Efficacy of a parent-child program for 3- to 6-year-old children with stuttering: a retrospective controlled wait-list group study

Nicole E. Neef[a], Imke Niemann[b], Anna Merkel [b], Kristina Anders[b], Katja Hente[b], Johanna Margarete Joisten[a], Alexander Wolff von Gudenberg[b], Christian H. Riedel[a]

[a]Department of Diagnostic and Interventional Neuroradiology, University Medical Center Göttingen, Georg August University, Göttingen, Robert-Koch-Straße 40, 37075 Göttingen, Germany; [b]KST Institut GmbH, Feriendorfstraße 1, 34308 Bad Emstal, Germany; Corresponding author: Nicole Neef, nicole.neef@med.uni-goettingen.de

Abstract

We evaluated the efficacy of Frankini, an early parent-child program that integrates online parent counseling and training with speech restructuring both in-person and in telehealth settings to reduce stuttering severity and enhance interaction styles that support fluency. This retrospective nonrandomized trial included all cases participating in the parent-child program between September 2019 and November 2023. Eligible cases were divided into early and delayed groups by median split to simulate a wait-list-controlled study, matched on key characteristics, differing only in the timing of the first direct intervention. Of the 79 participants, 42 completed the first two modules of the intervention, and 30 completed all modules. The 12-month Frankini intervention consisted of an online module with indirect parental training, followed by two hybrid modules of speech restructuring. The primary outcomes were the Stuttering Severity Index score, parental severity rating and 10-item parent report.

At 9 months post-baseline, the early group showed reduced stuttering severity, while the delayed group showed no change, with a mean difference of -8.33 95%CI [-12.98, -3.68], $p < 0.001$, with $d = -1.14$. By 12 months, both groups showed reductions, and there was no further group difference with -3.37 95%CI [-8.23, 1.50], $p = 0.168$ and $d = -0.48$. Parent ratings mirrored objective measures; that is, they showed a significant reduction after each hybrid module. Early parent-child intervention significantly improved speech fluency in preschoolers and enhanced parents' confidence in managing stuttering, supporting the benefits of starting treatment long before 6 years of age.

Trial Registration: DRKS00034731.

Introduction

Approximately 5% of children experience stuttering, F98.5 (Bloodstein et al., 2021). Overt symptoms include sound and syllable repetitions, sound prolongations, and speech blocks ─ involuntary disruptions that the speaker perceives as a loss of control ─ often resulting in struggle, compensatory behaviors, and a negative impact on life (Tichenor & Yaruss, 2021). Stuttering typically begins in early childhood, with an onset ranging from 2 to 5 years and a mean age of 36 months (Yairi & Ambrose, 2013). Spontaneous remission occurs in 75% of cases within the first 18 months (Reilly et al., 2009; Yairi & Ambrose, 2013), however no marker currently predicts whether stuttering will persist. Despite a high remission rate, 1% of the population continues to stutter throughout life (Yairi & Ambrose, 2013). A recent Cochrane review identified early treatment as the most effective treatment (Sjøstrand et al., 2021), and because of the high neuroplasticity in young children (Neef & Chang, 2024), early interventions are highly desirable. Treatment approaches for preschoolers who stutter are recommended in Germany (Neumann et al., 2017), however, referrals for therapy peak late, at 6 years of age (Sommer et al., 2021), and efficacy studies are rare (Brignell et al., 2021; Sjøstrand et al., 2021), with only one conducted in German preschoolers (Lattermann et al., 2008).

Worldwide, there are three treatment approaches for preschoolers who stutter that have been shown to reduce stuttering and improve communication attitudes in young children: The Lidcombe Program (Harris et al., 2002; Jones et al., 2005; Lattermann et al., 2008; Lewis et al., 2008; Onslow et al., 2003), the Palin Parent-Child Interaction therapy (PCI, Millard et al., 2009, 2018; Preston et al., 2022), and RESTART Demands and Capacities Model (Sonneville-Koedoot et al., 2015). The three approaches are broadly comparable in effectiveness but differ in methodology and focus, offering flexibility for tailoring treatment to the needs of the child and family. The Lidcombe Program is a direct therapy that explicitly focuses on reducing stuttering by reinforcing fluent speech and correcting stuttered speech through verbal contingencies. Parents deliver therapy in everyday speaking situations guided by a trained clinician (Onslow et

al., 1994). Palin PCI and RESTART-DCM are indirect therapies. Palin-PCI (Kelman & Nicholas, 2019) focuses on enhancing parent-child interaction and reducing environmental demands to support fluency, using video analysis, tailored feedback, and collaborative goal-setting with parents. RESTART-DCM (Franken & Laroes, 2021) aims to balance speaking demands with a child's speech capacities by reducing environmental pressure and enhancing fluency skills with active parental involvement. All three approaches require active parental involvement, but the intensity and nature of the role vary. Lidcombe involves structured verbal feedback from parents; and Palin PCI and RESTART-DCM focus on modifying interaction styles and environments rather than targeting stuttering directly.

Here, we assessed the efficacy of Frankini, an early intervention program designed for parents and preschoolers, that combines online parent counseling and training with speech restructuring techniques delivered both in-person and via telehealth. The program aimed to reduce stuttering severity while fostering interaction styles that promote fluent communication (Anders et al., 2023). The program is an adaptation of the Kasseler Stuttering Therapy, a computer-assisted fluency-shaping program developed for adults who stutter (Euler et al., 2009; Wolff-von-Gudenberg & Euler, 2000). Previously, we introduced an adoption of this program for school-aged children (FRANKA, (Euler et al., 2021). The new program, Frankini, combines indirect and direct treatment components across three modules spread over the course of 12 months (Figure 1A). Since spontaneous remission is still possible between the ages of three and six, and the course of stuttering often fluctuates, parents and therapists decide together after each module whether to continue, pause, or end treatment. After Module 1, key indicators for initiating intensive in-person therapy included the level of distress experienced by the child and parents, the severity of stuttering, and the prognosis for its progression.

The following two paragraphs briefly summarize the treatment. Module 1: The parent counseling component addresses stuttering-related topics, such as etiology, symptoms, progression, and prognosis, in online individual and group sessions. Parents exchange

experiences with others, receive guidance on responding to stuttering, discuss it with their child, and share information with their social environment and preschool staff. The goal was to normalize stuttering in an age-appropriate manner and enable children to discuss it if needed. Parents are trained to structure speaking situations, adjust linguistic levels to their children's needs, and practice gentle voice onset techniques. They record speaking activities at home, review them with therapists, and develop routines that serve as speaking role models. Training was conducted through individual and group sessions, supported by software tools. Thus, parents participating in Frankini therapy had access to an online platform during and after treatment. The platform provides resources such as in-depth texts, exercises, video examples, a fluency scale, reflection cards for managing stuttering, session materials, handouts for educators and relatives, and the option to upload practice videos. It also includes tools for practicing soft voice onset with a visualized voice curve.

Modules 2 and 3: If therapy continues after the first module, the second and third modules include four-day in-person phases with up to six parent-child pairs. Children learn to identify stuttering symptoms using symbols and practice soft voice onset techniques through structured exercises both in groups and individually. Parents were present throughout, supporting their children as needed. Exercises focus on gradually increasing linguistic complexity, from single words to sentences, and real-life tasks, such as ordering food. The goal was to provide children with tools to manage stuttering while fostering natural communication. Between and after the in-person phases, parents participated in online individual and group sessions every one to two weeks. They received feedback on their child's speech and their own modeling in uploaded practice videos and adjusted the practice level as needed in consultation with therapists.

Randomized controlled trials of behavioral interventions in neurodevelopmental disorders are notoriously difficult to conduct. Recruiting and retaining families is difficult because of the time-intensive nature of participation, especially for those already burdened by the

disorder. Personalized treatment requires complicated standardization, and the long-term commitment often leads to high dropout rates, affecting study validity. Withholding treatment from the control groups raises ethical concerns, particularly when early intervention is crucial. Additionally, blinding is challenging because parents and clinicians often know if an intervention is active. We present an alternative approach by simulating a waitlist group design through the retrospective allocation of participants into early and delayed groups. Waiting times after registration varied, as parents were assigned to courses based on availability and compatibility with the family's schedule. At nine months post-baseline, the early group had completed a direct treatment module, while the delayed group had not yet started the same module, and an interaction between group and time would indicate an effect of the intervention. Six recordings of speech samples throughout the program allowed for the comparison of objectively quantified stuttering severity at this relative point in time. This study design accounted for maturation processes and spontaneous remission, ensuring that the likelihood of these influences was equally distributed across both groups. Additionally, raters of the stuttering severity assessment were blinded to the time point of recording, reducing bias related to expectations of progress over time.

Our study aimed to evaluate the efficacy of a new hybrid parent-child program for developmental stuttering, which integrates telehealth coaching and group settings. The primary outcomes included objectively measured stuttering severity, parent-reported severity ratings, and coping measures assessed through online surveys that reflect confidence in communication, emotional management, and personal feelings and concerns.

Methods

This study was approved by the Ethical Review Board of the University Medical Center Göttingen and registered at the UMG study center (ID 2024-03288). The study protocol was registered in the German Clinical Trials Register https://www.drks.de/DRKS00034731. The trial

was a retrospective, two-armed, controlled, monocentric trial with a prospective simulated wait-list design.

Participants

All participants referred to the Frankini parent-child program between September 2019 and November 2023 were included. Eligibility required parental consent for repeated assessments (clinical and research), video calls, daily video recordings, and storage and processing of pseudonymized data for treatment evaluation. A systematic sampling plan was not implemented. Of the 79 families, 28 were excluded from this study because of pausing after Module 1, opting for a different therapy, dropping out, joining after Module 1, or the child's illness (Figure 2). Of the 42 children included in the analysis, 10 had very mild stuttering before intervention, 15 had mild stuttering, 16 had moderate, and one had severe stuttering.

Intervention

The program trains parents to manage stuttering, remove taboos, and explain stuttering to their child, while helping children enjoy speaking, develop self-efficacy, and accept and control their speech. The 12-month program consisted of three modules, with parents involved throughout (Figure 1A). Module 1 is delivered online, focusing indirectly on the child and primarily on the counseling parent on stuttering management. Modules 2 and 3 included a four-day in-person phase with direct child engagement followed by online sessions for continued support. Children learn to identify and manage stuttering symptoms through playful exercises, slow and soft speech initiation with a relaxed onset of phonation, and practice fluency shaping with the flunatic.mini software adopted from Flunatic (Euler et al., 2009). Parents participate in ongoing online sessions for feedback and individualized adjustments, emphasizing fun in speaking. Given the possibility of spontaneous remission, parents and therapists collaboratively

decide after each module whether to continue, pause, or end treatment based on distress level, stuttering severity, and prognosis.

Simulated wait-list design

The program courses involved five to eight families per course, with a total of 13 completed courses. The 13 courses were conducted by eight therapists, including the coauthors I.N., K.A., A.M., and K.H. Families had varying waiting times to start the program after the initial clinical assessment at T0 (Figure 1B). This allowed us to retrospectively separate the participants into two groups. We divided the participants into early and delayed groups using the median split of the time span between T0 and T2 (*Mdn* = 6.3 months). The early group completed Module 2 for an average of nine months, while the delayed group took 12 months (Table 1, Figure 1B). The two groups were matched for age, sex, and age at stuttering onset, resulting in the exclusion of three additional children (Table 1). The family history, bilingualism, and former treatments are presented in Supplementary Table 1.

Outcomes

The objective assessment of stuttering severity was conducted using the Stuttering Severity Index (SSI-4, Riley, 2009), which was conducted at six time points: at the initial assessment before Module 1, at the end of Module 1, and at the beginning and end of the two hybrid modules (T0 - T5, Figure 1A). At each time point, a speech sample was recorded during a video call in which the therapist engaged the child in a conversation. Additionally, at T0, T3, and T5, parents provided videos of the children in everyday situations. Because speech samples were not available for every child at each time point, all available samples for a child were analyzed at each time point. The number of analyzed syllables varied among the children, with a median of 348 syllables in the early group and 316 syllables in the delayed group at T0 (Table 1). Parent ratings of stuttering severity (PR) and the online questionnaire on parents'

experiences with the child's stuttering (OQ) were conducted before Module 1 and at the end of each module (T0, T1, T3, and T5; Figure 1A). Parent-reported measures were scored on a Likert scale.

The surveys assessed parents' subjective perception of their child's stuttering severity as well as their attitudes and feelings about stuttering. The severity rating involved evaluating the child's current symptoms on a scale of one (no stuttering) to 10 (very severe). Additionally, five questions gauged parents' confidence in handling and discussing stuttering (e.g., "I can handle my child's stuttering calmly."), while another five questions measured their emotional responses and concerns (e.g., "My child's stuttering worries me."). Responses were recorded on a scale ranging from one (do not agree at all) to five (completely agree).

Blinded assessment of stuttering severity

K.A. pseudonymized the speech samples and assigned them to three raters, including the coauthor A.M., all of whom are clinical speech scientists. Initially, T0 samples were assessed to test for baseline differences between the groups, with none found (Table 1). Subsequently, the remaining samples (T1–T5) were randomized according to the time point for analysis. Each rater analyzed all samples from a given child. No rater was involved in the intervention for that child.

The objective assessment of stuttering severity was conducted using the SSI-4 (Riley, 2009), which involves analyzing the frequency of stuttered syllables, measuring the duration of the three longest stuttering events, and evaluating physical concomitants such as grimacing and head and limb movements. SSI-4 provides a total score that encompasses three subscales: frequency, duration, and physical concomitants.

Statistical methods

To test the efficacy of the parent-child program, we fitted the SSI-4 total scores with a linear mixed-effects model using maximum likelihood estimation (Supplementary Table 2). The baseline model included sex and age as fixed-effects variables, and subject and time as random-effects variables. We tested whether the model fit improved by including (i) group (early versus delayed treatment group), (ii) time (pre-, 9 months post-T0, 12 months post-T0), and (iii) group-by-time interaction. Additionally, we set the following orthogonal and non-orthogonal contrasts: The contrast for the group tested whether the early treatment group had a greater reduction than the delayed group; contrasts for time tested (i) whether the 9-month condition showed smaller SSI values than the pre-condition, and (ii) whether the 12-month condition showed smaller SSI values than the pre-condition. Post hoc unpaired *t*-tests were conducted to assess group differences at 9 and 12 months after baseline. To assess the effect size, we calculated Cohen's *d*. Additionally, we conducted one-sample *t*-tests to determine whether the reduction in stuttering, as reflected by the subjective parent rating score, was significant. These tests were performed after treatment Module 2 and Module 3.

To test whether the parents' experience with the child's stuttering improved, we calculated the Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction between baseline scores and scores at T1, T3, and T5. Additionally, we plotted the difference in scores between these time points and the baseline to visualize individual changes.

Interrater agreement

We tested interrater agreement among all three raters. Therefore, each rater analyzed one randomly chosen speech sample from each child. This resulted in a total of 42 speech samples per rater (19%). Krippendorff's alpha (Hughes, 2021), along with the macro developed by Hayes for ordinal and interval data (Hayes & Krippendorff, 2007), was used to calculate interrater agreement for both frequency (interval scale) and SSI total score (ordinal scale).

Additionally, we calculated the intraclass correlation (ICC) with a two-way model, type agreement, to provide the 95% confidence interval for the ICC population values.

Statistical analysis was performed using R version 4.4.0 using *irr*, *multcomp*, *nlme*, *pastecs*, *stats,* and*, tidyr*.

Results

Objective measure

Treatment significantly reduced stuttering severity, $\chi^2(9) = 22.0$, $p < 0.001$, and there was a difference in severity reduction between the early and delayed treatment groups, $\chi^2(7) = 5.1$, $p < 0.024$ (Figure 3A). Most importantly, the treatment × group interaction was significant, $\chi^2(11) = 10.6$, $p = 0.005$. Contrasts revealed that at 9 months, stuttering was reduced in the early treatment group with $M = 7.6$ and 95% CI [4.6, 10.5] and a mean change of -8.7 and a 95% CI [-12.2, -5.2], while the delayed group showed no change from baseline with $M = 15.9$ and 95% CI [12.1, 19.6] and a mean change of 0.3 and 95% CI [-3.1, 3.6]. A post hoc unpaired *t*-test revealed a significant difference in the SSI total scores between the groups at 9 months post-baseline, with a mean difference score of -8.33 (95% CI [-12.98, -3.68], $t(36.3) = -3.63$, $p < 0.001$, and an effect size of $d = -1.14$ (95% CI [-1.82, -0.47]). At 12 months, both groups exhibited a reduction in stuttering severity, with the early group showing a mean score of $M = 7.2$ (95% CI [3.2, 11.1]) and the delayed group showing $M = 10.5$ (95% CI [7.4, 13.7]). The difference between the groups was no longer significant ($t(30.1) = -1.44$, $p = 0.168$, $d = 0.49$, 95% CI [-1.18, 0.21]). The mean change from baseline at 12 months was -10.6 (95% CI [-18.2, -3.3]) for the early group and -5.1 (95% CI [-8.0, -2.2]) for the delayed group. Supplementary Table 2 lists the details of the statistical analysis of the SSI total scores. The results are similar when analyzing the percentage of stuttered syllables or SSI-4-subscore for frequency and duration (Supplementary Tables 3 to 5). The group-wise mean changes in the SSI-4 total score from

baseline (T0) to the end of Module 2 (T3) and Module 3 (T5) are listed in Table 2. Figure 3B shows the trajectory of stuttering severity over the course of the program for all 42 participants, regardless of the group assignment. Changes in SSI-4 total were most prominent after Module 2 and stabilized after Module 3 in children who continued the program.

Parents' reports

The subjective parent rating also showed a significant decrease in stuttering severity after completing Module 2 with $M = -2.4$, 95% CI [-3.2, -1.6], $T(31) = -5.82$, $p < .001$, and Module 3 with $M = -2.6$, 95% CI [-3.7, -1.5], $T(24) = -5.10$, $p < .001$. The change in the parents' experience ratings with their child's stuttering after Module 2 is depicted in Figure 3C. The first five items represent questions where an increase in the score indicates improvement, whereas for the second half of the questions, improvement is indicated by a decrease in the score. The parents showed significant improvements in all but one item (Figure 3C and Supplementary Table 6). The difference in scores after the online module with indirect treatment components and after Module 2 were also significant. Specifically, Module 1 resulted in improvements in six items, while Module 3 led to improvements in seven items (Supplementary Figure 2A and 2B, and Supplementary Table 6).

Interrater-reliability

The interrater agreement was almost-perfect according to the interpretation of Hayes and Krippendorff (Hayes & Krippendorff, 2007) with a Krippendorff's alpha of 0.88 for the SSI total score and 0.92 for stuttering frequency. The ICC for the total SSI score was 0.88, with a 95% CI [0.80, 0.93]. The ICC for stuttering frequency was 0.92, with a 95% CI [0.86, 0.96].

Discussion

The newly developed parent-child program significantly reduced stuttering, achieving a large effect within 9 months post-baseline. The program's efficacy is comparable to that of existing randomized controlled trials for stuttering interventions in children aged 3 - 6 years (Harris et al., 2002; Jones et al., 2005; Lattermann et al., 2008; Lewis et al., 2008). Our findings demonstrate for the first time that child-friendly fluency shaping is a feasible therapeutic component that can be effectively delivered to preschoolers in the context of a parent-child program.

Our results suggest that early intervention is more effective than current interventions for improving fluency outcomes in school-age children. The brain's capacity for speech motor learning at a young age, combined with the reduced emotional burden for both parents and children, likely accounts for the positive outcome. In contrast, a randomized controlled trial involving German school-age children who stutter reported no significant effect on the SSI-4 total score after 3 months (d = 0.092) and only a modest improvement after 12 months (Kohmäscher 2023). As a result, treatments for school-age children often focus on reducing the impact of stuttering on quality of life by addressing their attitude toward stuttering, showing a moderate d = 0.62 (Kohmäscher 2023). Thus, our findings underscore the critical importance of early intervention, not only for improving fluency but also for minimizing the long-term emotional and psychological effects of stuttering.

A key challenge in evaluating the efficacy of interventions for preschoolers who stutter is the high probability of spontaneous remission (Reilly et al., 2009; Yairi & Ambrose, 2013). To account for this, our study included a parallel wait-list control group that did not receive intervention until approximately six months after baseline. Both the intervention and control groups had comparable stuttering durations since onset (*Mdn* = 20 months) at the start of the study. Therefore, we attributed the reduction in stuttering primarily to the intervention and not to spontaneous remission.

We consider the results of this study preliminary as the retrospective design did not allow for random assignment to early treatment or wait-list-control groups, introducing potential selection bias. We controlled for variables, such as sex, age, stuttering onset, time since onset, and baseline severity to minimize such biases. Observer bias is also a concern, as SSI-4 raters knew that all participants received treatment, possibly leading to favorable interpretations of ambiguous cases. To address this, we simulated a waitlist group and blinded raters for the timing of the speech samples. The observed improvement in the early group after 9 months, with no change in the delayed group, supports the efficacy of the treatment. Additionally, since participants and parents knew they were receiving treatment, placebo effects or response bias could have affected subjective ratings, although the objective SSI-4 measure is less prone to these biases. Finally, 29% of the cases were excluded from Module 3 analysis due to attrition (18% did not continue treatment). While attrition bias was unavoidable due to the program's design, Figure 3B shows that stuttering severity improved for all but one of those excluded after Module 2, suggesting the bias likely did not skew results toward more favorable outcomes.

Conclusion

Early intervention is crucial as it targets stuttering before it becomes deeply ingrained, leading to improved long-term outcomes and reducing its impact on the child's overall quality of life. Our novel parent-child program effectively reduced stuttering severity in preschoolers, while enhancing parents' attitudes and coping strategies. Future research should include follow-up assessments to determine the long-term sustainability of the intervention’s benefits along with measures of children's self-perception of their speech and communication abilities.

Acknowledgments

This project was supported by the University Medical Center Göttingen, Germany. IN, AM, KA, and KA have received institutional support from KST GmbH for the development of the parent-child program.

Data Availability Statement

Owing to ethical concerns, supporting data cannot be made openly available. Further information regarding the data and conditions for access is available from the corresponding author.

References

Anders, K., Hente, K. & Merkel, A. (2023). Frankini Therapie für 3- bis 6-jährige stotternde Kinder und deren Eltern: Ein intensivtherapeutischer Behandlungsansatz in der Gruppe. *Sprachtherapie Aktuell: Praxis – Beruf – Verband*, *5*(3), 12–18.

Bloodstein, O., Ratner, N. B. & Brundage, S. (2021). *A Handbook on Stuttering* (7th ed.). Plural Publishing, Inc.

Brignell, A., Krahe, M., Downes, M., Kefalianos, E., Reilly, S. & Morgan, A. (2021). Interventions for children and adolescence who stutter: A systematic review, meta-analysis, and evidence map. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *70*, 105843. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2021.105843

Euler, H. A., Gudenberg, A. W. von, Jung, K. & Neumann, K. (2009). Computergestützte Therapie bei Redeflussstörungen: Die langfristige Wirksamkeit der Kasseler Stottertherapie (KST). *Sprache, Stimme, Gehör*, *33*(04), 193–202. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0029-1242747

Euler, H. A., Lange, B. P., Schroeder, S. & Neumann, K. (2014). The effectiveness of stuttering treatments in Germany. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *39*, 1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2014.01.002

Euler, H. A., Merkel, A., Hente, K., Neef, N., Gudenberg, A. W. von & Neumann, K. (2021). Speech restructuring group treatment for 6-to-9-year-old children who stutter: A therapeutic trial. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *89*, 106073. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2020.106073

Franken, M.-C. & Laroes, E. (2021). *RESTART-DCM Method*. https://restartdcm.nl/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/RestartDCM-Method-2021_online.pdf

Harris, V., Onslow, M., Packman, A., Harrison, E. & Menzies, R. (2002). An experimental investigation of the impact of the Lidcombe Program on early stuttering. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *27*(3), 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0094-730x(02)00127-4

Hayes, A. F. & Krippendorff, K. (2007). Answering the Call for a Standard Reliability Measure for Coding Data. *Communication Methods and Measures*, *1*(1), 77–89. https://doi.org/10.1080/19312450709336664

Hughes, J. (2021). krippendorffsalpha: An R Package for Measuring Agreement Using Krippendorff's Alpha Coefficient. *The R Journal*, *13*(1), 413. https://doi.org/10.32614/rj-2021-046

Jones, M., Onslow, M., Packman, A., Williams, S., Ormond, T., Schwarz, I. & Gebski, V. (2005). Randomised controlled trial of the Lidcombe programme of early stuttering intervention. *BMJ*, *331*(7518), 659. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.38520.451840.e0

Kelman, E. & Nicholas, A. (2019). *Practical Intervention for Early Childhood Stammering, Palin PCI Approach*. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315169200

Lattermann, C., Euler, H. A. & Neumann, K. (2008). A randomized control trial to investigate the impact of the Lidcombe Program on early stuttering in German-speaking preschoolers. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *33*(1), 52–65. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2007.12.002

Lewis, C., Packman, A., Onslow, M., Simpson, J. M. & Jones, M. (2008). A Phase II Trial of Telehealth Delivery of the Lidcombe Program of Early Stuttering Intervention. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *17*(2), 139–149. https://doi.org/10.1044/1058-0360(2008/014)

Millard, S. K., Edwards, S. & Cook, F. M. (2009). Parent-child interaction therapy: Adding to the evidence. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *11*(1), 61–76. https://doi.org/10.1080/17549500802603895

Millard, S. K., Zebrowski, P. & Kelman, E. (2018). Palin Parent–Child Interaction Therapy: The Bigger Picture. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *27*(3S), 1211–1223. https://doi.org/10.1044/2018_ajslp-odc11-17-0199

Neef, N. E. & Chang, S.-E. (2024). Knowns and unknowns about the neurobiology of stuttering. *PLOS Biology*, *22*(2), e3002492. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002492

Neumann, K., Euler, H. A., Bosshardt, H.-G., Cook, S., Sandrieser, P. & Sommer, M. (2017). The Pathogenesis, Assessment and Treatment of Speech Fluency Disorders. *Deutsches Aerzteblatt Online*, *114*(22–23), 383–390. https://doi.org/10.3238/arztebl.2017.0383

Onslow, M., Andrews, C. & Lincoln, M. (1994). A Control/Experimental Trial of an Operant Treatment for Early Stuttering. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*, *37*(6), 1244–1259. https://doi.org/10.1044/jshr.3706.1244

Onslow, M., Packman, A. & Harrison, R. E. (2003). *The Lidcombe Program of early stuttering Intervention: A clinician's guide*. Pro-Ed.

Preston, R., Halpin, M., Clarke, G. & Millard, S. (2022). Palin parent-child interaction therapy with children with autism spectrum disorder and stuttering. *Journal of Communication Disorders*, *97*, 106217. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomdis.2022.106217

Reilly, S., Onslow, M., Packman, A., Wake, M., Bavin, E. L., Prior, M., Eadie, P., Cini, E., Bolzonello, C. & Ukoumunne, O. C. (2009). Predicting Stuttering Onset by the Age of 3 Years: A Prospective, Community Cohort Study. *Pediatrics*, *123*(1), 270–277. https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2007-3219

Riley, G. D. (2009). *SSI-4: Stuttering Severity Instrument* (Fourth Edition).

Sjøstrand, Å., Kefalianos, E., Hofslundsengen, H., Guttormsen, L. S., Kirmess, M., Lervåg, A., Hulme, C. & Næss, K.-A. B. (2021). Non pharmacological interventions for stuttering in children six years and younger. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*, *2021*(9), CD013489. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.cd013489.pub2

Sommer, M., Waltersbacher, A., Schlotmann, A., Schröder, H. & Strzelczyk, A. (2021). Prevalence and Therapy Rates for Stuttering, Cluttering, and Developmental Disorders of Speech and Language: Evaluation of German Health Insurance Data. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *15*, 645292. https://doi.org/10.3389/fnhum.2021.645292

Sonneville-Koedoot, C. de, Stolk, E., Rietveld, T. & Franken, M.-C. (2015). Direct versus Indirect Treatment for Preschool Children who Stutter: The RESTART Randomized Trial. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(7), e0133758. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0133758

Tichenor, S. E. & Yaruss, J. S. (2021). Variability of Stuttering: Behavior and Impact. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *30*(1), 75–88. https://doi.org/10.1044/2020_ajslp-20-00112

Webster, R. L. (1980). *The Precision Fluency Shaping Program: Speech Reconstruction for Stutterers*.

Wolff-von-Gudenberg, A. & Euler, H. A. (2000). Evaluation study of the Kasseler Stuttering Therapy (KST). *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *25*(3), 195. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0094-730x(00)80227-2

Yairi, E. & Ambrose, N. (2013). Epidemiology of stuttering: 21st century advances. *Journal of Fluency Disorders*, *38*(2), 66–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfludis.2012.11.002

Tables

Table 1. Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics

Characteristic	**Early-treatment** *n* = 23	**Delayed-treatment** *n* = 19	**Difference** *T*(*df*) *p*
Sex, No. (%)			
Male	16 (70)	13 (68)	[a]0.007 (1.0)
Female	7 (30)	6 (32)	.936
Age stuttering onset, mo			
M (*SD*)	33.7 (8.7)	32.1 (7.0)	0.66 (40.0)
Mdn (*IQR*)	33 (8.5)	30 (10)	.515
Min-Max	18-54	24-48	
Age start Module 1, mo			
M (*SD*)	53.6 (8.8)	58.0 (8.0)	-0.40 (39.6)
Mdn (*IQR*)	55.5 (11.2)	58.0 (11.7)	.690
Min-Max	36.0 - 69.7	38.0 - 67.6	
Δ start Module 1 - age onset, mo			
M (*SD*)	19.9 (9.3)	22.6 (9.0)	-0.93 (39.1)
Mdn (*IQR*)	19.5 (12.9)	20.9 (12.8)	.358
Min-Max	4.3 - 43.3	7.0 - 37.0	
Δ T2 - T0, mo			
M (*SD*)	5.3 (0.5)	8.1 (1.0)	-10.8 (26.0)
Mdn (*IQR*)	5.3 (0.7)	8.5 (1.5)	**< .001**
Min-Max	3.9 - 6.1	6.3 - 9.4	
N Syllables of T0 sample			
M (*SD*)	377 (193)	389 (164)	[c]78.5 (.079)
Mdn (*IQR*)	348 (348)	316 (246)	
Min-Max	23 - 614	69 - 615	
SSI-4 total score at T0			
M (*SD*)	16.2 (7.3)	15.6 (5.4)	0.34 (39.5)
Mdn (*IQR*)	13.5 (13)	15.9 (6.5)	.734
Min-Max	6.0 - 31.5	4.0 - 26.0	
Stuttering frequency at T0 (%)			
M (*SD*)	7.6 (5.1)	7.0 (4.6)	0.44 (39.7)
Mdn (*IQR*)	6.5 (7.5)	5.7 (6.5)	.656
Min-Max	1.2 - 18.6	0.3 - 16.9	
Parent rating at T0			
M (*SD*)	6.0 (2.1)	[b]5.3 (2.2)	1.06 (33.5)
Mdn (*IQR*)	6.0 (2.0)	5.0 (2.0)	.297
Min-Max	2 - 10	2 – 10	
Online Questionnaire at T0			
…Q1 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	3.0 (1.0)	3.0 (0.5)	[c]198 (.954)
…Q2 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	2.8 (2.0)	3.0 (1.0)	[c]151 (.295)
…Q3 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	3.0 (2.1)	3.0 (2.0)	[c]157 (.395)
…Q4 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	5.0 (1.8)	4.0 (1.0)	[c]204 (.610)
…Q5 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	3.0 (2.0)	3.0 (1.5)	[c]112 (.556)
…Q6 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	2.0 (2.0)	2.0 (2.0)	[c]188 (.844)
…Q7 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	4.0 (2.0)	5.0 (1.0)	[c]167 (.414)

…Q8 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	2.0 (2.0)	2.0 (2.9)	[c]167 (.553)
…Q9 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	3.0 (2.0)	2.0 (1.3)	[c]130 (.468)
…Q10 *Mdn* (*IQR*)	2.5 (2.0)	2.0 (1.5)	[c]250 (.069)

[a]χ^2-test, [b]n = 17, [c]*W* (*p*-value) after the Wilcoxon rank sum test with continuity correction

Table 2 Summary of mean changes from baseline per group

		Early-treatment		**Delayed-treatment**	
		at 9 months *n* = 23	at 12 months *n* = 16	at 9 months *n* = 19	at 12 months *n* = 19
Stuttered syllables %	*M* [$CI_{95\%}$] *Mdn* (*Min* to *Max*)	-5.3 [-7.3 to -3.2] -4.0 (-16.7 to 1.4)	-6.0 [-9.0 to -3.1] -5.1 (-15.4 to 3.5)	-0.8 [-3.6 to 1.9] -0.8 (-11.7 to 7.6)	-3.8 [-5.4 to -2.1] -2.9 (-10.2 to 0.6)
SSI-4 total	*M* [$CI_{95\%}$] *Mdn* (*Min* to *Max*)	-8.7 [-12.2 to -5.2] -7.5 (-23.0 to 8.5)	-10.6 [-18.2 to -3.3] 17.0 (-31.5 to 18)	0.3 [-3.1 to 3.6] 0.5 (-12.0 to 13.0)	-5.1 [-8.0 to -2.2] -6.0 (-14.5 to 4)
Frequency	*M* [$CI_{95\%}$] *Mdn* (*Min* to *Max*)	-5.4 [-7.4 to -3.3] -5.0 (-15.0 to 5.0)	-5.6 [-8.5 to -2.6] -4.5 (-15 to 5)	0.2 [-2.3 to 2.7] 0.0 (-7.0 to 9.0)	-2.7 [-4.6 to -0.8] -3.0 (-9.0 to 4.0)
Duration	*M* [$CI_{95\%}$] *Mdn* (*Min* to *Max*)	-2.9 [-4.1 to -1.6] -2.0 (-8.0 to 2.0)	-2.6 [-4.1 to -1.1] -3.0 (-8.0 to 4.0)	-0.1 [-1.0 to 0.8] 0.0 (-4.0 to 3.0)	-1.6 [-2.4 to -0.7] -1.0 (-4.0 to 1.0)
Physical concomitants	*M* [$CI_{95\%}$] *Mdn* (*Min* to *Max*)	-0.5 [-1.0 to 0.1] 0.0 (-4.5 to 1.5)	-0.8 [-1.8 to 0.2] -0.5 (-6.5 to 2.5)	0.3 [-0.7 to 1.4] 0.0 (-2.0 to 7.0)	-0.7 [-1.4 to -0.01] -0.5 (-4.5 to 2.0)
Subjective parent rating	*M* [$CI_{95\%}$] *Mdn* (*Min* to *Max*)	-2.75 [-3.9 to -1.6] -3 (-8 to 3)	-3.1 [-4.6 to -1.5] -3 (-7 to 2)	nan	-1.8 [-3.2 to -0.5] -2 (-5 to 2)

Figure Legends

Figure 1. **Procedure of the parent child program and participant's group allocation.** A) T0 – T5 are assessment time points. Assessments included Stuttering Severity Index (SSI), subjective parent rating (PR), online questionnaire on parents' experience with the child's stuttering (OQ). Modules included online sessions (blue) therapy in presence (red), individual therapy (IT) and group therapy (GT). B) Individual time schedules and group assignments of the participants.

Figure 2. **Participant flow diagram** illustrates the sequence of identifying participants for inclusion in the analysis.

Figure 3. Changes in stuttering severity and parents' experiences of their child's stuttering over time. A) Stuttering severity (SSI) reduced after 9 months in the early treatment group, with no change in the delayed group. Plotted are group averages and standard errors. The dotted line represents the SSI cut-off value for stuttering. B) Box plots and individual curves for SSI total scores, separately plotted for the three treatment modules. Red lines indicate cases not participating in Module 3. Blue circles indicate cases with missing values. C) Heat map showing changes in parental experience with their child's stuttering between baseline and T3 (after Module 2). White cells indicate missing data. The last column indicates the grand mean for a given item with *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, and ***$p < .001$ (Wilcoxon signed rank test with continuity correction).


A
SSI
PR
OQ
T0
Module 1
indirect
4.5 months
Parent
6 × IT
12 × GT
T1
SSI
T2
Module 2
direct
4 months
Child/Parent
4 days
3 × IT
6 × GT
T3
SSI
PR
OQ
T4
Module 3
direct
3.5 months
Child/Parent
4 days
3 × IT
2 × GT
T5
B
pre
DELAYED
EARLY
Nr. of participant
time points early
time points delayed
Start Module 2
End Module 2
time in months


Referred to treatment
September 2019 to November 2023
N = 79
Excluded N = 28
- Termination after Modul 1
- paused (n = 11)
- different therapy (n = 1)
- drop out (n = 4)
- Lateral entrant after Module 1 (n = 11)
- Child's illness during Module 2 (n = 1)
Eligible N = 51
Median split of time span till T2
Matched for age, sex
age stuttering onset
Excluded N = 3
- No match
Controlled N = 48
Early start with Module 2
3.9 to 6.1 months after T0
N = 24
Delayed start with Module 2
6.3 to 9.4 months after T0
N = 24
Not analyzed N = 1
- No compliance
for speech sample at T3 (n = 1)
Not analyzed N = 5
- No compliance
for speech sample at T3 (n = 2)
- Maternal health factors (n = 1)
- Child fluent, ended early (n = 1)
- Other challenges more
severe than stuttering (n = 1)
Analyzed T0 to T3 N = 23
Analyzed T0 to T3 N = 19
Paused after Module 2 n = 4
Missing speech sample (T5) n = 2
Missing SSI Analysis (T4/T5) n = 1
Paused after Module 2 n = 4
Missing speech sample (T5) n = 1
Analyzed T4 to T5 N = 16
Analyzed T4 to T5 N = 14


A
SSI total score
delayed
early
pre
9
12
16
months
B
Module 1
n = 42
Module 2
n = 42
Module 3
n = 30
SSI total score
T0
T1
T2
T3
T4
T5
C
Parental coping with child stuttering [ΔT3-T0]
Deal calmly with my child's stuttering
Confident talking to my child
Confident talking to others
Confident talking to close contacts
I can handle my childs emotions
My child's stuttering embarrasses me
My child's stuttering worries me
Talking about stuttering is uncomfortable
My child's reactions overwhelm me
Stuttering disrupts family communication
Nr. participant
Group average
Δ Score