## Table S1 Summary of reviewed articles

	y of reviewed articles	Olinical	Creefie revelerathelery	Therepy	Comple Size		Female/male	Effect size
sychopathology	Capron	Clinical No	Specific psychopathology Anxiety sensitivity	Therapy CBM-I; PIM	Sample Size Intervention (CBM-I)=48;	Age (years) 18.87 (1.37)	73/16	Intervention vs. Control
Anxiety	<i>et al.</i> , 2016	110	AnAloty Scholavity		Control (PIM)=41		10,10	t=5.19, $\beta$ =0.33, P<0.001
	De Hullu <i>et al.</i> , 2017	No	Social and test anxiety symptoms	CBM; CBT	Intervention (CBT)=84; Intervention (CBM)=86;	12–16	174/66	Intervention <i>vs.</i> Control Social anxiety: F=0.45, P=0.64
			symptoms		Control (no intervention)=70			Test anxiety: $F=1.14$ , $P=0.32$
	Scholten et al., 2016	No	Anxiety symptoms	Dojo	Intervention (CBM-I)=70;	13.27 (0.88)	90/48	Intervention vs. Control
					Control=68			Anxiety symptoms: $\beta$ =0.03, SE=0.08, P=0.72 personalized anxiety symptoms: $\beta$ =0.04, SE=0.05, P=0.46
	Knapp <i>et al.</i> , 2020	No	Anxiety sensitivity	ASAP-Y	Intervention=44;	12.5 (1.4)	43/45	Intervention vs. Control
					Control=44			d=0.75; B=-2.13, SE=1.05, P=0.04
	Bechor <i>et al.</i> , 2014	Yes	Generalized anxiety disorder;	ABMT	Intervention=6	11.2 (1.17)	4/2	From pre to post Anxiety: t=3.58, P=0.02;
	ot un, <u>_</u> ot t		Social phobia, or Separation					Depression: t=4.39, P=0.01
araaaian	Pössel <i>et al.</i> , 2013	No	anxiety disorder Depression symptoms	CBP	Intervention (CBP)=166;	15.09 (0.76)	325/193	Intervention (CBP) vs. Control (nonspecific)
pression	Fossel <i>et al.</i> , 2013	INO	Depression symptoms	GBF	Control (nonspecific)=175;	15.09 (0.76)	323/193	P=0.047, g=0.29, 95% CI: [0.06, 0.52];
					Control (no-intervention) =177			Intervention (CBP) <i>vs.</i> Control (no-intervention) P=0.003, g=0.30; 95% CI: [0.07, 0.53]
	Kindt <i>et al.</i> , 2014	No	Depression symptoms	OVK	Intervention (OVK)=667;	13.42 (0.77)	702/641	Intervention (OVK) vs. Control
					Control=676			Completers only: OR=0.558, 95% CI: [0.351, 0.887], P<0.05; Intention to treat: OR=0.564, 95% CI: [0.378, 0.842], P<0.01
	Gest <i>et al.</i> , 2016	No	Depression symptoms	Chronotherapeutic treatments	Intervention (bright light therapy)=37;	-	57/5	From pre to post
	addt of an, 2010	110			Intervention (Combined wake and light		01/0	Combined wake and light therapy: t (24)=2.10, P=0.02;
ing disordor	Trainor <i>et al.</i> , 2020	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	FBT	therapy)=25	15.81 (1.46)	82/13	bright light therapy: t (36)=2.43, P=0.02 Rates of comorbid diagnoses decreased from 54% to 26%.
Eating disorder	Lock <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	гы FBT; SyFT	- Intervention (FBT)=78;	15.3 (1.8)	141/17	Intervention (FBT) vs. Intervention (SyFt)
	200101 01, 2010	100			Intervention (SyFT)=80;		,	Mann-Whitney U=51.0, $P=0.02$
	Lock <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	IPC; FBT	Intervention (IPC)=35;	FBT=14.3 (1.5)	41/4	Intervention (IPC) vs. Intervention (FBT)
	Herscovici <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Vas	Anorexia nervosa	FTFM	Intervention (FBT)=10 Intervention (FTFM)=11;	IPC=14.6 (1.4) 7.1 (2.3)	_	Cohen's d=0.82, P=0.002 Intervention (FTFM) vs. Intervention (FT):
	Herscovici et al., 2017	ies	Anorexia hervosa	FTFIN	Intervention (FT)=12	7.1 (2.3)	-	Effect size=2.13, 95% CI: [8.47, 4.21]
	Accurso et al., 2014	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	FBT; AFT	Intervention (FBT)=61;	14.4 (1.6)	110/11	Intervention (FBT) vs. Intervention (AFT)
					Intervention (AFT)=60			B=0.134, P=0.086
	Le Grange et al., 2012	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	FBT & AFT	Intervention (FBT)=61; Intervention (AFT)=60	14.4 (1.6)	110/11	Intervention (FBT) vs. Intervention (AFT) Effect Size=0.321, P=0.027
	Rienecke <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	FBT & AFT	Intervention (FBT)=61;	14.4 (1.6)	110/11	Intervention (FBT) vs. Intervention (AFT) in adolescents with high eating disord
					Intervention (AFT)=60	(		differences=0.233, P=0.026
	Ciao <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	FBT & AFT	Intervention (FBT)=61;	14.4 (1.6)	110/11	Intervention (FBT) vs. Intervention (AFT)
					Intervention (AFT)=60			Communication: F (1, 82)=55.20, P=0.03; Behavior Control: F (1, 82)=57.41, P=0.008
ADHD	Eisler <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	MFT-AN; FT-AN	Intervention (FT-AN)=82;	FT-AN=15.7 (1.6)	152/15	MFT-AN vs. FT-AN
					Intervention (MFT-AN)=85	MFT-AN=15.7 (1.7)		%medium BMI at 18 months post randomisation: Difference=4.11, 95% CI: [0.98, 7.24], P=0.01
	Philipp <i>et al.</i> , 2021	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	SUCCEAT	Intervention (SUCCEAT-workshop)=48;	SUCCEAT-workshoP=14.65 (1.94)	91/7	Intervention (workshop) vs. Intervention (online)
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				Intervention (SUCCEAT-online)=50	SUCCEAT-online=15.12 (1.80)		F=0.026–0.918, Ps>0.05.
	Biney <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	CBT (Self-esteem group intervention)	Intervention (CBT)=25; Control (TAU)=25	15.22 (1.62)	50/0	Intervention (CBT) <i>vs.</i> Control (TAU) Eating concern:
				intervention)	Control (IAU)=25			Mean difference=0.66, 95% CI: [0.44, 1.28]
	Herbrich et al., 2017	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	CRT	Intervention (CRT)=24;	-	48/0	Intervention (CBT) vs. Control (TAU)
					Control (TAU)=24			F=0.125-2.511, Ps>0.05
	Glashouwer et al., 2018	3 Yes	Anorexia nervosa	Computer-based evaluative conditioning intervention	Intervention=25; Control=26	16.73 (2.45)	51/0	Intervention vs. Control F=0.24–0.78, Ps>0.05
	Giel <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Yes	Anorexia nervosa	Lifestyle Intervention	-	13.7 (1.4)	20/21	Significant weight loss:
								t (39)=3.44, P<0.01
	Boyer <i>et al.</i> , 2018	Yes	ADHD	PML; SFT	Intervention (PML)=33; Intervention (SFT)=36	PML:14.54 (1.24) SFT:14.28 (1.19)	19/50	Intervention (PML) vs. Intervention (SFT) Alliance: $\beta$ =1.34, P=0.04
	Langberg <i>et al.</i> , 2018	Yes	ADHD	HOPS; CHIEF	Intervention (HOPS)=111;	HOPS:12.00 (1.05)	72/202	Intervention (HOPS) vs. Intervention (CHIEF)
	Langberg et al., 2010	103			Intervention (CHIEF)=111;	CHIEF:12.02 (0.99)	12/202	d=0.43-0.68
					Control=52	Control:11.87 (1.12)		
	Sibley <i>et al.</i> , 2020	Yes	ADHD	Parent-teen Group; Dyadic treatment	Intervention (Dyadic treatment)=63; Intervention (parent-teen Group)=60	Dyadic treatment: 13.63 (1.49) Parent-teen group:13.59 (1.78)	24/99	Intervention (Dyadic treatment) vs. Intervention (parent-teen Group) F=0.06–1.96, Ps>0.05
Externalizing problems	Weiss <i>et al.</i> , 2013	No	Conduct problems	MST	Intervention (MST)=84;	MST:14.6 (1.3)	28/136	Intervention (MST) vs. Control
					Control=80	Control: 14.5 (1.4)		Time×treatment: F=5.19, P<0.05.
	Caldwell et al., 2012	No	Antisocial Behaviors	Specialized intensive treatment program	Intervention=127	16.1 (0.89)	0/127	From pre to post: F=12.48–44.22, Ps<0.00001
	Van Ryzin <i>et al.</i> , 2012	No	Antisocial Behaviors	FCU	Intervention=998	16.1 (0.89)	472/526	From pre to post:
	,, .							β=0.30, P<0.05
•	Idris <i>et al.</i> , 2022	Yes	Autism spectrum disorder	PEERS®	Intervention (PEERS <sup>®</sup> )=54;	Intervention:14.65 (1.51) Control:14.48	73/33	Intervention (PEERS®) vs. Control
disorder Substance use	Hendriks <i>et al.</i> , 2012	Yes	Substance use	MDFT; CBT	Control=52 Intervention (MDFT)=55;	(1.62) MDFT: 16.6 (1.3) CBT: 16.9 (1.2)	22/87	Social Skills Improvement: F=5.37, P=0.02 Intervention (MDFT) vs. Intervention (CBT)
		165	Substance use		Intervention (CBT)=54;		22/01	F=0.46-0.55
								13–16: <i>β</i> [95% CI]: –25.6 [–44.0, –7.1]; 17–18: <i>β</i> [95%CI]: 16.8 [–2.2, 35.7]
	Lammers <i>et al.</i> , 2015	No	Substance use	Coping skills intervention	Intervention=343;	Interventiont:13.9 (0.98)	335/364	Intervention vs. Control
					Control=356	Control:14.1 (0.77)		OR=0.99-1.05, Ps>0.05
	Lammers <i>et al.</i> , 2017	No	Substance use	Coping skills intervention	Intervention=343; Control=356	Intervention:13.9 (0.98) Control:14.1 (0.77)	335/364	Intervention vs. Control reducing alcohol use in anxiety sensitivity group: OR=2.14, P=0.03;
					Control=350	0011101.14.1 (0.77)		reducing binge drinking and binge drinking frequency in sensation seeking gro
								OR=1.76, P=0.04; OR=0.24, P=0.04
	Lindenberg et al., 2022	No	Substance use	PROTECT	Intervention (PROJECT)=167; Control=255	15.11 (2.01)	229/193	Intervention vs. Control t=–2.148, P=0.03
	Chaplin <i>et al.</i> , 2021	No	Substance use	PM; PE	Intervention (PM)=48;	PM: 14.00 (1.49)	47/49	Intervention (PM) vs. Intervention (PE)
				,	Intervention (PE)=48	PE: 13.98 (1.69)		b=-0.02, t=-2.27, SE=0.01, P=0.03
	de Bruin <i>et al.</i> , 2018	Yes	Insomnia	CBTI	Intervention (Internet group)=39;	15.6 (1.6)	87/29	Intervention (Internet group) vs. Control
					Intervention (Face to face group)=38; Control=39			$\beta$ =0.98, P<0.001 Intervention (face to face group) vs. control group
								β=1.04, P<0.001
	Dong <i>et al.</i> , 2020	No	Insomnia	TranS-C	Intervention (TranS-C)=89; Intervention (psychoeducation)=87	14.77 (1.84)	-	Intervention (TranS-C) <i>vs.</i> Intervention (psychoeducation)
								Morningness–Eveningness Preferences: Coef=1.84, P=0.006;
	largeneen -t -t - 2000	Ver	Bordorling neres all'		Intervention (MPT) 55	15 8 (1 1)	110/1	Sleep quality: Coef=-1.09, P=0.02
derline sonality	Jørgensen <i>et al.</i> , 2021	Yes	Borderline personality disorder (BPD)	MBT-G	Intervention (MBT)=55; Control=56	15.8 (1.1)	110/1	Intervention (MBT) vs. Control difference=–0.6, 95% CI: [–3.9, 2.7], P=0.70
order	Schuppert et al., 2012	Yes	Borderline personality	ERT	Intervention (ERT)=54;	15.98 (1.22)	105/4	Intervention vs. Control
			disorder (BPD)		Control=55			SE=-11.16 to 1.19, P>0.05
Psychosis	She <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Yes	Psychosis	Structural group therapy	Intervention=30; Control=30	Intervention: 16.8; Control: 16.6	34/26	Intervention <i>vs.</i> Control Self-consistency: t=6.100, P<0.001;
								Positive symptom: t=2.271, P<0.05
	Poulton et al., 2014	No	Psychosis	MTFC	Intervention (MTFC)=81;	15.3 (1.17)	166/0	Intervention vs. Control
ntol beau	Cobloider + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	NIc	Montal has the	The single contains "	control=85	12 22 /1 1 4\	52/40	Coef=-2.05, P<0.05
	Schleider <i>et al.</i> , 2016	No	Mental health	The single-session growth mindset intervention	Intervention=48; Control=48	13.32 (1.14)	53/43	Intervention vs. Control Mindsets: Cohen's d=0.89, 95%CI: [0.53, 1.82];
								Perceived control: Cohen's d=0.36, 95% CI: [0.17, 0.52]; Social stress recovery slope: Cohen's d=0.48; 95% CI: [0.05, 0.90]
	Schleider <i>et al.</i> , 2018	No	Mental health	The single-session growth	Intervention=48;	13.32 (1.14)	53/43	Social stress recovery slope: Cohen's d=0.48; 95% CI: [0.05, 0.90]
	Joniolagi el al., 2018	110	mentarricalti	ne single-session growth mindset intervention	Control=48;		0, 10	Youth reported depression: B=1.02; P=0.03;
								Youth reported perceived primary control: B=1.24; P=0.047
	Osborn <i>et al.</i> , 2020	No	Mental health	"Shamiri" group intervention	Intervention=28; Control=23	Intervention: 15.36 (0.95) Control: 16.09 (1.04)	31/20	Intervention vs. Control Depression: Cohen's d [95% CI]: 0.32 [–0.34, 0.99]
								Anxiety: Cohen's d [95% Cl]: 0.54 [–0.20, 1.29]
	Johnson <i>et al.</i> , 2016	No	Mental health	School-based mindfulness	Intervention=132;	13.63 (0.43)	147/161	Intervention vs. Control
		K I	Montelline	program	Control=176		10/10	Cohen's d=0.01 to 0.28, Ps>0.05
	Bluth <i>et al.</i> , 2015	No	Mental health	Mindfulness intervention	Intervention=28	-	16/12	From pre to post t=–1.85 to –2.29, effect size=0.33 to 0.40, Ps<0.05
	Bluth <i>et al.</i> , 2017	No	Mental health	Mindful self-compassion	Intervention=47	-	24/23	From pre to post
	,			intervention				Stress: Cohen's d [95% Cl]: 0.36 [0.10, 0.62];
								Resilience: Cohen's d [95% Cl]:   –0.03 [–0.21, 0.16]; Curiosity: Cohen's d [95% Cl]:  –0.25 [–0.49, 0]
	Bei <i>et al.</i> , 2013	No	Mental health	Mindfulness-based, multi-	Intervention=10	-	10/0	From pre to post:
				component group sleep				Sleep quality: Cohen's d [90% Cl]: 0.51 [0.16, 0.86]
	Bierman <i>et al.</i> . 2021	No	Mental health	intervention	Intervention=192;		192/164	Intervention vs. Control
	biemian et al., 2021	UNI	montai Hedili I	The enrichment program	Intervention=192; Control=164		192/104	Conduct problem: estimate=-0.43, P<0.05;
	-							Emotional symptoms: estimate=-0.53, P<0.01
	Shoshani <i>et al.</i> , 2014	No	Mental health	Positive psychology school- based intervention	Intervention=537; Control=501	Intervention: 13.61 (0.61) Control:13.75 (0.66)	525/513	Participants in the Intervention group exhibited significantly decrease in contra- significantly increase in distress, anxiety, and depression symptoms
	Manicavasagar et al.,	No	Mental health	The positive psychology	Intervention=62;	15.4 (1.7)	104/50	Intervention vs. Control
	2014			program	Control=92			Depression: z=-2.44, P=0.02, r=-0.22;
								Stress: z=-2.14, P=0.03, r=-0.21; Well-being: z=2.07, P=0.04, r=0.19

Well-being: z=2.07, P=0.04, r=0.19

CBM-I, cognitive bias modification for interpretation biases intervention; PIM, placebo interpretation modification; CBM, cognitive behavioral theropy; ASAP-Y, anxiety sensitivity amelioration program for youth; ABMT, attention bias modification treatment; CBP, cognitive-behavioral program; OVK, Op Volle Kracht; FBT, family-based treatment; SyFT, systemic family therapy; IPC, intensive parental coaching; FTFM, family therapy with family meal; AFT, individual adolescent supportive psychotherapy; MFT-AN, multi-family therapy for anorexia nervosa; BMI, body mass index; SUCCEAT, supporting carers of children and adolescents with eating disorders in Austria; TAU, treat as usual; CRT, cognitive remediation therapy; ADHD, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; PML, planning-focused treatment, SFT, solution-focused treatment; HOPS, homework, organization, and planning Skills intervention, CHIEF, the completing homework by improving efficiency and focus; MST, multisystemic therapy; FCU, the family therapy for insomnia; TranS-C, Trans-diagnostic Sleep and Circadian Intervention; MBT-G, mentalization-based treatment in groups; ERT, emotion regulation training; MTFC, multidimensional treatment foster care.

© Translational Pediatrics. All rights reserved.

Transl Pediatr 2023 | https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tp-22-589