric PTSD list trauma-focused cognitive behavior therapy (TF-CBT) as the first-line recommendation for the treatment of pediatric PTSD[18-23]. TF-CBT – in the present work – refers to all interventions based on cognitive behavior therapy (CBT) principles with a direct trauma focus in treatment (e.g., prolonged exposure therapy[24], cognitive processing therapy[25]). High efficacy of TF-CBT for the treatment of

pediatric PTSD has been reported in multiple pairwise and network meta-analyses[17,26-30]. Also other psychological interventions have been developed and examined and these can be categorized into the following four families of interventions: eye movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR), other trauma-focused interventions (i.e., interventions that explicitly address trauma during the treatment but are not based on CBT or EMDR), non-trauma-focused interventions (non-TF; i.e., interventions that do not address traumatic experiences during the treatment), and multi-disciplinary treatments (MDTs, i.e., interventions that combine techniques from two or more theoretical approaches). However, these four families have produced a) fewer RCTs than TF-CBT and b) lower or less certain efficacy in meta-analyses of RCTs, which is why they are either recommended as second-line treatments (such as EMDR) or not listed in international treatment guidelines. Recent RCTs (i.e., 19 RCTs published since 2019)[25,31-48] require a new analysis of treatment efficacy of interventions for pediatric PTSD.

Whilst pairwise meta-analyses are restricted to direct treatment comparisons (i.e., comparison of arms within a given RCT), NMAs allow integrating data from both direct comparisons and indirect treatment comparisons (i.e., comparisons of arms across RCTs), providing estimates of the relative effect of any given pair of interventions in a given network[49]. Numerous pairwise and NMAs of psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD have been published, yat all of these omitted the following three aspects. First, a comprehensive summary of the field is lacking. Most previous work solely focused on a particular family of interventions for pediatric PTSD such as TF-CBT[26,50-54], group-based interventions[55], interventions with caregiver involvement[56], on a specific population such as refugees[57], children and adolescents in low and middle-income countries[29,58,59] or adolescents with interpersonal trauma-related PTSD[60], or on short-term efficacy only[28]. To this date, only one published NMA[27] comprehensively summarized the literature across interventions and

populations and included both short-term and long-term efficacy (up to 12 months posttreatment). However, this NMA[27] can be considered outdated given that the literature search was conducted in December 2020 and yielded 56 RCTs, compared to 67 RCTs included in the present work. The present work also did not have a restriction with regards to long-term follow-up assessments (up to 24 months posttreatment). Second, no previous NMA included a sensitivity analysis that quantitatively tested whether efficacy estimates might be biased by trials with low quality, despite the fact that treatment efficacy of psychological interventions has been overestimated in some fields due to including low quality evidence in meta-analytic synthesis (e.g., field of adult depression[61]). Third, no previous NMA performed sensitivity analyses concerning multiple-event-related PTSD. Rather, all previous work has analyzed efficacy across samples irrespective of whether most participants had a single or a multiple trauma history. It is crucial for clinical practice to determine whether treatment efficacy varies in RCTs in which most participants have experienced multiple (rather than single) traumatic events given that clinicians are often reluctant to address trauma, particularly in children and adolescents with multiple-event-related PTSD who are often perceived as particularly vulnerable[62]. In addition to clinicians, also patients and their caregivers must be well-informed about evidence-based approaches to treating multiple-event-related PTSD. The present work addresses all three omissions. That is, the present work a) comprehensively summarizes the short-, mid-, and long-term efficacy of all psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD, b) includes a sensitivity analysis on high-quality trials only, and c) includes a sensitivity analysis on multiple-trauma trials only.

Methods

This NMA was conducted and reported in line with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) 2015 guidelines for NMAs[63]. Each step,

including the systematic literature search, data extraction, and quality ratings, were carried out independently by at least two authors. Results were systematically compared and disagreements were discussed between these two authors and in complicated cases amongst at least three of the authors (THH, LW, AK, & NM). In case of missing data, we sent a data request e-mail to corresponding authors and – in case of no response – a reminder a month later. We obtained data for all eligible trials and thus included all trials in the NMAs. The objectives and methods of the present NMA were defined a priori and pre-registered in the PROSPERO database (ID: CRD42020206290). We defined the main research question in line with the recommended format (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome, and Study; PICOS) as follows: In children and adolescents with full or subthreshold PTSD (P), how do psychological interventions (I), compared to either passive control conditions, active control conditions, or amongst different families of interventions (C), perform in terms of lowering PTSD symptom severity (O) in randomized controlled trials (S)?

Identification and Selection of Studies

Search Strategy

For the timespan from inception to April 21st 2022, we relied on the literature search of our previous work[17], which included 57 eligible RCTs. To identify RCTs published thereafter, we conducted a new search, which was conducted on April 18th 2023 and covered the timespan from January 1st 2022 to April 18th 2023. The overlap between searches was intentional to not miss relevant studies. THH and LW independently carried out the systematic literature search and results were compared after each step (e.g., title and abstract screening, full-text eligibility check). See Appendix A in the online supplementary material for the full search strategy. In brief, we searched four large bibliometric health sciences databases: PsycINFO and MEDLINE through a combined search via EBSCOhost, Web of

Science, and PTSDpubs. We searched for relevant RCTs by means of various search terms for PTSD (ptsd OR ptss OR post-traumatic stress OR posttraumatic stress OR post-traumatic syndrome OR posttraumatic syndrome) and treatment (treatment* OR intervention* OR therap* OR psychotherap* OR exposure OR counse*ing OR trial*) in all-field searches. In line with our previous literature search, no restrictions were applied to languages or publication formats. We also searched two further sources for eligible RCTs: 1) 71 reviews fully or at least partly focusing on psychological treatment of pediatric PTSD (see Appendix B for their references) and 2) the reference lists of included trials.

Eligibility Criteria

In line with our previous work[17], we included trials that met all of the following inclusion criteria: 1) RCT, 2) investigating the efficacy of a psychological intervention for pediatric PTSD compared to either a passive control condition, an active control condition, or to another psychological intervention from a different treatment family, 3) PTSD or sub-threshold PTSD was the primary treatment target, 4) mean age of sample less than 19 years, 5) at least ten participants per arm have outcome data reported, and 6) PTSD was assessed at least once post-intervention with a PTSD-specific outcome measure (i.e., clinician-administered or self-report measure) based on diagnostic criteria reported in any iteration of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM[11]) or the International Statistical Classifications of Diseases (ICD[64]). In line with inclusion criterion 3), we excluded transdiagnostic approches[65] and school-based interventions with partly preventive focus[66] (i.e., partially including participants without PTSD complaints). The age threshold was set at below 19 years rather than 18 years given that some trials applied developmentally adapted approaches and involved sample with a mean age of just above 18 years[25].

Quality Assessment

Risk of bias was independently assessed by two authors (THH & NM) by means of eight dichotomously scored quality criteria reported by Cuijpers et al.[61]. These eight criteria originated partly from the Cochrane Collaboration criteria[67] as well as authoritative criteria for evidence-based psychological interventions[68] and were applied as follows (i.e., a positive score was given when a criterion was met): 1) 100% of the included participants were diagnosed with PTSD at baseline which was assessed with an interview-based/clinician-administered diagnostic measure, 2) a specific (and identifiable) treatment manual was followed, 3) study therapists were trained to apply this specific treatment manual, 4) treatment integrity of study therapists with regards to this treatment manual was formally checked (e.g., formal fidelity ratings), 5) intention-to-treat (ITT) data (i.e., means, SDs, and ns) were reported to allow meta-analysis of ITT data, 6) large trial ($n_1 + n_2 \geq 50$), 7) random group allocation was performed by an independent party or computerized, and 8) PTSD outcomes post-intervention were assessed either by blinded interviewers (for clinician-based measures) or via self-report (for self-report measures). When insufficient information was reported with regards to a given quality criterion, this given criterion was scored conservatively (i.e., score of zero = not meeting this criterion). Possible quality sum scores ranged from 0 to 8. Note that the score for criterion 6 may differ a) between comparison dyads for multi-arm trials and b) between timepoints (i.e., attrition in completer data). Initial agreement between independent raters was good (91.27% of all ratings). In the present study, RCTs were defined as high-quality trials (i.e., with low risk of bias) when fulfilling at least six of the eight quality criteria. An overview of the quality criteria and their scoring is presented in Appendix C and quality ratings per trial (including the categorization of high-quality trials) are presented in Appendix D.

Data Extraction

Trial characteristics (e.g., country of conduct, specific psychological intervention applied and category/family of interventions, number of treatment sessions applied, treatment delivery format, specific control condition and category of control condition, and risk of bias), sample characteristics (e.g., mean age, percentage females, trauma type(s), and percentage of participants with PTSD relating to one vs. two or more traumatic events), and PTSD outcome data (i.e., PTSD symptom severity means, standard deviations, and sample sizes per arm at a given assessment timepoint to calculate standardized between-group effect sizes) were extracted by at least two authors (THH, LW, AK, & NM). When ITT and completer data concerning PTSD symptom severity were reported, the former was prioritized. Similarly, when PTSD outcomes were assessed via both a clinician-based measure as well as a self-report measure, the former was prioritized. If a trial included two or more arms from the same intervention family (e.g., multiple TF-CBT arms[69]), the primary intervention arm (e.g., primary TF-CBT arm) as indicated by the authors of the original work was prioritized.

Categorization of Psychological Interventions and Control Conditions

The present study compared four families of psychological interventions: 1) TF-CBT, 2) EMDR, 3) non-TF interventions, and 4) MDTs. Initially, we planned to also analyze other trauma-focused interventions (i.e., interventions with a trauma focus but not belonging to TF-CBT or EMDR), which was not feasible given that the evidence base was too thin. Control conditions were divided into passive control conditions (e.g., wait-list control) and active control conditions (e.g., treatment-as-usual). An overview of all categorizations is depicted in Appendix E.

Categorization of Assessment Timepoints

To evaluate the short, mid, and long-term efficacy of psychological interventions and in line with previous research[70], we distinguished between three assessment timepoints: 1) *post-treatment*, which we defined as assessments at treatment endpoint and which served as an estimate of short-term efficacy, 2) *follow-up 1* (FU1), which we defined as assessments of up to or equal to five months after the treatment endpoint and which served as an estimate of mid-term efficacy, and 3) *follow-up 2* (FU2), which we defined as assessments longer than five months after the treatment endpoint and which served as an estimate of long-term efficacy. When several assessments fell into the FU1 and FU2 categories, the longest assessment was chosen.

Outcomes

The primary outcome of interest was the standardized mean differences (Hedges' *g*[71]) in PTSD symptom severity between comparator groups.

Statistical Analysis

NMAs allow for an estimation of the relative effectiveness of all interventions in a given network, synthesizing evidence across all available RCTs. This is done by including both direct comparisons (i.e., comparisons between two arms in a given RCT) and indirect comparisons (i.e., comparisons arms between RCTs). In light of the high heterogeneity in both included interventions and samples, random effects NMAs were conducted[71]. For all analyses, the applied level of statistical significance was set at $\alpha = .05$. Data processing and statistical analyses were performed in R (version 4.1.1[72]) with the netmeta package[73]. Effect sizes (Hedges' *g*) were first calculated at the study-level[74] and then pooled and compared between all comparison dyads in NMA[71]. Following Cohen's convention[75], NMA-pooled *gs*

were interpreted as small (0.20), medium (0.50), and large effects (0.80). We only included psychological intervention families with minimally sufficient evidence base (i.e., total number of direct comparisons *kes* ≥ 4[76]) to ensure that effects were also estimated via a sufficient number of direct comparisons (i.e., effects not solely based on indirect comparisons[77]). In the present work, *k* denotes the number of independent RCTs, whereas *kes* denotes the number of direct comparisons, which may differ in the light of multi-arm trials.

For valid inferences of NMAs transitivity[77] is assumed. That is, the relative efficacy of any given comparison dyad needs to be exchangeable regardless of whether it was derived from direct or indirect comparisons. For this to hold true, a similar distribution of sample and methodological characteristics across comparison dyads is needed. To test whether the transitivity assumption was met, we checked whether the distribution of basic sample characteristics (e.g., mean age, percentage females), clinical sample characteristics (e.g., percentage of total sample meeting full diagnostic criteria for PTSD) and trial characteristics (e.g., trial quality, applied treatment format) was similar across comparison dyads in the networks. To check for (in)consistency[77] in the global network[63,78] and per comparison dyad (i.e., local consistency), we performed the net splitting procedure[79] and examined net heat plots[80]. Whenever the net splitting procedure detected significant inconsistencies, we performed corrected analyses. Further, we calculated outlier-adjusted NMAs whenever (≥ 1) outliers were detected. We defined statistical outliers as direct comparison effect sizes of at least 3.3 standard deviations above or below the pooled g[81]. To check for potential influence of small-study effects, we performed Egger's test[82] and inspected funnel plots. We calculated the I^2 and τ^2 statistics as estimates of overall heterogeneity[83]. We further calculated Q_{het} and Q_{inc} as estimates of heterogeneity within and between comparison dyads, respectively[84]. We also calculated surface under the cumulative ranking (SUCRA) rankings, which allow for a ranking of interventions and control conditions based on their efficacy estimates. We

performed 50,000 resamples for all SUCRA analyses. Lastly, we performed the following two sensitivity NMAs: 1) NMA including only high-quality trials (as done in previous NMA in the field of adult PTSD[70]) and 2) NMA including only multiple-trauma trials (as done in a previous pairwise meta-analysis in the field of pediatric PTSD[17]). In the present study, the term *multiple-trauma trial* refers to trials involving a majority of participants (i.e., at least 50% of the total sample reported) with multiple-event-related PTSD (i.e., PTSD relating to two or more traumatic events)[17,76].

Results

Study Selection Process

The new search wave covered 8,845 electronic records and yielded ten additional eligible RCTs. Combined with the 57 previously identified RCTs[17], the present study summarizes data from 67 independent RCTs. Figure 1 shows a detailed overview of the study synthesis process.

- Figure 1 about here -

Study Characteristics

An overview of the characteristics of included trials is presented in Appendix F and their references are given in Appendix G. Apart for one dissertation[85], all RCTs were published in peer-reviewed journals. Most RCTs (40 of 67 RCTs, 60%) were conducted in high-income countries and the rest (27 of 67 RCTs, 40%) were conducted in low and middle-income countries. The 67 RCTs included 5,297 children and adolescents in total (*ns* of first assessment after treatment termination added up), 66% of whom were females. Nine RCTs

(13%) included only female participants and four RCTs (6%) included only male participants. In total, 2,667 children and adolescents were randomized to psychological interventions and 2,630 to control conditions. The unweighted mean age across trials was 12.56 years. Across included trials, 85% of the participants met diagnostic criteria for PTSD at the baseline assessment. In 44 RCTs (67% of included RCTs), the majority of participants reported multiple-event-related PTSD and the given trial was therefore categorized as multiple-trauma trial (see Appendix F for this categorization). Psychological interventions comprised an average of 10 sessions (*SD* = 5 sessions) with a mean total duration of 657 minutes (*SD* = 383 minutes). A little less than half of the RCTs (30 of 67 RCTs, 45%) involved parents or primary caregivers in the treatment sessions. A little more than half of the trials (38 of 67 RCTs, 57%) assessed follow-up data, with follow-up assessment timepoints ranging from one month to 24 months post-treatment. ITT data concerning PTSD outcomes were reported in most trials RCTs (44 of 67 RCTs, 66%).

Network Meta-analyses of Short, Mid, and Long-term Efficacy

Assumption Checks

Assumptions were mostly met. In all but one analysis, no significant inconsistencies were observed. In the NMA on mid-term efficacy, significant inconsistency was found for MDTs and a corrected analysis (i.e., without MDTs) was performed. The transitivity assumption was met. The distribution of sample and methodological characteristics across comparison dyads is presented in Table 1. No outliers were found, with one exception. In the NMA on short-term efficacy, one outlier (concerning TF-CBT) was found and an outlier-adjusted analysis was performed.

Network Graphs

Figure 2 shows the network graphs for the NMAs on short-term efficacy, mid-term efficacy, and long-term efficacy. Most available trials assessed TF-CBT. Only TF-CBT had enough accumulated evidence to be analyzed across timepoints (i.e., short, mid, and long-term efficacy NMAs). The network graphs for the outlier-adjusted and sensitivity analyses concerning short-term efficacy are provided in Appendix H. An inconsistency-adjusted network graph (with MDTs deleted) for mid-term efficacy is presented in Appendix I. Network graphs for the NMA on mid-term and long-term efficacy are presented in Appendix J and K, respectively.

- Figure 2 and Table 1 about here -

Network Meta-analysis of Short-term Efficacy

Table 2 provides an overview of the results concerning the short-term efficacy, including the results of the sensitivity analyses. Forest plots for all analyses across timepoints are presented in the Appendices in the online supplementary material. Too few trials were available to include the other trauma-focused interventions category in any NMA. In the short-term, all four therapy families with at least four direct comparisons – TF-CBT, EMDR, MDTs, and non-TF interventions – were efficacious in treating pediatric PTSD compared to passive control conditions with standardized mean differences ranging from $g = 0.84$ for non-TF interventions to $g = 1.08$ for TF-CBT (Appendix L). Compared to active control conditions, only TF-CBT ($g = 0.56$, $p < .001$) and MDTs ($g = 0.40$, $p = .027$) were efficacious in treating PTSD in the short-term with a moderate and small effect size, respectively (Appendix M). Differences in efficacy between treatment families were not statistically significant in any of the analyses, with few or no direct comparisons for most comparison dyads. Heterogeneity in this main analysis of the short-term efficacy was large

within as well as between comparison dyads ($\tau^2 = 0.18$, $I^2 = 73.90\%$; $Q_{\text{total}} = 233.45$, $df = 61$, $p < .001$; $Q_{het} = 209.28$, $df = 50$, $p < .001$; $Q_{inc} = 23.06$, $df = 11$, $p = .017$). There was high consistency between direct and indirect comparisons for almost all comparison dyads (Appendix N). No significant inconsistencies were detected in the network splitting procedure. Further, no evidence for significant small-study effects was found in the funnel plot (Appendix O including the results of the Egger's test). One outlier[86] investigating group TF-CBT delivered in a sample of former male child soldiers in the DR Congo was detected with an very large effect size ($g = 2.71$) and an outlier-adjusted analysis excluding this trial produced very similar results (Appendix P).

Sensitivity Analyses.

All results of the sensitivity analyses are presented in Table 2. In the sensitivity analysis of high-quality trials only, the results compared to passive control conditions were confirmed with effect sizes ranging from $g = 0.85$ for non-TF interventions to $g = 1.05$ for TF-CBT (Appendix Q). Compared to active control conditions in high-quality trials, however, only TF-CBT ($g = 0.53$, $p < .001$) and EMDR ($g = 0.43$, $p = .046$) produced significant (moderate-sized) short-term efficacy. In contrast to the results when also lower quality trials were included, MDTs now did not yield significant short-term efficacy, and neither did non-TF interventions (Appendix R). In the sensitivity analysis of multiple--event-related PTSD, only TF-CBT and MDTs had sufficient trials available. Both TF-CBT ($g = 1.24$, $p < .001$) and MDTs ($g = 1.00$, $p < .001$) yielded (large-sized) significant short-term efficacy compared to passive control conditions (Appendix S). Compared to active control conditions in multiple-trauma trials, only TF-CBT yielded significant (moderate-sized) treatment efficacy ($g = 0.56$, $p < .001$), whereas MDTs did not produce significant short-term effects (Appendix T).

- Table 2 about here -

Network Meta-analyses of Mid and Long-term Efficacy

See Table 3 for an overview of all mid and long-term efficacy results, including the results of the sensitivity analyses. For non-TF interventions, there were too few direct comparisons available. In the mid-term up to 5 months posttreatment, TF-CBT, EMDR, and MDTs were effective in treating pediatric PTSD as compared to passive control conditions with *gs* ranging from 0.71 for MDTs to 0.94 for EMDR (Appendix U). Compared to active control conditions, only EMDR (g = 0.51, p = .040) and TF-CBT (g = 0.44, p = .003) produced significant (moderate-sized) mid-term efficacy, whereas MDTs was not found efficacious (Appendix V). Heterogeneity in this main analysis concerning mid-term efficacy was large within as well as between comparison dyads (τ^2 = 0.15, I^2 = 67.10%; Q_{total} = 69.88, df = 23, p < .001; Q_{het} = 45.56, df = 14, p < .001; Q_{inc} = 25.45, df = 9, p = .003). There was high consistency between direct and indirect comparisons for nearly all comparison dyads, as illustrated in the net heat graph (Appendix W). However, significant inconsistency was detected for MDTs in the network splitting procedure. Results remained very similar after the exclusion of MDTs from the analysis (Appendices X & Y). There was no evidence for significant small-study effects in the funnel plot (Appendix Z including the results of the Egger's test).

In the long-term, between 6 to 24 months posttreatment, only TF-CBT and non-TF interventions had sufficient evidence for synthesis. Compared to passive control conditions, both TF-CBT (g = 0.75, p = .002) and non-TF interventions (g = 0.74, p = .008) were efficacious in the long-term with moderate-to-large effect sizes (Appendix AA). Compared to

active control conditions, both TF-CBT (g = 0.55, p < .001) and non-TF interventions (g = 0.53, p = .007) were efficacious with moderate effect sizes (Appendix AB). Heterogeneity in this main analysis concerning long-term efficacy was large within as well as between comparison dyads (τ^2 = 0.10, I^2 = 64.80%; Q_{total} = 42.58, df = 15, p = .002; Q_{het} = 31.32, df = 10, p = .005; Q_{inc} = 11.30, df = 5, p = .046). There was high consistency between direct and indirect comparisons for all comparison dyads as illustrated in the net heat graph (Appendix AC). No significant inconsistencies were found in the network splitting procedure. There was no evidence for significant small-study effects in the funnel plot (Appendix AD including the results of the Egger's test).

Sensitivity Analyses.

Sensitivity analysis on high-quality trials at mid-term could be conducted with TF-CBT and EMDR only. Both EMDR (g = 1.15, p < .001) and TF-CBT (g = 1.06, p < .001) produced large treatment effects compared to passive control conditions (Appendix AE). Compared to active control conditions in high-quality trials, however, only TF-CBT (g = 0.33, p = .029) produced a significant effect (Appendix AF). With respect to multiple-trauma trials at mid-term, sensitivity analysis could be conducted only for TF-CBT and MDTs and evidence for MDTs was mostly from lower quality trials. Compared to passive control conditions, TF-CBT produced a large pooled treatment effect across multiple-trauma trials (g = 0.84, p < .001) and MDTs a moderate-sized pooled effect (g = 0.67, p = .027, Appendix AG). Compared to active control conditions, only TF-CBT yielded significant mid-term efficacy in lowering multiple-event-related PTSD with a moderate-sized pooled effect (g = 0.56, p < .001, Appendix AH).

In terms of long-term efficacy, only TF-CBT and non-TF interventions had a sufficient number of accumulated trials. Compared to active control conditions, only TF-CBT

produced a significant moderate-sized treatment effect ($g = 0.53$, $p < .001$) in high-quality trials (Appendix AI). Compared to passive control conditions, both TF-CBT ($g = 0.74$, $p = .004$) and non-TF interventions ($g = 0.71$, $p = .019$) produced a moderate-to-large pooled treatment effects in multiple-trauam trials (Appendix AJ). Compared to active control conditions, only TF-CBT ($g = 0.45$, $p = .004$) produced a significant long-term effect in multiple-trauma trials (Appendix AK).

- Table 3 about here -

Ranking of Efficacy

See Table 4 for all SUCRA rankings. TF-CBT was the highest ranking psychological intervention at all timepoints in both the main analyses and sensitivity analyses, except at mid-term when it was second to EMDR.

- Table 4 about here -

Discussion

In this network meta-analysis, we synthesized the findings of 67 RCTs on the efficacy of psychological interventions for PTSD in children and adolescents. The present review extends previous NMAs[27,28] and conventional meta-analyses[26,30,53,60,87] in the field. With 67 RCTs on pediatric PTSD, the present NMA is by far the largest to date. The main finding is that TF-CBT is currently the most evaluated and most effective treatment for PTSD in children and adolescents, followed by (in this order) EMDR, MDTs and non-TF intervention. This result supports the recommendations of international treatment guidelines, such as the

recommendations by the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies[22], the World Health Organization[19], the UK National Institute of Clinical Excellence (NICE)[21], the World Federation of Societies of Biological Psychiatry[18], the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry[20], or the Australian National Health and Research[23] for the treatment of PTSD in children and adolescents. Notably, the effectiveness of TF-CBT was robust across different comparison groups (passive and active control conditions), across timepoints (short, mid, and long-term follow-up), and when restricting analyses to high-quality trials or multiple-trauma trials. These results are important for the training of therapist as well as for implementation of treatment in clinical practice. The findings regarding the treatment efficacy of TF-CBT for children and adolescents with a history of multiple traumatic events should be taught in therapist training, helping therapists to overcome fears about applying a trauma-focused treatment approach when working with individuals with a multiple-trauma history[62]. This challenge may be particularly pronounced when working with children and adolescents, who are often seen as especially vulnerable. Based on our robust evidence, training programs can equip therapists to confidently guide their patients through trauma-focused interventions. Further, young people themselves may also harbor fears and reservations about engaging in trauma-focused therapy. Addressing these concerns from an empirically informed perspective within the therapeutic relationship is crucial for mitigating barriers to treatment implementation.

The present review, however, also details remaining gaps in the literature. Data on EMDR, MDTs, and non-TF interventions are emerging, but many analyses of these interventions were not possible due to a paucity of available trials. EMDR, while showing promise in several trials with significant treatment effects at short and mid-term follow-up, has not been evaluated sufficiently at long-term follow-up. Further, multiple-trauma trials and trials comparing to active control conditions are also largely lacking for EMDR. There are

also insufficient data on MDTs, non-TF interventions, and other trauma-focused interventions (i.e., not belonging to TF-CBT or EMDR). More long-term follow-up, high-quality, and multiple-event-related PTSD data are needed for all of these families of interventions to draw firmer conclusions about their efficacy. As more RCTs accumulate, more fine-grained (adequately powered) NMAs will become feasible. At present, there is insufficient data to allow a sub-categorization of the heterogeneous umbrella-categories of MDTs, non-TF interventions, and other trauma-focused interventions.

The short and mid-term efficacy of EMDR is supported by the present review. However, our review highlights the lack of evidence in relation to multiple traumatic exposures, long-term follow-up data, as well as comparisons with active control conditions. The present results therefore add credibility to international treatment guidelines[21,23] that list EMDR as second-line treatment recommendation (e.g., recommended when TF-CBT has proven ineffective for an individual or when TF-CBT is not available). The data presented here provide tentative support for other forms of intervention. The preliminary findings for MDTs and non-TF interventions suggests that these interventions may become second-line treatment recommendations in the unforeseeable future. However, more data are needed for that. As long as high-quality data, long-term data, and data from multiple trauma contexts are scarce, one is well-advised to not overstate conclusions regarding the efficacy of these interventions families until sufficient data has accumulated.

Limitations

Three limitations should be noted. First, the categorizations of psychological interventions can be critically scrutinized. Other NMAs in this field such as Mavranezouli et al.'s[28] and Xiang et al.'s[27] decided to analyze comparisons by manuals (e.g., examining prolonged

exposure and cognitive processing therapy separately rather than clustering these as TF-CBT). Clustering different manuals may mask efficacy differences between manuals. However, to date there is no evidence for this notion, but rather evidence to suggest a non-inferiority between different TF-CBT manuals[88,89]. TF-CBT interventions – while being labeled differently in manuals – have substantial overlap in terms of theoretical grounding, assumed underlying mechanisms (e.g., habituation, extinction learning, and reappraisal of trauma-associated maladaptive beliefs), applied techniques (e.g., exposure) and all involve a direct trauma focus during treatment. Notably, other NMAs for common mental disorders have also clustered psychological therapies[90-92] including one in the field of adult PTSD[70]. Second, we found evidence for inconsistency in the NMA regarding the mid-term efficacy data of MDTs. However, an analysis excluding MDTs produced similar results to the main analysis. The third limitation is inherent in the field and concerns the rather slim evidence base with regards to mid and long-term efficacy data for all intervention families apart from TF-CBT. While robust evidence on the mid and long-term efficacy of TF-CBT was found in the main and sensitivity analyses, other families of interventions had either just enough or insufficient evidence available for analysis. More research is needed.

Conclusion

There is robust evidence that PTSD in children and adolescents can be effectively treated by psychological therapies, in particular TF-CBT. A large evidence base on the efficacy of TF-CBT supports efficacy at short, mid, and long-term, in comparison to both passive and active control conditions, in high-quality trials, and in multiple-trauma contexts. A comparably thin evidence base also supports the short and mid-term efficacy of EMDR and to a lesser extent MDTs and non-TF interventions. For these latter three interventions families, more high-quality, long-term, and multiple-trauma context data are needed to draw firmer conclusions regarding their efficacy.

Author contributions
THH and NM conceptualized the present study. THH, LW, MJ, AK, and NM performed (parts of) the literature search and data extractions. THH, LW, MJ, JM, and NM performed (parts of) the statistical analyses. THH, NM, PS, and RM-S discussed the results and implications. THH and RM-S wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors contributed to and have approved the final manuscript.

Conflict of interest
THH, MJ, LW, AK, PC and NM declare no competing interests. JM is funded by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Maudsley Biomedical Research Centre at South London and Maudsley NHS Foundation Trust and King's College London. The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. RM-S occasionally receives payment (from universities and private training providers) for training therapists in the delivery of cognitive therapy for PTSD for children and adolescents; is a co-investigator or chief investigator on four National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR)-funded or Medical Research Council-funded clinical trials of psychological therapies, particularly cognitive therapy for PTSD in children and young people; and was the chair of a steering committee for a trial addressing the online treatment of PTSD in adults. RM-S' institution (University of East Anglia) has received payment through the following research grants: "Addressing the trauma-related distress of young people in care: a randomised feasibility trial across social-care and mental health services" (NIHR RfPB NIHR200586); "Internet-delivered Cognitive Therapy (iCT) for young people with Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)" (MRC DPFS MR/P017355/1); "Supporting services to deliver trauma-focused cognitive behavioural therapy for care-experienced young people: a pilot implementation study", NIHR Applied Research Collaboration West; "Cognitive Behavioural Therapy for the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in youth exposed to multiple traumatic stressors: a phase II randomised controlled trial" (NIHR CDF-2015-08-073). RM-S' institution part owns the intellectual property for an online guided self-help version of cognitive therapy for PTSD for children and young people as a result of RM-S' involvement in one of these trials.

Funding
This research received no specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Ethics statement
All data analyzed were extracted from published journal articles. No new data were created. Ethical approval is not applicable for the present work.

Data and code availability
The data set and the R script to reproduce results are available on request via email to Dr. Thole H. Hoppen (thoppen@uni-muenster.de).

References

1. Danese A, Smith P, Chitsabesan P, Dubicka B. Child and adolescent mental health amidst emergencies and disasters. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2020;216(3):159-162.
2. Copeland WE, Keeler G, Angold A, Costello EJ. Traumatic events and posttraumatic stress in childhood. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2007;64(5):577-584.
3. Saunders BE, Adams ZW. Epidemiology of traumatic experiences in childhood. *Child Adolesc Psychiatr Clin*. 2014;23(2):167-184.
4. Lewis SJ, Arseneault L, Caspi A, et al. The epidemiology of trauma and post-traumatic stress disorder in a representative cohort of young people in England and Wales. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2019;6(3):247-256.
5. McLaughlin KA, Koenen KC, Hill ED, et al. Trauma exposure and posttraumatic stress disorder in a national sample of adolescents. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2013;52(8):815-830. e14.
6. Bonanno GA, Westphal M, Mancini AD. Resilience to loss and potential trauma. *Annu Rev Clin Psychol*. 2011;7:511-535.
7. Alisic E, Zalta AK, van Wesel F, et al. Rates of post-traumatic stress disorder in trauma-exposed children and adolescents: meta-analysis. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2014;204(5):335-340. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.113.131227.
8. Lewis SJ, Koenen KC, Ambler A, et al. Unravelling the contribution of complex trauma to psychopathology and cognitive deficits: a cohort study. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2021;219(2):448-455.
9. Copeland WE, Shanahan L, Hinesley J, et al. Association of childhood trauma exposure with adult psychiatric disorders and functional outcomes. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2018;1(7):e184493-e184493.

10. Widom CS. Posttraumatic stress disorder in abused and neglected children grown up. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1999;156(8):1223-1229.
11. American Psychiatric Association. *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5.* 5. ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Publishing; 2013.
12. Gilbert R, Widom CS, Browne K, Fergusson D, Webb E, Janson S. Burden and consequences of child maltreatment in high-income countries. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9657):68-81.
13. Lansford JE, Dodge KA, Pettit GS, Bates JE, Crozier J, Kaplow J. A 12-year prospective study of the long-term effects of early child physical maltreatment on psychological, behavioral, and academic problems in adolescence. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2002;156(8):824-830.
14. Banyard VL, Williams LM, Siegel JA. The long-term mental health consequences of child sexual abuse: An exploratory study of the impact of multiple traumas in a sample of women. *J Trauma Stress*. 2001;14:697-715.
15. Guiney H, Caspi A, Ambler A, et al. Childhood sexual abuse and pervasive problems across multiple life domains: Findings from a five-decade study. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2024;36(1):219-235.
16. Dahl RE, Allen NB, Wilbrecht L, Suleiman AB. Importance of investing in adolescence from a developmental science perspective. *Nature*. 2018;554(7693):441-450.
17. Hoppen TH, Meiser-Stedman R, Jensen TK, Birkeland MS, Morina N. Efficacy of psychological interventions for post-traumatic stress disorder in children and adolescents exposed to single versus multiple traumas: meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2023;222(5):196-203.
18. Bandelow B, Allgulander C, Baldwin DS, et al. World Federation of Societies of Biological Psychiatry (WFSBP) guidelines for treatment of anxiety, obsessive-compulsive

and posttraumatic stress disorders – Version 3. Part II: OCD and PTSD. *World J Biol Psychiatry*. 2023;24(2):118-134. doi:10.1080/15622975.2022.2086296.

19. World Health Organization. *Guidelines on mental health promotive and preventive interventions for adolescents: helping adolescents thrive*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020.
20. Cohen JA, Issues, The Work Group On Quality, AACAP Work Group on Quality Issues. Practice parameter for the assessment and treatment of children and adolescents with posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2010;49(4):414-430.
21. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Post-traumatic stress disorder (NICE guideline NG116): [B] Evidence reviews for psychological, psychosocial and other non-pharmacological interventions for the treatment of PTSD in children and young people. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng116/resources/posttraumatic-stress-disorder-pdf-66141601777861.
22. Bisson JI, Berliner L, Cloitre M, et al. The international society for traumatic stress studies new guidelines for the prevention and treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder: Methodology and development process. *J Trauma Stress*. 2019;32(4):475-483.
23. Phelps AJ, Lethbridge R, Brennan S, et al. Australian guidelines for the prevention and treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder: Updates in the third edition. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2022;56(3):230-247.
24. Foa EB, McLean CP, Capaldi S, Rosenfield D. Prolonged exposure vs supportive counseling for sexual abuse–related PTSD in adolescent girls: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2013;310(24):2650-2657.
25. Rosner R, Rimane E, Frick U, et al. Effect of developmentally adapted cognitive processing therapy for youth with symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder after

childhood sexual and physical abuse: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2019;76(5):484-491.

26. Huang T, Li H, Tan S, et al. The efficacy and acceptability of exposure therapy for the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder in children and adolescents: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2022;22(1):259.
27. Xiang Y, Cipriani A, Teng T, et al. Comparative efficacy and acceptability of psychotherapies for post-traumatic stress disorder in children and adolescents: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *BMJ Ment Health*. 2021;24(4):153-160.
28. Mavranezouli I, Megnin-Viggars O, Daly C, et al. Research Review: Psychological and psychosocial treatments for children and young people with post-traumatic stress disorder: a network meta-analysis. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2020;61(1):18-29.
29. Alozkan-Sever C, Uppendahl JR, Cuijpers P, et al. Research Review: Psychological and psychosocial interventions for children and adolescents with depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder in low-and middle-income countries–a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2023;64(12):1776-1788.
30. Bastien RJ-B, Jongsma HE, Kabadayi M, Billings J. The effectiveness of psychological interventions for post-traumatic stress disorder in children, adolescents and young adults: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*. 2020;50(10):1598-1612.
31. Auslander W, Edmond T, Foster A, et al. Cognitive behavioral intervention for trauma in adolescent girls in child welfare: A randomized controlled trial. *Child Youth Serv Rev*. 2020;119.
32. Barron I, Freitas F, Bosch CA. Pilot randomized control trial: Efficacy of a group-based psychosocial program for youth with PTSD in the Brazilian favelas. *J Child Adolesc Trauma*. 2021;14(3):335-345.

33. Dorsey S, Lucid L, Martin P, et al. Effectiveness of task-shifted trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy for children who experienced parental death and posttraumatic stress in Kenya and Tanzania: A randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2020;77(5):464-473.
34. Hitchcock C, Goodall B, Wright IM, et al. The early course and treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder in very young children: Diagnostic prevalence and predictors in hospital-attending children and a randomized controlled proof-of-concept trial of trauma-focused cognitive therapy, for 3-to 8-year-olds. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2022;63(1):58-67.
35. Kameoka S, Tanaka E, Yamamoto S, et al. Effectiveness of trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy for Japanese children and adolescents in community settings: A multisite randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*. 2020;11(1):1767987.
36. Meentken MG, van der Mheen M, van Beynum IM, et al. EMDR for children with medically related subthreshold PTSD: Short-term effects on PTSD, blood-injection-injury phobia, depression and sleep. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*. 2020;11(1):1705598.
37. Molero RJ, Jarero I, Givaudan M. Longitudinal multisite randomized controlled trial on the provision of the EMDR-IGTP-OTS to refugee minors in Valencia, Spain. *Am J Appl Psychol*. 2019;8(4):77-88.
38. Peltonen K, Kangaslampi S. Treating children and adolescents with multiple traumas: A randomized clinical trial of narrative exposure therapy. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*. 2019;10(1):1558708.
39. Roque-Lopez S, Llanez-Anaya E, Álvarez-López MJ, et al. Mental health benefits of a 1-week intensive multimodal group program for adolescents with multiple adverse childhood experiences. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2021;122:105349.

40. Rossouw J, Yadin E, Alexander D, Seedat S. Long-term follow-up of a randomised controlled trial of prolonged exposure therapy and supportive counselling for post-traumatic stress disorder in adolescents: A task-shifted intervention. *Psychol Med*. 2022;52(6):1022-1030.
41. Ahmadi SJ, Musavi Z, Samim N, Sadeqi M, Jobson L. Investigating the feasibility, acceptability and efficacy of using modified-written exposure therapy in the aftermath of a terrorist attack on symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder among Afghan adolescent girls. *Front Psychiatry*. 2022;13:826633.
42. Banoğlu K, Korkmazlar Ü. Efficacy of the eye movement desensitization and reprocessing group protocol with children in reducing posttraumatic stress disorder in refugee children. *Eur J Trauma Dissoc*. 2022;6(1):100241.
43. Bidstrup PE, Salem H, Andersen EW, et al. Effects on Pediatric Cancer Survivors: The FAMily-Oriented Support (FAMOS) Randomized Controlled Trial. *J Pediatr Psychol*. 2023;48(1):29-38.
44. El-Khani A, Cartwright K, Maalouf W, et al. Enhancing teaching recovery techniques (TRT) with parenting skills: RCT of TRT+ parenting with trauma-affected Syrian refugees in Lebanon utilising remote training with implications for insecure contexts and Covid-19. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2021;18(16):8652.
45. Espil FM, Balters S, Li R, et al. Cortical activation predicts posttraumatic improvement in youth treated with TF-CBT or CCT. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2022;156:25-35.
46. Kaminer D, Simmons C, Seedat S, et al. Effectiveness of abbreviated trauma-focused cognitive behavioural therapy for South African adolescents: A randomized controlled trial. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*. 2023;14(1):2181602.
47. Li J, Li J, Yuan L, Zhou Y, Zhang W, Qu Z. The acceptability, feasibility, and preliminary effectiveness of group cognitive behavioral therapy for Chinese children with

posttraumatic stress disorder: A pilot randomized controlled trial. *Psychol Trauma*. 2024;16(1):255-264.

48. Li J, Li J, Zhang W, Wang G, Qu Z. Effectiveness of a school-based, lay counselor-delivered cognitive behavioral therapy for Chinese children with posttraumatic stress symptoms: a randomized controlled trial. *Lancet Reg Health West Pac*. 2023;33:100699.
49. Cipriani A, Higgins JPT, Geddes JR, Salanti G. Conceptual and technical challenges in network meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;159(2):130-137.
50. Siehl S, Robjant K, Crombach A. Systematic review and meta-analyses of the long-term efficacy of narrative exposure therapy for adults, children and perpetrators. *Psychother Res*. 2021;31(6):695-710.
51. Thielemann JF, Kasparik B, König J, Unterhitzenberger J, Rosner R. A systematic review and meta-analysis of trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy for children and adolescents. *Child Abuse Negl*. 2022;134:105899.
52. de Haan A, Meiser-Stedman R, Landolt MA, et al. Efficacy and moderators of efficacy of cognitive behavioural therapies with a trauma focus in children and adolescents: an individual participant data meta-analysis of randomised trials. *Lancet Child Adolesc Health*. 2024;8(1):28-39.
53. Grainger L, Thompson Z, Morina N, Hoppen T, Meiser-Stedman R. Associations between therapist factors and treatment efficacy in randomized controlled trials of trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy for children and youth: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Trauma Stress*. 2022;35(5):1405-1419.
54. Xian-Yu C-Y, Deng N-J, Zhang J, et al. Cognitive behavioral therapy for children and adolescents with post-traumatic stress disorder: meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord*. 2022;308:502-511.

55. Davis RS, Meiser-Stedman R, Afzal N, et al. Systematic Review and Meta-analysis: Group-Based Interventions for Treating Posttraumatic Stress Symptoms in Children and Adolescents. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2023;62(11):1217-1232.
56. Szota K, Schulte KL, Christiansen H. Interventions involving caregivers for children and adolescents following traumatic events: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev*. 2023;26(1):17-32.
57. Kip A, Priebe S, Holling H, Morina N. Psychological interventions for posttraumatic stress disorder and depression in refugees: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Psychol Psychother*. 2020;27(4):489-503.
58. Uppendahl JR, Alozkan-Sever C, Cuijpers P, Sijbrandij M. Psychological and psychosocial interventions for PTSD, depression and anxiety among children and adolescents in low-and middle-income countries: A meta-analysis. *Front Psychiatry*. 2020;10:485096.
59. Venturo-Conerly KE, Eisenman D, Wasil AR, Singla DR, Weisz JR. Meta-analysis: the effectiveness of youth psychotherapy interventions in low-and middle-income countries. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2023;62(8):859-873.
60. Peters W, Rice S, Alvarez-Jimenez M, et al. Relative efficacy of psychological interventions following interpersonal trauma on anxiety, depression, substance use, and PTSD symptoms in young people: A meta-analysis. *Early Interv Psychiatry*. 2022;16(11):1175-1184.
61. Cuijpers P, van Straten A, Bohlmeijer E, Hollon SD, Andersson G. The effects of psychotherapy for adult depression are overestimated: a meta-analysis of study quality and effect size. *Psychol Med*. 2010;40(2):211-223. doi:10.1017/S0033291709006114.
62. Finch J, Ford C, Lombardo C, Meiser-Stedman R. A survey of evidence-based practice, training, supervision and clinician confidence relating to post-traumatic stress disorder

(PTSD) therapies in UK child and adolescent mental health professionals. *Eur J Psychotraumatol*. 2020;11(1):1815281.

63. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;162(11):777-784.
64. World Health Organization. *International classification of diseases, eleventh revision (ICD-11)*. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2021.
65. Jeppesen P, Wolf RT, Nielsen SM, et al. Effectiveness of transdiagnostic cognitive-behavioral psychotherapy compared with management as usual for youth with common mental health problems: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2021;78(3):250-260.
66. Tol WA, Komproe IH, Susanty D, Jordans MJD, Macy RD, Jong JT de. School-based mental health intervention for children affected by political violence in Indonesia: a cluster randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2008;300(6):655-662.
67. Higgins JPT, Green S, eds. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.* Repr. with corr. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell; 2009. Cochrane book series.
68. Chambless DL, Hollon SD. Defining empirically supported therapies. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 1998;66(1):7-18. doi:10.1037//0022-006x.66.1.7.
69. Deblinger E, Lippmann J, Steer R. Sexually abused children suffering posttraumatic stress symptoms: Initial treatment outcome findings. *Child Maltreat*. 1996;1(4):310-321.
70. Hoppen TH, Jehn M, Holling H, Mutz J, Kip A, Morina N. The efficacy and acceptability of psychological interventions for adult PTSD: A network and pairwise meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2023;91(8):445-461.
71. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JPT, Rothstein HR. *Introduction to meta-analysis*. John Wiley & Sons; 2011.

72. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. http://www.R-project.org/.

73. *Network meta-analysis using frequentist methods*; 2017.

74. Lipsey MW, Wilson DB. *Practical meta-analysis.* [Nachdr.]. Thousand Oaks, Calif.: SAGE Publ; 2009. Applied social research methods series; 49.

75. Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences.* 2nd ed. Hoboken: Taylor and Francis; 2013. http://gbv.eblib.com/patron/FullRecord.aspx?p=1192162.

76. Hoppen TH, Meiser-Stedman R, Kip A, Birkeland MS, Morina N. The efficacy of psychological interventions for adult post-traumatic stress disorder following exposure to single versus multiple traumatic events: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2024;11(2):112-122.

77. Donegan S, Williamson P, D'Alessandro U, Tudur Smith C. Assessing key assumptions of network meta-analysis: a review of methods. *Res Synth Methods*. 2013;4(4):291-323.

78. *Netmeta: Network meta-analysis using frequentist methods*; 2021.

79. Dias S, Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, Ades AE. Checking consistency in mixed treatment comparison meta-analysis. *Stat Med*. 2010;29(7-8):932-944.

80. Krahn U, Binder H, König J. A graphical tool for locating inconsistency in network meta-analyses. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2013;13(1):1-18.

81. Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. *Using multivariate statistics.* 6. ed., internat. ed. Boston, Mass.: Pearson; 2013. Always learning.

82. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7109):629-634.

83. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-Analysis in Clinical Trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials*. 1986;7:177-188.

84. Cochran WG. The combination of estimates from different experiments. *Biometrics*. 1954;10(1):101-129.

85. Schauer E. *Trauma treatment for children in war: Build-up of an evidence-based large-scale mental health intervention in north-eastern Sri Lanka*. University of Konstanz.

86. McMullen J, O'callaghan P, Shannon C, Black A, Eakin J. Group trauma-focused cognitive-behavioural therapy with former child soldiers and other war-affected boys in the DR Congo: A randomised controlled trial. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry*. 2013;54(11):1231-1241.

87. Hoppen TH, Morina N. Is high-quality of trials associated with lower treatment efficacy? A meta-analysis on the association between study quality and effect sizes of psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2020;78:101855. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2020.101855.

88. King NJ, Tonge BJ, Mullen P, et al. Treating sexually abused children with posttraumatic stress symptoms: A randomized clinical trial. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2000;39(11):1347-1355.

89. Nixon RDV, Sterk J, Pearce A. A randomized trial of cognitive behaviour therapy and cognitive therapy for children with posttraumatic stress disorder following single-incident trauma. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*. 2012;40:327-337.

90. Setkowski K, Palantza C, van Ballegooijen W, et al. Which psychotherapy is most effective and acceptable in the treatment of adults with a (sub) clinical borderline personality disorder? A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*. 2023;53(8):3261-3280.

91. Karyotaki E, Efthimiou O, Miguel C, et al. Internet-based cognitive behavioral therapy for depression: a systematic review and individual patient data network meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2021;78(4):361-371.

92. Cuijpers P, Quero S, Noma H, et al. Psychotherapies for depression: a network meta-analysis covering efficacy, acceptability and long-term outcomes of all main treatment types. *World Psychiatry*. 2021;20(2):283-293.



Figure 1. PRISMA flow chart depicting the study selection process.

Figure 2

Network graphs for main analyses concerning short-term (left), mid-term (middle), and long-term (right) efficacy



Note. ACC = active control conditions (e.g., = treatment-as-usual); EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; MDTs = multi-disciplinary treatments (e.g., bounce back); non-TF-PIs = non-trauma-focused psychological interventions (e.g., non-directive supportive therapy); PCC = passive control conditions (e.g., = waitlist); TF-CBT = trauma-focused cognitive behaviour therapy (e.g., prolonged exposure).
Nodes sizes are proportional to the number of included participants per dyad and the thickness of lines is proportional to the number of direct comparisons.

Table 1

Trial and sample characteristics across comparison dyads

	100% PTSD		*Sample age*		*% females*		*High-income countries*		*High-quality trials*[a]		*Interview-based outcome assessment*		*Individual delivery*[b]		*Treatment length in minutes*[c]		*Parent involvement = yes*		*Multiple trauma trials*[d]	
Comparison	*k*	*%*	*mean*	*SD*	*mean*	*SD*	*k*	*%*	*k*	*%*	*k*	*%*	*k*	*%*	*mean*	*SD*	*k*	*%*	*k*	*%*
TF-CBT vs. PCC	11	55	13.75	3	57.18	30	11	55	12	60	12	60	12	60	733	442	6	30	13	65.00
EMDR vs. PCC	2	28.57	12.24	4	45.08	22	5	71.43	3	42.86	3	42.86	4	57.14	349	86	0	n.a.	3	42.86
non-TF vs. PCC	1	100	n.r.	n.r.	0	0	0	n.a.	0	n.a.	0	n.a.	1	100	300	0	0	n.a.	1	100
MDTs vs. PCC	1	20	11.57	4	54.03	17	3	60	3	60	3	60	1	20	766	404	3	60	5	100
TF-CBT vs. ACC	10	47.62	12.89	3	66.90	21	10	47.62	14	66.67	11	52.38	10	47.62	697	284	9	42.86	15	71.43
EMDR vs. ACC	1	100	9.60	0	33.78	0	1	100	1	100	0	n.a.	1	100	175	0	1	100	1	100
non-TF vs. ACC	0	n.a.	3.45	0	59	0	1	100	1	100	0	n.a.	0	n.a.	525	0	1	100	0	n.a.
MDTs vs. ACC	1	20	14.21	1	83.77	18	3	60	1	20	4	80	2	40	877	596	2	40	5	100
TF-CBT vs. MDTs	1	50	13.89	1	52.44	15	1	50	1	50	2	100	0	n.a.	818	11	2	100	2	100
TF-CBT vs. non-TF	3	33	11.34	2	51.29	22	4	44.44	5	55.56	7	77.78	9	100	606	376	5	55.56	8	88.89
TF-CBT vs. EMDR	0	n.a.	12.02	2	54.67	9	3	100	3	100	2	66.67	3	100	410	269	2	66.67	0	n.a.

Note. ACC = active control conditions (e.g., treatment-as-usual); EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; MDTs = multidisciplinary treatments; n.a. = not applicable; non-TF = non-trauma-focused interventions; n.r. = not reported; TF-CBT = trauma-focused cognitive behavior therapy; PCC = passive control conditions (e.g., waitlist).
[a]Meeting at least six of eight trial quality criteria (see risk of bias assessment).
[b]Treatment delivered individually (i.e., excluding group or mixed formats).
[c]Total treatment length in minutes ([mean] number of sessions multiplied by [mean] session length).
[d]Trials in which at least 50% of the participants had PTSD related to multiple (i.e., two or more) traumatic events.

Table 2

Short-term efficacy of psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD

Reference group	*Psych. interv.*	*kes (N)*	*SMD*	*[95% CI]*	*p*	*I^2 (τ^2)*
Main analysis (i.e., across all data, irrespective of trial quality and trauma history)						
relative to PCC	TF-CBT	17 (1,123)	**1.08**	**[0.86 – 1.30]**	**< .001**	73.90 *** (0.18)
	EMDR	7 (297)	**0.86**	**[0.52 – 1.21]**	**< .001**	
	non-TF	1 (40)	**0.84**	**[0.46 – 1.23]**	**< .001**	
	MDTs	5 (292)	**0.92**	**[0.58 – 1.27]**	**< .001**	
	ACC	1 (22)	**0.52**	**[0.24 – 0.79]**	**< .001**	
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	20 (2,028)	**0.56**	**[0.36 – 0.77]**	**< .001**	
	EMDR	0 (0)	0.34	[-0.07 – 0.76]	.106	
	non-TF	0 (0)	0.32	[-0.06 – 0.71]	.100	
	MDTs	5 (166)	**0.40**	**[0.05 – 0.75]**	**.027**	
relative to EMDR	TF-CBT	3 (185)	0.22	[-0.15 – 0.59]	.245	
	non-TF	0 (0)	-0.02	[-0.51 – 0.47]	.937	
	MDTs	0 (0)	0.06	[-0.41 – 0.53]	.812	
relative to non-TF	TF-CBT	9 (631)	0.24	[-0.09 – 0.56]	.150	
	MDTs	0 (0)	0.08	[-0.39 – 0.55]	.748	
relative to MDTs	TF-CBT	2 (72)	0.16	[-0.18 – 0.51]	.358	
Sensitivity analysis: high quality trials[a] only						
relative to PCC	TF-CBT	10 (882)	**1.05**	**[0.83 – 1.28]**	**< .001**	67.50 *** (0.10)
	EMDR	3 (145)	**0.95**	**[0.57 – 1.34]**	**< .001**	
	non-TF	0 (0)	**0.85**	**[0.42 – 1.27]**	**< .001**	
	MDTs	3 (218)	**0.91**	**[0.54 – 1.28]**	**< .001**	
	ACC	0 (0)	**0.53**	**[0.23 – 0.82]**	**< .001**	
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	13 (1,792)	**0.53**	**[0.33 – 0.72]**	**< .001**	
	EMDR	0 (0)	**0.43**	**[0.01 – 0.85]**	**.046**	
	non-TF	0 (0)	0.32	[-0.09 – 0.73]	.123	
	MDTs	1 (46)	0.38	[-0.03 – 0.80]	.069	
relative to EMDR	TF-CBT	3 (185)	0.10	[-0.28 – 0.48]	.602	
	non-TF	0 (0)	-0.11	[-0.63 – 0.41]	.690	
	MDTs	0 (0)	-0.04	[-0.56 – 0.47]	.868	
relative to non-TF	TF-CBT	5 (322)	0.21	[-0.15 – 0.57]	.263	
	MDTs	0 (0)	0.06	[-0.47 – 0.59]	.817	
relative to MDTs	TF-CBT	1 (50)	0.14	[-0.24 – 0.53]	.468	
Sensitivity analysis: multiple-trauma trials[b] only						
relative to PCC	TF-CBT	8 (561)	**1.24**	**[0.91 – 1.57]**	**< .001**	79.60 *** (0.21)
	MDTs	4 (221)	**1.00**	**[0.59 – 1.41]**	**< .001**	
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	15 (1,738)	**0.56**	**[0.31 – 0.82]**	**< .001**	
	MDTs	5 (166)	0.33	[-0.08 – 0.73]	.112	
relative to non-TF	TF-CBT	8 (593)	0.21	[-0.15 – 0.58]	.252	

Note. ACC = active control conditions (e.g. = treatment-as-usual); EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; kes = number of direct comparisons for the given comparison; MDTs = multidisciplinary treatments; N = total number of participants; non-TF = non-trauma-focused psychological interventions; PCC = passive control conditions (e.g. = waitlist); Psych. interv. = psychological interventions; SMD = standardized mean differences (i.e. = Hedges' g); TF-CBT = trauma-focused cognitive behaviour therapy. **Bold** print highlights statistical significance of findings. A positive (negative) SMD indicates superior (inferior) efficacy of the given psychological intervention relative to the given reference group.

[a]Meeting at least six of eight trial quality criteria (Cuijpers et al., 2010).

[b]Multiple-trauma trials being defined as trials involving ≥ 50% participants with multiple-event-related PTSD (i.e., ≥ 2 traumatic events).

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, corresponding to the respective Q-statistic as a measure of heterogeneity in outcomes.

Table 3

Mid- (top) and long-term (bottom) efficacy of psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD

Reference group	*Psych. interv.*	*kes (N)*	*SMD*	*[95% CI]*	*p*	*I^2 (τ^2)*
Mid-term efficacy (i.e., ≤ 5 months follow-up) - main analysis						
relative to PCC	TF-CBT	8 (367)	**0.87**	**[0.56 – 1.17]**	**< .001**	67.10 *** (0.15)
	EMDR	2 (86)	**0.94**	**[0.47 – 1.42]**	**< .001**	
	MDTs	2 (74)	**0.71**	**[0.20 – 1.22]**	**.007**	
	ACC	2 (74)	**0.43**	**[0.06 – 0.80]**	**.023**	
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	8 (403)	**0.44**	**[0.15 – 0.73]**	**.003**	
	EMDR	1 (74)	**0.51**	**[0.03 – 1.00]**	**.040**	
	MDTs	4 (99)	0.28	[-0.20 – 0.76]	.258	
relative to EMDR	TF-CBT	2 (125)	-0.08	[-0.53 – 0.37]	.732	
	MDTs	0 (0)	-0.24	[-0.87 – 0.40]	.467	
relative to MDTs	TF-CBT	1 (15)	0.16	[-0.35 – 0.66]	.542	
Sensitivity analysis: high quality trials[a] only						
relative to PCC	TF-CBT	4 (223)	**1.06**	**[0.64 – 1.49]**	**< .001**	71.90 *** (0.14)
	EMDR	1 (23)	**1.15**	**[0.56 – 1.75]**	**< .001**	
	ACC	1 (52)	**0.73**	**[0.24 – 1.21]**	**.004**	
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	7 (781)	**0.33**	**[0.03 – 0.63]**	**.029**	
	EMDR	1 (74)	0.43	[-0.08 – 0.94]	.102	
relative to EMDR	TF-CBT	2 (125)	-0.09	[-0.58 – 0.39]	.702	
Sensitivity analysis: multiple trauma trials[b] only						
relative to PCC	TF-CBT	5 (256)	**0.84**	**[0.40 – 1.27]**	**< .001**	74.30 *** (0.21)
	MDTs	2 (74)	**0.67**	**[0.08 – 1.27]**	**.027**	
	ACC	2 (74)	0.35	[-0.16 – 0.86]	.180	
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	5 (582)	**0.49**	**[0.06 – 0.92]**	**.024**	
	MDTs	4 (99)	0.32	[-0.22 – 0.87]	.241	
relative to MDTs	TF-CBT	1 (15)	0.17	[-0.43 – 0.76]	.587	
Long-term efficacy (i.e., > 5 months follow-up) - main analysis						
relative to PCC	TF-CBT	3 (118)	**0.75**	**[0.28 – 1.23]**	**.002**	64.80 *** (0.10)
	non-TF	1 (40)	**0.74**	**[0.20 – 1.29]**	**.008**	
	ACC	1 (51)	0.21	[-0.30 – 0.71]	.426	
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	9 (920)	**0.55**	**[0.30 – 0.79]**	**< .001**	
	non-TF	1 (25)	**0.53**	**[0.14 – 0.93]**	**.007**	
relative to non-TF	TF-CBT	5 (343)	0.01	[-0.32 – 0.35]	.938	
Sensitivity analysis: high quality trials[a] only						
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	8 (887)	**0.53**	**[0.27 – 0.80]**	**< .001**	70.70 *** (0.11)
	non-TF	1 (45)	0.46	[-0.03 – 0.95]	.065	
relative to non-TF	TF-CBT	3 (151)	0.07	[-0.37 – 0.52]	.744	
Sensitivity analysis: multiple-trauma trials[b] only						
relative to PCC	TF-CBT	3 (118)	**0.74**	**[0.24 – 1.23]**	**.004**	69.90 *** (0.11)
	non-TF	1 (40)	**0.71**	**[0.12 – 1.31]**	**.019**	
	ACC	1 (51)	**0.29**	**[-0.26 – 0.83]**	**.303**	
relative to ACC	TF-CBT	7 (796)	**0.45**	**[0.16 – 0.75]**	**.003**	
	non-TF	0 (0)	0.43	[-0.07 – 0.93]	.094	
relative to non-TF	TF-CBT	4 (305)	0.02	[-0.39 – 0.44]	.912	

Note. ACC = active control conditions (e.g. = treatment-as-usual); EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; kes = number of direct comparisons for the given comparison; MDTs = multidisciplinary treatments; N = total number of participants; non-TF = non-trauma-focused psychological interventions; PCC = passive control conditions (e.g. = waitlist); Psych. interv. = psychological interventions; SMD = standardized mean differences (i.e. = Hedges' g); TF-CBT = trauma-focused cognitive behaviour therapy. **Bold** print highlights statistical significance of findings. A positive (negative) SMD indicates superior (inferior) efficacy of the given psychological intervention relative to the given reference group.

[a]Meeting at least six of eight trial quality criteria (Cuijpers et al., 2010).

[b]Multiple-trauma trials being defined as trials involving ≥ 50% participants with multiple-event-related PTSD (i.e., ≥ 2 traumatic events).

*** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05, corresponding to the respective Q-statistic as a measure of heterogeneity in outcomes.

Table 4

Efficacy rankings[a] of psychological interventions for pediatric PTSD vs. control conditions

	$SUCRA_{post-treatment\ all\ data}$	$SUCRA_{post-treatment\ outlier-adjusted\ analysis}$	$SUCRA_{post-treatment\ high-quality\ trials\ only}$	$SUCRA_{post-treatment\ multiple-trauma\ trials\ only}$	$SUCRA_{FU1\ all\ data}$	$SUCRA_{FU1\ MDTs\ deleted\ due\ to\ inconsistency}$	$SUCRA_{FU1-high-quality\ trials\ only}$	$SUCRA_{FU1-multiple-trauma\ trials\ only}$	$SUCRA_{FU2\ all\ data}$	$SUCRA_{FU2-high-quality\ trials\ only}$	$SUCRA_{FU2-multiple-trauma\ trials\ only}$
TF-CBT	0.92	0.91	0.87	0.94	0.78	0.79	0.78	0.90	0.84	0.81	0.85
EMDR	0.60	0.63	0.70	NA	0.85	0.86	0.87	NA	NA	NA	NA
MDTs	0.67	0.70	0.64	0.63	0.59	NA[b]	NA	0.71	NA	NA	NA
Non-TF	0.58	0.55	0.57	0.66	NA	NA	NA	NA	0.82	0.67	0.80
ACC	0.22	0.22	0.23	0.28	0.29	0.34	0.36	0.36	0.26	0.02[c]	0.30
PCC	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.07	NA	0.06

Note. ACC = active control conditions (e.g. = treatment-as-usual); EMDR = eye movement desensitization and reprocessing; FU1 = mid-term efficacy (i.e., assessments ≤ 5 months after treatment determination); FU2 = long-term efficacy (i.e., assessments > 5 months after treatment determination); high-quality trials only = sensitivity-analysis exclusively involving high-quality trials (i.e., trials fulfilling at least six of eight quality criteria); MDTs = multi-disciplinary treatments; multiple-trauma trials only = sensitivity-analysis exclusively involving trials with at least 50% participants with multiple-event-related PTSD (i.e., ≥ 2 traumatic events); NA = not applicable given insufficient accumulated evidence (i.e., kes < 4); Non-TF = non-trauma-focused psychological interventions (i.e., psychological interventions without a trauma focus); PCC = passive control conditions (i.e., waitlist); post-treatment = short-term efficacy(i.e., assessments at treatment endpoint); SUCRA = surface under the cumulative ranking; TF-CBT = trauma-focused cognitive behaviour therapy.

[a]Ranked by means of surface under the cumulative ranking (SUCRA).

[b]Excluded from this analysis given discovered inconsistency.

[c]Reference group for this analysis given lacking trials (k < 4) for PCC.