**Supplementary Material: Quality Assessment and Risk of Bias Tool**

*Quality Assessment and Risk of Bias Tool for Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item number** | **Item** | **Score** |
| **1.0** | **Study information**  |  |
| 1.1 | Initials of first coder:  |  |
| 1.2 | Date of first coding: |  |
| 1.3 | Initials of second coder:  |  |
| 1.4 | Date of second coding: |  |
| 1.5 | Name of first author:  |  |
| 1.6 | Study title: |  |
| 1.7 | Year of publication: |  |
| 1.8 | Journal title:  |  |
| **2.0** | **Quality Appraisal and Assessment of Bias**  |  |
| 2.1 | **Were research questions and objectives clearly stated?**  |
|  | Explicitly defined research questions or aims and hypotheses (whether one-tailed or two-tailed) are present  | 2 |
|  | Some description of study aims, without the presence of hypotheses or research questions | 1 |
|  | No clear statement of study aims or objectives, research questions or hypotheses  | 0 |
| 2.2 | **Was the study sample clearly specified and defined?** |
|  | Descriptive statistics were reported on participant demographics (including age range and mean, gender split, ethnicity) and trauma exposure (type of traumatic event the study sample was exposed to)  | 2 |
|  | Some description provided about the sample but some missing information (e.g. authors did not report nature of traumatic event or provide enough information about demographic variables) | 1 |
|  | No clear description of sample demographics and trauma characteristics  | 0 |
| 2.3 | **Was the sampling method clearly stated?**  |
|  | Clear statement of sampling method  | 2 |
|  | Sampling method stated but may not have been appropriate for the study  | 1 |
|  | Sampling method is either not stated or inappropriate for the study  | 0 |
| 2.4 | **Were participants recruited from the same (or similar) population and inclusion/exclusion criteria stated and consistently applied?**  |
|  | Clear reporting of inclusion and exclusion criteria; sample recruited from the same or similar study population (e.g. for participants exposed to war trauma, were they exposed to the same war? If maltreatment, was it the same type of abuse?) | 2 |
|  | Some indication of inclusion or exclusion criteria; unclear whether sample were recruited from the same population  | 1 |
|  | Inclusion and exclusion criteria not stated or applied inconsistently; sample recruited from different study population  | 0 |
| 2.5 | **Was the participation rate of eligible participants at least 50%?** (If less than 50% of eligible participants consented to take part in the study, the study population may not adequately represent the target population) |
|  | More than 50% of eligible and approached participants took part  | 2 |
|  | Less than 50% of those approached took part, but there was no significant difference in non-response characteristics (such as age, gender) between those who participated and those who did not | 1 |
|  | Less than 50% of those approached took part, and differences between those who took part and those who did not were no reported or highlighted significant differences. Or, response was not reported  | 0 |
| 2.6 | **Longitudinal studies only: was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?**  |
|  | Participant drop-out or non-response was less than 20% | 2 |
|  | Loss to follow-up was more than 20% but participants who dropped-out did not differ in key characteristics (e.g. age, gender) from those who completed the full study  | 1 |
|  | Loss to follow-up was more than 20% and was not accounted for.  | 0 |
|  | Not applicable; this was a cross-sectional study  | N/A  |
| 2.7 | **Was the measure of PTSD valid and reliable?**  |
|  | A well-validated interview or self-report measure based on DSM criteria was used and internal consistency reported as at least adequate in the sample | 2 |
|  | A validated interview or self-report measure was used but it was not based on DSM criteria of PTSD  | 1 |
|  | A poorly validated or unknown measure of PTSD was used  | 0 |
| 2.8 | **Was the measure of attachment valid and reliable?** If observation-based, consider if inter-coder reliability is adequate and coders were appropriately trained.  |
|  | A well-validated interview, observation or self-report measure of attachment was used, and validity and reliability were reported and deemed at least adequate  | 2 |
|  | Well-validated measure of attachment was used but reliability and validity within the sample not reported  | 1 |
|  | A poorly validated or unknown measure of attachment was used  | 0 |
| 2.9 | **Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure and outcome(s)?** Consider presence of other psychiatric diagnoses, substance use, presence of neurodevelopmental disorder, and participant demographic information  |
|  | Key confounding variables were identified and adjusted for during the analysis  | 2 |
|  | Key confounding variables were identified and discussed but not adjusted for statistically  | 1 |
|  | No confounding variables identified or discussed  | 0 |
| **Total Quality Assessment Score for First Coding** |
| For longitudinal studies:/18= % | For cross-sectional studies:/16= %  |
| >70% = high study quality50-70% = medium quality study <50% = low quality study |
| **Total Quality Assessment Score for Second Coding**  |
| For longitudinal studies:/18= % | For cross-sectional studies:/16= %  |
| >70% = high study quality50-70% = medium quality study<50% = low quality study |