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Educational interventions to prevent paediatric abusive head trauma in babies younger than one year old: A systematic review and meta-analyses
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ABSTRACT

Background: Paediatric abusive head trauma (AHT) occurs in young children due to violent shaking or blunt impact. Educational and behavioural programmes modifying parent/infant interactions may aid primary prevention. This systematic review aims to assess the effectiveness of such interventions to prevent AHT in infants.

Methods: We searched Embase, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, The Cochrane library, CINAHL databases and trial registries to September 2021, for studies assessing the effectiveness of educational and behavioural interventions in preventing AHT. Eligible interventions had to include messaging about avoiding or dangers of infant shaking. Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) reporting results for primary (AHT, infant shaking) or secondary outcomes (including parental responses to infant crying, mental wellbeing), and non-randomised studies (NRSs) reporting primary outcomes were included. Evidence from combinable studies was synthesised using random-effects meta-analyses.Certainty of evidence was assessed using GRADE framework. PROSPERO registration CRD42020195644.

Findings: Of 25 identified studies, 16 were included in meta-analyses. Five NRSs reported results for AHT, of which four were meta-analysed (summary odds ratio [OR] 0.95, 95 % confidence intervals [CI] 0.80 –1.13). Two studies assessed self-reported shaking (one cluster-RCT, OR 0.11, 95 % CI 0.02 –0.53; one cohort study, OR 0.36, 95 % CI 0.20 –0.64, not pooled). Meta-analyses of secondary outcomes demonstrated marginal improvements in parental response to inconsolable crying (summary mean difference 1.58, 95 % CI 0.11–3.06, on a 100-point scale) and weak evidence that interventions increased walking away from crying infants (summary incidence rate ratio 1.52, 95 % CI 0.94–2.45). No intervention effects were found in meta-analyses of parental mental wellbeing or other responses to crying.
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Interpretation: Low certainty evidence suggests that educational programmes for AHT prevention are not effective in preventing AHT. There is low to moderate certainty evidence that educational interventions have no effect or only marginally improve some parental responses to infant crying.

1. Introduction

Paediatric abusive head trauma (AHT) is an injury inflicted on young children, usually through either a direct blow to the head or violent shaking. Most victims are younger than six months (Blumenthal, 2002), and perpetrators are usually parents, in particular fathers or father figures (Starling, Holden, & Jenny, 1995). The incidence in under one year olds in high income countries is 21–35 cases per 100,000 infants (Minns, Jones, & Mok, 2008). Around 18–25 % die due to the injuries sustained, and up to 80 % of survivors are left with lifelong cognitive or neurological impairment (Barr, 2012), such as damaged vision and hearing. AHT is associated with significant financial impact to health and social care, legal costs related to safeguarding processes, and societal costs related to long-term care needs of survivors (Beaulieu, Rajabali, Zheng, & Pike, 2019; Miller, Steinbeigle, Lawrence, et al., 2018; Stabile & Allin, 2012).

The pathway from education to changing behaviour first requires learning and knowledge, which in turn may change attitudes, leading to behaviour change (Ajzen & Fishbean, 1980). Educational and behavioural programmes aim to prevent AHT by modifying carer/infant interactions, particularly during times of peak infant crying (Dias, Cappos, Rottmund, et al., 2021). Most preventive interventions therefore focus on educating carers on patterns of infant crying, and the dangers of shaking their infant (Barr, n.d.; Altman et al., 2011; Bechtel et al., 2011; Bechtel, Gaither, & Leventhal, 2020; Dias et al., 2005; Groisberg, Hashmi, & Girardet, 2020). One such intervention, implemented in New York State and evaluated in an uncontrolled observational study, reported a large reduction in cases (Altman et al., 2011; Dias et al., 2005). These findings were followed by development and implementation of similar programmes, including “The Period of PURPLE Crying” (Barr, n.d.), “I promise”, Take 5 (Bechtel et al., 2011) and the ICON programme (ICON, 2020).

Evaluations of these programmes have been limited in size and scope. They have been implemented and maintained with varying success, with one of the key challenges being a paucity of robust evidence on their effectiveness. Identifying whether any of these programmes are effective in reducing this catastrophic injury is essential to inform preventive policies.

We aimed to systematically review preventative strategies, evaluating the effectiveness of educational interventions aimed at reducing AHT in infants younger than one year old.

2. Methods

The study protocol was registered on PROSPERO prior to full text screening (CRD42020195644) (Scott, Davies, Savovic, Dawson, & Mamluk, 2020). Results are reported according to PRISMA guidelines (Page, McKenzie, Bossuyt, et al., 2021).

2.1. Study eligibility criteria

2.1.1. Study design

We included Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs). Comparative non-randomised intervention studies (NRSs) were also included if they reported our primary outcomes (AHT, incidence of infant shaking), as AHT is a rare outcome which is rarely measured in RCTs. We excluded uncontrolled before-after/pre-post designs as studies without a comparison group cannot provide estimates of intervention effectiveness.

2.1.2. Participants

The target population included parents, expectant parents, and carers of children under one year old (at the point of enrolment or start of intervention). We also included studies where an intervention was delivered to health and/or social care professionals supporting parents and carers (e.g. training to enable delivery of messages about shaking and AHT), provided the study reported outcomes in infants and/or parents.

2.1.3. Interventions

We included educational or behavioural interventions aimed at preventing AHT. Interventions primarily focused on managing infant crying were also included if the intervention included messaging about the dangers of infant shaking, or instructions to not shake the baby. Studies did not have to state an explicit aim of preventing AHT. Eligible settings included primary, secondary and community health/social care.

2.1.4. Comparators

We included studies that compared interventions with either no intervention, standard/usual care, or an alternative educational/behavioural intervention. The comparison group could also include some elements of AHT education as in many countries this constitutes standard care.
2.1.5. Outcomes
The primary outcomes were the incidence of AHT and the incidence of infant shaking (e.g. self-reported by parent or carer). Secondary outcomes in parents/caregivers were (i) response to inconsolable crying, (ii) mental health (e.g. anxiety and depression), (iii) confidence/self-efficacy, (iv) emotional regulation (e.g. use of coping strategies), (v) stress/frustration, and (vi) frequency of seeking support (e.g. from GP or health visitor). Secondary outcomes in infants were (i) frequency of crying, (ii) sleep patterns (e.g. hours of continuous or total sleep), (iii) other forms of abuse (including maltreatment or neglect), and (iv) mortality. We did not explore knowledge and learning based outcomes (e.g. knowledge of shaken baby syndrome). Whilst learning is an important step on the pathway to behaviour change, the measurement of the behaviour change itself is required to assess the effectiveness of educational interventions. Outcomes were not used as an eligibility criterion for RCTs, but NRSs were only included if they reported one of the primary outcomes.

2.2. Literature search
We searched Ovid Embase, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, The Cochrane library and CINAHL from inception to September 2021, without language or date restrictions. We also searched trial registries (ClinicalTrials.gov and the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform) and grey literature (Open Grey, Google Scholar, theses, and dissertation databases). Search terms were developed by an information specialist (SD) with the study team and adapted for each database (Appendix 1). We supplemented these searches by examining reference lists of included studies, reviews of similar topics, citation searches on Web of Science and Google Scholar, and contacting experts.

2.3. Study selection
Identified titles and abstracts were double-screened for relevance. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion or escalation of the discrepant record to full-text assessment. For the potentially relevant records, full-text articles were obtained, and each was independently assessed against the inclusion criteria by two reviewers, with any discrepancies resolved through consensus and, if necessary, by referral to a third reviewer.

2.4. Data extraction
Data extraction forms were developed in a custom-built Microsoft Access database and piloted on two studies prior to use. For each study, we extracted information on study design, location, population characteristics, intervention details, outcomes, and estimates of intervention effectiveness. Data extraction was carried out by one reviewer and checked by another; discrepancies were resolved through discussion. When necessary, authors were contacted for additional information or clarification.

2.5. Risk of bias assessments
Risk of bias in RCTs was assessed using the Cochrane risk of bias tool “RoB-2” (Sterne, Savovic, Page, et al., 2019) for key results included in the meta-analyses. For NRSs, we used the “ROBINS-I” tool (Sterne, Hernan, Reeves, et al., 2016). We pre-specified key confounding factors expected to be relevant for most NRSs in this review: socioeconomic status, ethnicity or race, parent’s age, sex of the parent and/or partner, parental substance misuse, mother’s pre-existing/acute mental illness, and previous safeguarding concerns. The effect of interest was assignment to the intervention (i.e. intention to treat), for risk of bias assessment of both RCTs and NRSs. Risk of bias assessments were carried out independently, in duplicate, by two co-authors and final judgements agreed through consensus.

We used the pilot version of the “RoB-ME” (Risk of Bias due to Missing Evidence) tool (Page, JAC, Boutron, et al., 2020) to explore the potential impact of evidence unavailable for synthesis due to selective non-reporting (e.g. non-significant results not reported in study publications). Constructing funnel plots to consider the possibility of small-study effects, missing evidence, and/or publication bias was not feasible due to small number of included results (Sterne, Sutton, Ioannidis, et al., 2011). Instead, we contacted authors of registered but unpublished studies to informally assess the approximate volume of unavailable results (see detailed methods in Appendix 2).

2.6. Synthesis and certainty of evidence
We narratively summarised data from all included studies, grouped by outcomes of interest. Meta-analyses were carried out where study design, interventions and outcomes were similar enough to combine results. Primary analyses used random-effects meta-analyses, due to anticipated heterogeneity between studies (e.g. interventions were expected to differ in content, mode of delivery, settings, dosing and timing), with fixed-effects models provided as sensitivity analyses (with both estimates shown on the same forest plot when feasible). The ‘meta summarize’ and ‘meta forestplot’ user-built commands in Stata Statistical Software: Release 16 (StataCorp. 2019. College Station, TX) were used to generate and present summary estimates of effect, 95% confidence intervals (CIs), and the percentage of variation across studies due to heterogeneity ($I^2$) for the analysed results (see detailed methods in Appendix 2).

We rated the certainty in the overall body of evidence by applying the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) framework for our main synthesised outcomes (Guyatt, Oxman, Vist, et al., 2008). We followed the revised GRADE guidelines which propose that when using ROBINS-I tool to assess risk of bias, NRSs can start at “high certainty” (same as
RCTs) and be downgraded for identified limitations (Schunemann, Cuello, Akl, et al., 2019). We used the GRADE-Pro web application to construct our summary of findings table (GRADEpro, 2020).

3. Results

Our searches identified 6157 records, after removing duplicates. Title and abstract screening resulted in exclusion of 5799 irrelevant records, leaving 358 records requiring full text assessment. Of these, 10 publications could not be obtained and 305 were excluded after full text assessment (Appendix 3). We included 25 studies, reported in 43 records. We extracted outcome data for 16 studies: ten were RCTs (Arshadi, Mostafa, & Saiedi, n.d.; Barr et al., 2009a; Barr, Rivara, Barr, et al., 2009b; Bishe, Aziznejadroshan, Mojaveri, Hajiahmadi, & Bishe, 2020; Cala, Kelly, Ramos, VanVleet, & High, 2020; Fujiwara et al., 2012; Fujiwara, Isumi, Sampei, et al., 2020a; Groisberg et al., 2020; Lou, D’Souza, Chen, & Barr, 2011; McRury & Zolotor, 2010), including one cluster-RCT (Fujiwara et al., 2020a). Of the six NRSs, three were state/region-wide controlled before-and-after (CBA) studies (Dias, Rottmund, Cappos, et al., 2017; Vinchon, Rakza, Karnoub, & Gobert, 2020; Zolotor, Runyan, Shanahan, et al., 2015), two were case-control studies (Bechtel et al., 2020; Keenan & Leventhal, 2010), and one was a cohort study (Fujiwara, Isumi, Sampei, Yamada, & Miyazaki, 2020b). Of the remaining nine; four (ChiCtr, 2019; JPRN-UMIN000038940, 2020; NCT04568538, 2020; NCT04608877, 2021) were trial registry records of ongoing RCTs, one RCT registry record (JPRN-UMIN000012445, n.d.) was for a completed RCT which had not yet published results, two published RCT protocols (Cook, Seymour, Giallo, et al., 2015; Obikane, Baba, Shinozaki, et al., 2021) had not published

Fig. 1. PRISMA flowchart.

AHT = abusive head trauma; NRS = non-randomised study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author/PI (year)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Parental age</th>
<th>Parent ethnicity</th>
<th>Sample size: randomised/analysed</th>
<th>Setting of recruitment (R) and delivery (D)</th>
<th>Intervention name</th>
<th>Intervention details</th>
<th>Control details</th>
<th>Timing of intervention</th>
<th>Timing of outcomes</th>
<th>Outcomes included in review</th>
<th>Outcomes not included in review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barr (2009a) (Barr et al., 2009a)</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>&lt;25: 8 % 25-30: 23 % 30-35: 37 % &gt;35: 29 %</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>1833/1279</td>
<td>R: Secondary care D: Home</td>
<td>PURPLE crying</td>
<td>Two brochures and a DVD about infant safety.</td>
<td>Two brochures and a DVD about infant safety.</td>
<td>0-2 weeks post-birth</td>
<td>8 weeks post-birth</td>
<td>Response to crying. Stress. Emotional regulation.</td>
<td>Knowledge (e.g. about crying and shaking). Information sharing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishe (2020) (Bishe et al., 2020)</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>Intervention: mean = 29 (SD = 6) Control: mean = 29 (SD = 7)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>70/7</td>
<td>R: Unclear D: Home</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>“Premature infant care training package” was presented at home during four sessions, twice a week with an</td>
<td>Unclear, probably just routine hospital care.</td>
<td>Post-hospital discharge</td>
<td>One month post-intervention end</td>
<td>Anxiety. None.</td>
<td>Knowledge (e.g. about crying and shaking). Information sharing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author/PI (year)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Parental age</th>
<th>Sample size: randomised/analysed</th>
<th>Setting of recruitment (R) and delivery (D)</th>
<th>Intervention name</th>
<th>Intervention details</th>
<th>Control details</th>
<th>Timing of intervention</th>
<th>Timing of outcomes</th>
<th>Outcomes included in review</th>
<th>Outcomes not included in review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cala (2020) (Cala et al., 2020)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>Intervention: mean = 27 (SD = 5)</td>
<td>R: Secondary care</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>A bilingual ABC (all babies cry) DVD and corresponding bilingual booklet explaining crying as part of normal infant behaviour, highlighting signs of parental distress and providing strategies to soothe parents and their children.</td>
<td>A bilingual DVD and bilingual booklet addressing the benefits of reading, talking, and playing with young children, as well as a new children’s board book.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control: mean = 28 (SD = 6)</td>
<td>D: Secondary care/home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>300/115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiwara (2012) (Fujiwara et al., 2012)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>&lt;25: 10 %</td>
<td>R: Secondary care</td>
<td>PURPLE crying</td>
<td>An 11-page booklet and a DVD on crying behaviours and advice around unsoothable crying and the dangers of shaking your baby.</td>
<td>A DVD about infant safety.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25–29: 20 %</td>
<td>D: Home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30–34: 38 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;34: 29 %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>230/201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>average time of 60 min (30 min practical and 30 min theoretical) according to previous coordination with their mothers. Fourth session included AHT prevention.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author/PI (year)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Parental age</th>
<th>Parent ethnicity</th>
<th>Sample size: randomised/analysed</th>
<th>Setting of recruitment (R) and delivery (D)</th>
<th>Intervention name</th>
<th>Intervention details</th>
<th>Control details</th>
<th>Timing of intervention</th>
<th>Timing of outcomes</th>
<th>Outcomes included in review</th>
<th>Outcomes not included in review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groisberg (2020)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Parents (4 % fathers)</td>
<td>Intervention: median = 29</td>
<td>Hispanic: 43 % African-American: 32 % Caucasian: 14 % Asian: 2 %</td>
<td>271/164</td>
<td>R: Secondary care D: Secondary care</td>
<td>PURPLE crying</td>
<td>Firstly, verbal instruction from the trainee about general newborn care, excluding information about infant crying. They then reviewed the PURPLE crying brochure with the paediatric resident or medical student and watched the PURPLE crying video on a mobile computer. The video and pamphlet were developed by the shaken baby (continued on next page)</td>
<td>Verbal newborn discharge instructions provided by the trainee which included pertinent information about infant crying and the dangers of shaking a baby. I.e. same information, different method of delivery.</td>
<td>Post-birth, pre-hospital discharge</td>
<td>5-8 weeks post-hospital discharge</td>
<td>Self-reported shaking. Frequency of crying. Stress. Knowledge (e.g. about crying and shaking). Information sharing. Advice seeking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes (2017)</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Health care professionals (3 nurses, 6 paediatricians, 3 nursing technicians, 1 dentist)</td>
<td>34/13</td>
<td>R: Unclear D: Unclear</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Four x 2 h in-person sessions, including multimedia resources covering violence in the home, head trauma and crying management. The video and pamphlet were developed by the shaken baby</td>
<td>Wait list control. No detail about when they received it.</td>
<td>Received during working hours</td>
<td>Immediately post intervention.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Knowledge (e.g. about crying and shaking). Beliefs about baby care.</td>
<td>(continued on next page)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author/PI (year)</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Parental age</td>
<td>Sample size: randomised/analysed</td>
<td>Setting of recruitment (R) and delivery (D)</td>
<td>Intervention name</td>
<td>Intervention details</td>
<td>Control details</td>
<td>Timing of intervention</td>
<td>Timing of outcomes</td>
<td>Outcomes included in review</td>
<td>Outcomes not included in review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lopes (2018) (Lopes et al., 2018)</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Parents and expectant parents (159 pregnant women, 36 expectant partners, 39 mothers, 18 fathers)</td>
<td>Mean = 27 (SD = 7)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>252/183</td>
<td>R: Unclear</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Standard care. Wait list control. No detail about when they received it.</td>
<td>Expectant parents - 2 years post-birth</td>
<td>Immediately post intervention</td>
<td>None. Knowledge (e.g. about crying and shaking), Beliefs about baby care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author/PI (year)</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Parental age</td>
<td>Parent ethnicity</td>
<td>Sample size: randomised/analysed</td>
<td>Setting of recruitment (R) and delivery (D)</td>
<td>Intervention name</td>
<td>Intervention details</td>
<td>Control details</td>
<td>Timing of intervention</td>
<td>Timing of outcomes</td>
<td>Outcomes included in review</td>
<td>Outcomes not included in review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRury (2010) (&lt;br&gt;McRury &amp; Zolotor, 2010)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>51/35</td>
<td>R: Secondary care</td>
<td>30-min videotape demonstrating the happiest baby method for calming newborn infants. Caregivers were reminded to first try feeding, holding, and changing their newborn when he/she cried. If none of these was effective, they were encouraged to try a detailed swaddling technique. Caution is given never to shake an infant.</td>
<td>A 30-min videotape entitled “Begin with Love” by Civitas. This videotape provides 5 standard recommendations for taking care of normal newborns: 1. Take care of yourself. 2. Provide a warm and loving environment. 3. Talk, sing, and read to your baby. 4. Create a predictable world with routines. 5. Respond to your baby’s needs; a newborn infant cannot be spoiled. Again, this included advice never to shake your baby.</td>
<td>Post-birth, pre-hospital discharge</td>
<td>6 &amp; 12 weeks post-birth</td>
<td>Frequency of crying. Stress. Sleep patterns.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
Characteristics of included non-randomised studies (NRSs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author/PI (year)</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Study type</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Parental age</th>
<th>Parent ethnicity</th>
<th>Sample size: analysed</th>
<th>Setting of recruitment (R) and delivery (D)</th>
<th>Intervention name</th>
<th>Intervention details</th>
<th>Control details</th>
<th>Timing of intervention</th>
<th>Timing of outcomes</th>
<th>Outcomes included in review</th>
<th>Outcomes not included in review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bechtel (2020) (Bechtel et al., 2020)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Case-control</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>White: 48%</td>
<td>Black: 10%</td>
<td>Other: 42%</td>
<td>R: Unclear</td>
<td>Take 5 messaging. The approach of teaching parents how to recognise their feelings of frustration with their infants’ crying and to walk away from the crying infant, as a way to interrupt the dangerous relationship between infant crying and caregiver shaking. Advise included putting baby down, walking away, doing something to calm down, don’t return to infant until calm.</td>
<td>D: Unclear</td>
<td>Standard care.</td>
<td>Post-birth</td>
<td>&lt;12 months</td>
<td>Knowledge (e.g. about crying and shaking). Information sharing. Learning beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dias (2017) (Dias et al., 2017)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Controlled before &amp; after study</td>
<td>Parents (break-down not provided)</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>5961</td>
<td>R: Secondary care</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>&quot;Pennsylvania Shaken Baby Syndrome Prevention Program&quot;. A brochure, an 8 min video, ask questions of nurse, sign commitment statement. Also, posters saying ‘never, never, never shake a baby’ around hospital.</td>
<td>D: Secondary care</td>
<td>Standard care. There was no AHT prevention program running in the five control states.</td>
<td>Post-birth, pre-hospital discharge</td>
<td>12 months post-birth</td>
<td>Knowledge (e.g. about crying and shaking). Information sharing. Learning beliefs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiwara (2020) (Fujiwara et al., 2020)</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Cohort</td>
<td>Mothers &amp; expectant mothers</td>
<td>&lt;25: 6%</td>
<td>25-29: 23%</td>
<td>30-34: 37%</td>
<td>&gt;34: 34%</td>
<td>R: Community</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>An 11-min education video including: 1) features of infant crying, 2) danger of shaking, 3) a simulation of the</td>
<td>D: Home</td>
<td>Standard care (missed video control group).</td>
<td>4 months post-birth</td>
<td>Self-reported shaking. Other abuse. Response to crying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First author/PI (year)</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Study type</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Parental age</td>
<td>Parent ethnicity</td>
<td>Sample size: analysed</td>
<td>Setting of recruitment (R) and delivery (D)</td>
<td>Intervention name</td>
<td>Intervention details</td>
<td>Control details</td>
<td>Timing of intervention</td>
<td>Timing of outcomes</td>
<td>Outcomes included in review</td>
<td>Outcomes not included in review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keenan (2010) (Keenan &amp; Leventhal, 2010)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Case-control</td>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>Cases: 25 (median), 21–29 (IQR)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Cases: 91 % white (5 % missing), 18 % Hispanic</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>R: Secondary care</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>Verbal info delivered by nurse to mother and other available caregivers, the viewing of 1 of 2 videos (Elijah’s story or Portrait of a Promise) about the consequences of SBS, and written materials, including refrigerator magnets and posters in maternity wards</td>
<td>Standard care (no viewing of video).</td>
<td>Post-birth, pre-hospital discharge</td>
<td>2 years post-birth</td>
<td>AHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinchon (2020) (Vinchon et al., 2020)</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>Controlled before &amp; after study (abstract only)</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>R: Secondary care</td>
<td>Crying Plan Prevention program based on the “Crying plan” in maternity wards</td>
<td>Standard care. Control regions did not receive intervention.</td>
<td>Post-birth, pre-hospital discharge</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>AHT</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolotor (2015) (Zolotor et al., 2015)</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Controlled before &amp; after study</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Not reported</td>
<td>PURPLE crying</td>
<td>R: Secondary care</td>
<td>PURPLE crying DVD and booklet, and 3 min of education from nurse before hospital discharge. Also, reinforcement messages in primary care offices and media campaigns.</td>
<td>Standard care. Control states did not receive PURPLE crying education.</td>
<td>Post-birth, pre-hospital discharge</td>
<td>&lt;12 months post-birth</td>
<td>AHT</td>
<td>Changes to call rate to after hours nurse advice line about crying.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
esults, and two studies did not report any of our outcomes of interest (Fig. 1) (Lopes, 2017; Lopes, Gorni, Mattar, & de Albuquerque Williams, 2018).

3.1. Summary of included studies

Characteristics of included studies are shown Table 1 (RCTs) and Table 2 (NRSs). Ongoing and unpublished studies (all study designs) are presented in Appendix 4 Table S1. Nine studies were conducted in the USA (Barr et al., 2009a; Bechtel et al., 2020; Cala et al., 2020; Dias et al., 2017; Groisberg et al., 2020; Keenan & Leventhal, 2010; McRury & Zolotor, 2010; NCT04608877, 2021; Zolotor et al., 2015), six in Japan (JPRN-UMIN000012445, n.d.; Fujiwara et al., 2012; Fujiwara et al., 2020a; Fujiwara et al., 2020b; JPRN-UMIN000038940, 2020; Obikane et al., 2021), two in Canada (Barr et al., 2009a; Lou et al., 2011), two in Iran (Asrari et al., n.d.; Bishe et al., 2020), two in Brazil (Lopes, 2017; Lopes et al., 2018), and one in France (Vinchon et al., 2020), Australia (Cook et al., 2015), Turkey (NTCT04568538, 2020), and China (ChiCtr, 2019). The intervention was delivered in a hospital setting in eight studies (Asrari et al., n.d.; Dias et al., 2017; Fujiwara et al., 2020a; Groisberg et al., 2020; Keenan & Leventhal, 2010; NTCT04568877, 2021; Vinchon et al., 2020; Zolotor et al., 2015), at home in eight studies (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Bishe et al., 2020; Cook et al., 2020; Fujiwara et al., 2012; Fujiwara et al., 2020b; McRury & Zolotor, 2010; Obikane et al., 2021), in hospital and/or at home in two studies (Cala et al., 2020; NTCT04568538, 2020), and seven studies did not provide details (JPRN-UMIN000012445, n.d.; Bechtel et al., 2020; ChiCtr, 2019; JPRN-UMIN000038940, 2020; Lopes, 2017; Lopes et al., 2018; Lou et al., 2011). Outcome assessments ranged from immediately after the intervention to two years post-intervention, though most were at less than three months.

Seven studies (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Fujiwara et al., 2012; Fujiwara et al., 2020a; Groisberg et al., 2020; Lou et al., 2011; Zolotor et al., 2015) investigated the proprietary intervention “Period of PURPLE Crying”, compared with standard care (with or without alternative education on child safety). The following proprietary interventions were assessed by one study each: “The Happiest Baby” (McRury & Zolotor, 2010), the “Cry Baby” (Cook et al., 2015), the “SmartMama” (Obikane et al., 2021), the “Crying plan” (Vinchon et al., 2020), and the “Take 5 safety plan” (Bechtel et al., 2020). The remaining studies did not specify a proprietary intervention name. In 13 studies (Arshadi et al., n.d.; Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Bishe et al., 2020; Cala et al., 2020; Fujiwara et al., 2012; Fujiwara et al., 2020a; Fujiwara et al., 2020b; Keenan & Leventhal, 2010; Lou et al., 2011; McRury & Zolotor, 2010; NTCT04568538, 2020; Obikane et al., 2021) the interventions were delivered only to mothers and/or expectant mothers, in nine studies (JPRN-UMIN000012445, n.d.; ChiCtr, 2019; Cook et al., 2015; Dias et al., 2017; Groisberg et al., 2020; Lopes et al., 2018; NTCT04608877, 2021; Vinchon et al., 2020; Zolotor et al., 2015) to both parents, in one study to health care professionals (Lopes, 2017), and in two it was not clear (Bechtel et al., 2020; JPRN-UMIN000038940, 2020).

3.2. Risk of bias

Risk of bias assessments for 14 outcomes from 10 included RCTs are presented in Table 3. Three studies (Arshadi et al., n.d.; Fujiwara et al., 2020a; Groisberg et al., 2020) were at high risk of bias, two (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b) at low risk of bias (each with two assessed outcomes), and the remaining RCTs had some concerns for bias. The most frequent reasons for bias concerns were (i) no mention of attempts to conceal the random sequence, (ii) unblinded outcome assessments, (iii) high levels of missing data, and (iv) evidence or suspicion of selective reporting of results. Risk of bias assessments for NRSs are presented in Table 4. One non-randomised CBA study (Vinchon et al., 2020) was judged to be at critical risk of bias as no attempt was made to control for confounding, and results were reported as a proportion of the national AHT cases from the intervention region compared with another region, which rendered them unusable. The remaining study results were at serious risk of bias. The most common issues were inadequate control of confounding, selection bias, issues with classification of intervention status or outcome measurement, and potential selective reporting.

Assessment of risk of bias due to missing evidence (RoB-ME) identified one pilot RCT (Cook et al., 2015), which remains unpublished due to problems with collection of their primary outcome (not an outcome of interest for our review); the reason for missing results was unrelated to the values of the results required for our synthesis and was thus not considered at risk of bias. Two published studies measured, but did not report, parental depression and/or anxiety, and the reasons for non-reporting were unclear (Barr et al., 2009b; Fujiwara et al., 2012). One study author confirmed the unreported result was ‘non-significant’ (Fujiwara et al., 2012). Two studies measuring parental stress were available as a conference abstract only (Lou et al., 2011) and a protocol only (JPRN-UMIN000012445, n.d.). We therefore reached a judgement of “some concerns” for missing evidence for synthesis of parental depression, anxiety, and stress. There was no clear evidence of risk of bias due to missing evidence for other syntheses. Recently registered unpublished RCTs were assumed ongoing and not considered as missing evidence. The matrix of reported results used for RoB-ME assessments is presented in Appendix 4, Table S2.

3.3. AHT incidence and incidence of infant shaking

No RCTs reported results for AHT. Two USA-based case-control studies (Bechtel et al., 2020; Keenan & Leventhal, 2010), and two CBA studies (Dias et al., 2017; Zolotor et al., 2015) comparing introduction of two different state-wide programmes with five control US states, were included in the meta-analysis for AHT and found no evidence of reduction in AHT associated with the intervention (summary OR 0.95, 95% CI 0.80 to 1.13, I² = 2%; Fig. 2). The subgroup estimate from two larger and more robust state-level CBA studies is consistent with no effect (OR 1.01, 95% CI 0.85 to 1.19, I² = 0%). Estimates from the two small case-control studies suggest an intervention benefit but with a very wide CI, consistent with both benefit and harm (Fig. 2). One further CBA study (Vinchon et al., 2020);
Table 3
Risk of bias assessments for randomised controlled trials (using RoB2 tool).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Outcome source</th>
<th>Randomisation</th>
<th>Deviation from interventions</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
<th>Outcome measurement</th>
<th>Selective reporting</th>
<th>Overall risk of bias</th>
<th>Reasons for concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arshadi 2015</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No information on randomisation, blinding, non-completers or drop-outs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr 2009</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr 2009</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr 2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barr 2009</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>No concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bishe 2020</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>No information on concealment, not blinded, no protocol or SAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cala 2020</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Missing data likely to be associated with outcome, no protocol or SAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRury 2010</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Significant loss of data, missing outcome data possibly associated with outcome, follow-up data collected unblinded, no protocol, trial registry or SAP available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRury 2010</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Significant loss of data, missing outcome data possibly associated with outcome, no protocol, trial registry or SAP available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiwara 2012</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>No information on concealment, missing data could be associated with outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiwara 2012</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Diary</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>No information on concealment, missing data could be associated with outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiwara 2020a</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not blinded, control group likely to cross-over to intervention group, subjective outcome (self-reported shaking) at risk of bias. Cluster RCT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosberg 2020</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Not randomised properly (first come first serve), missing outcome data not addressed and likely to be associated with outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lou 2011</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Some concerns</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Little information on randomisation and concealment (possibly due to limited content in conference abstract) and no protocol, trial registry or SAP available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAP: statistical analysis plan. Individual domain and overall ‘Low’ risk of bias judgements are coloured green, ‘Some concerns’ risk of bias judgements are coloured yellow, and ‘high’ risk of bias judgements are coloured red. Further, all overall risk of bias judgements are in bold to help guide the reader to the importance of this column.
Table 4
Risk of bias assessments for non-randomised studies (using ROBINS-I tool).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Confounding</th>
<th>Classification of interventions</th>
<th>Selection into the study</th>
<th>Deviation from interventions</th>
<th>Missing data</th>
<th>Outcome measurement</th>
<th>Selective reporting</th>
<th>Overall risk of bias</th>
<th>Reasons for concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dias</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>AHT</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No control of confounding, but the comparison populations thought to be fairly comparable. Protocol not available, possibility of selective reporting cannot be ruled out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fujiiwara</td>
<td>2020b</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Infant shaking (self-report)</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinchenon</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>AHT (not in MA)</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Modera te</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>No attempt to control confounding. Some concerns that being in the intervention area could affect reporting of AHT cases. Protocol not found (abstract only), reported result could have been selected on the basis of the result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolotor</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>AHT (unadjusted)</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Serious</td>
<td>Unadjusted rates used for synthesis, but comparison populations thought to be fairly comparable. Protocol not available, possibility of selective reporting cannot be ruled out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual domain and overall 'Low' risk of bias judgements are coloured green, 'Some concerns' risk of bias judgements are coloured yellow, and 'high' risk of bias judgements are coloured red. Further, all overall risk of bias judgements are in bold to help guide the reader to the importance of this column.
One cluster RCT (Fujiwara et al., 2020a) and one NRS (Fujiwara et al., 2020b) found that fewer mothers in the intervention groups admitted to shaking their baby “violently” or “hard”. Another RCT (Groisberg et al., 2020) had no reported instances of parents shaking their babies in either group (n = 164; non-estimable). These results were not meta-analysed due to the different study designs, but are presented separately in a forest plot (Fig. 3). Whether any reported shaking events led to AHT was not reported in any study.

3.4. Parental responses to infant crying

Four RCTs evaluating the PURPLE crying intervention (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Fujiwara et al., 2012; Fujiwara et al., 2020a) measured four coping responses to infant crying, which the trialists transformed into a scale of 0–100 (higher score indicated...
response in the desired direction). One cluster-RCT measured ‘Active coping’ (Fujiwara et al., 2020a), and found no difference between groups (MD 0.59 points on the 1–100 scale, 95% CI -0.73 to 1.91, n = 2655). Three RCTs (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Fujiwara et al., 2012) found no improvement in the ‘response to general crying’ (summary MD 0.08, 95% CI -0.84 to 1.00; n = 3794, I² = 0%). The same three RCTs found a negligibly small improvement in the intervention group for the ‘response to unsoothable crying’ (summary MD 1.58, 95% CI 0.11 to 3.06, n = 3497, I² = 0%). All four RCTs (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Fujiwara et al., 2012; Fujiwara et al., 2020a) assessed ‘self-talk’ in response to inconsolable crying (e.g. telling yourself the crying would end or that there was nothing that could be done); the summary estimate suggested no difference between groups (MD 1.38, 95% CI 1.27, 4.02, n = 6146, I² = 61%). Forest plots with summary estimates for these meta-analyses are presented in Fig. 4 (fixed effects models shown in Appendix 4 Fig. S1).

The same four RCTs also measured the number of times per day the mother walked away from her inconsolable child (as recorded in participant diaries), a behaviour encouraged as a coping strategy. This occurred more frequently in the intervention group compared with control (summary incidence rate ratio [IRR] from three trials (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Fujiwara et al., 2012) was 1.52, 95% CI 1.1 to 2.45, n = 3049, I² = 61%; Appendix 4 Fig. S2). The fourth RCT (Fujiwara et al., 2020a) dichotomised this outcome (ever vs. never), and found weak evidence of more frequent walking away in the intervention group (37.8% vs. 34.6%, n = 2655). Another RCT (Lou et al., 2011) measured likelihood of maternal walking away using a five-point scale (in a lab based setting), and found that mothers in the intervention group were more likely to do so (t = 2.1, p = 0.04).

Three RCTs (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Fujiwara et al., 2012) assessed the average number of times per day the child was picked up when distressed or crying; no difference was found between groups (summary IRR 1.02, 95% CI 0.96 to 1.07, n = 3049, I² = 0%; Appendix 4 Fig. S3).

One study (Cala et al., 2020) comparing “all babies cry” (ABC) material to other educational material measured change in number of calming strategies employed for parenting stress from enrolment to follow-up and found no difference between groups (MD 0.3, 95% CI -0.2 to 0.8, n = 115, p = 0.256).
3.5. Parental stress/frustration

This outcome was measured in seven RCTs. In three RCTs (Barr et al., 2009a; Barr et al., 2009b; Fujiwara et al., 2012) evaluating PURPLE crying, mothers rated frustration related to infant crying on a six-point Likert scale; there was no difference between groups (summary SMD $-0.01$, $95\%$ CI $-0.08$ to $0.05$, $n = 2999$, $I^2 = 23\%$ Appendix 4 Fig. S4). Another RCT (Groisberg et al., 2020), evaluating different methods of delivering PURPLE crying material, reported the weekly frequency of parental frustration, and found no difference between groups ($p = 0.66$, $n = 164$). One RCT (McRury & Zolotor, 2010) ($n = 35$) comparing “Happiest baby” intervention to other material reported parenting stress index at 6 and 12 weeks, and found higher stress in the intervention group at both time points ($p = 0.07$ and $p = 0.01$, respectively; effect estimates not reported). One RCT (Arshadi et al., n.d.), evaluating impact of hospital discharge planning found that maternal stress (using the Parental Stress Scale) was lower in the intervention group ($p < 0.001$, $n = 92$). A final RCT (Lou et al., 2011), assessing the effect of PURPLE crying material on mean frustration levels (rated on a 0–100 scale) when a 10-min audio of a child crying was played immediately after the education session, found some evidence of lower frustration levels in the intervention group ($p = 0.10$, $n = 33$).

3.6. Parental mental health

One RCT (Bishe et al., 2020) comparing a home education package to standard care reported both ‘state anxiety’ (current anxiety when answering questionnaire) and ‘trait anxiety’ (general anxiety level) were lower at follow-up in the intervention group ($p < 0.001$, $n = 70$). One cluster RCT (Doi, Fujiwara, Isumi, & Mitsuda, 2020; Fujiwara et al., 2020a) assessed depression using the Edinburgh Postnatal Depression Scale, and found no difference between groups ($13.7\%$ intervention, $16.0\%$ control; OR $0.85$, $95\%$ CI $0.64$ to $1.12$, $n = 2601$).

3.7. Frequency or duration of infant crying

This outcome was measured in two studies (Barr et al., 2009b; McRury & Zolotor, 2010). One RCT (Barr et al., 2009b) evaluating effectiveness of PURPLE crying material reported a small increase in average minutes of crying and inconsolable crying per day in the intervention group compared to controls (MD $5.5$ min, $95\%$ CI $2.7$ to $8.4$ min, $n = 1857$, and MD $1.9$ min, $95\%$ CI $0.4$ to $3.3$ min, $n = 1857$, respectively). A second RCT (McRury & Zolotor, 2010) comparing “Happiest Baby” with a control intervention found no difference in mean daily hours of crying between groups at 4 weeks ($p = 0.3$, $n = 33$), 6 weeks ($p = 0.4$, $n = 33$) or 12 weeks ($p = 0.8$, $n = 26$), but found frequency of crying was higher in the intervention group at 8 weeks ($p = 0.04$, $n = 34$).

3.8. Infant sleep patterns

One RCT (McRury & Zolotor, 2010) comparing “Happiest baby” with a control intervention measured mean daily hours of sleeping, and found no difference between groups at 4, 6, 8 or 12 weeks ($p = 0.2$ [n = 33], $p = 0.8$ [n = 33], $p = 0.7$ [n = 34] and $p = 1.0$ [n = 26], respectively).

None of the included RCTs reported outcomes on confidence/self-efficacy, frequency of seeking support, other infant abuse, or infant mortality.

3.9. Certainty of evidence

Based on GRADE assessments, there is low certainty evidence from two case-control studies and two CBA studies that educational interventions have no effect on AHT, due to serious bias concerns (downgraded 2 levels for bias). Evidence for self-reported shaking was of very low certainty due to serious bias concerns (downgraded 2 levels for bias) and imprecision. Evidence for parental responses to crying, some parental behaviours (e.g. walking away from infant, picking-up infant and others) and parental frustration ranged from very low to moderate certainty. GRADE assessments are presented in the summary of findings table (Table 5).

4. Discussion

4.1. Summary of findings

This systematic review found low certainty evidence (from two case-control studies and two controlled before-after studies) of no effect of educational interventions on the incidence of AHT. Further, we found very low certainty evidence, from a cohort study and a cluster-RCT, of reduced incidence of infant shaking; this self-reported outcome had high potential for bias as parents in the intervention group may underreport its occurrence.

There was moderate certainty evidence of negligible improvements in parental response to inconsolable crying, and low certainty evidence of possible increase in the ‘walking away’ behaviour in intervention groups, although this latter result was imprecise. There was no evidence for three other measures of parental responses to infant crying. In the one study that assessed anxiety there was an improvement in the intervention group, but the study was small. There was no difference between intervention and control in infant picking up behaviours and parental frustration with crying, and also for emotional regulation and postnatal depression. There was some indication that some evidence was potentially missing for parental mental health outcomes (depression, anxiety and stress).
Table 5
Summary of findings and certainty of evidence (based on GRADE rating) for abusive head trauma, self-reported shaking, parental responses to crying and parental frustrations syntheses.

| Certainty assessment | No. of studies | Study design | Risk of bias | Inconsistency | Indirectness | Imprecision | Other considerations | No. of patients | Effect | Absolute (95 % CI) | Certainty of evidence |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|--------|---------------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| Abusive head trauma (incidence) | 4 | Observational studies (2 case-control + 2 CBA) | Very seriousa | Not serious | Not serious | Not serious | None | Case control studies: 86 cases, 644 controls | OR 0.95 (0.81 to 1.13) | 0 fewer per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 0 fewer) | Narrative synthesis: educational interventions appear to have no effect on the incidence of AHT | ⨁◯◯◯ Low |
| Self-reported shaking of the baby (incidence) | 3 | 2RCTs + 1 NRS | Very seriousa | Not serious | Not serious | Seriousb | None | –/2692 | –/5924 | Not pooled. Narrative synthesis: educational interventions appear to reduce frequency of shaking | ⨁◯◯◯ Very low |
| Parental responses to crying: active coping (scale from: 0 to 100) | 1 | Randomised trials | Seriousb | Not serious | Not serious | Seriousb | None | 1058 | 1597 | – | MD 0.59 higher (0.73 lower to 1.91 higher) | ⨁◯◯◯ Low |
| Parental responses to crying: response to general crying (scale from: 0 to 100) | 3 | Randomised trials | Not serious | Not serious | Not serious | Seriousb | None | 1734 | 2060 | – | MD 0.08 higher (0.84 lower to 1 higher) | ⨁⨁◯◯ Moderate |
| Parental responses to crying: response to inconsolable crying (scale from: 0 to 100) | 3 | Randomised trials | Not serious | Not serious | Not serious | Seriousb | None | 1773 | 1724 | – | MD 1.58 higher (0.11 higher to 3.06 higher) | ⨁◯◯◯ Moderate |
| Parental responses to crying: Self-talk (Scale from: 0 to 100) | 4 | Randomised trials | Seriousb | Seriousb | Not serious | Seriousb | None | 2830 | 3316 | – | MD 1.38 higher (1.27 lower to 4.02 higher) | ⨁◯◯◯ Very low |
| Parental responses to crying: walking away from crying baby (times per day) | 3 | Randomised trials | Not serious | Seriousb | Not serious | Seriousb | None | –/1527 | –/1522 | Rate ratio 1.52 (0.94 to 2.49) | – | ⨁◯◯◯ Low |

(continued on next page)
Table 5 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certainty assessment</th>
<th>No. of studies</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Risk of bias</th>
<th>Inconsistency</th>
<th>Indirectness</th>
<th>Imprecision</th>
<th>Other considerations</th>
<th>No. of patients</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Certainty of evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental responses to crying: picking up child (times per day)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Randomised trials</td>
<td>Not serious</td>
<td>Not serious</td>
<td>Not serious</td>
<td>Serious&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>–/1527</td>
<td>–/1522</td>
<td>Rate ratio 1.02 (0.96 to 1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental frustration (scale from: 1 to 6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Randomised trials</td>
<td>Not serious</td>
<td>Not serious</td>
<td>Not serious</td>
<td>Serious&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1502</td>
<td>1497</td>
<td>MD 0.01 lower (0.08 lower to 0.05 higher)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CI: confidence interval; OR: odds ratio; MD: mean difference. RCT: randomised trial; NRS: non-randomised study.

<sup>a</sup> Serious risk of bias due to confounding and selection bias in case-controlled studies. Serious risk of confounding in CBA studies. Downgraded by 2 levels.

<sup>b</sup> Very wide confidence interval from two pooled case-control studies, and a very small number of cases (77 + 9). Summary estimate from only two CBA studies has narrow CI around the null. The overall estimate including all 4 studies has a narrow CI around the null. No downgrades made for precision.

<sup>c</sup> One cluster RCT at high risk of bias and one NRS at serious risk of bias (self-reported shaking - high risk of bias in the measurement of outcome). Studies not pooled due to different study design. Third RCT was inestimable due to zero events in both arms.

<sup>d</sup> Studies not pooled. Confidence intervals were somewhat wide for one of the studies and the third study was non-estimable because of no events.

<sup>e</sup> High risk of bias for deviations from intended interventions and missing data.

<sup>f</sup> Single study. Although the confidence interval is not wide, it is around a very small difference in measurement scale.

<sup>g</sup> CI relatively wide and consistent with the direction of both benefit and harm.

<sup>h</sup> Only 3 included studies.

<sup>i</sup> Two of the four included results had risk of bias issues: one was at high risk of bias (36.67 % weight in MA) and the other was rated some concerns (7.67 % weight).

<sup>j</sup> I<sup>2</sup> = 61 %, study estimates vary in opposite directions.

<sup>k</sup> CI wide across both directions of effect.

<sup>l</sup> I<sup>2</sup> = 61 %, estimates vary between studies (but they are in the same direction).

<sup>m</sup> Only 3 included studies and CI consistent with both benefit and harm.

<sup>n</sup> Only 3 included studies and CI consistent with both benefit and harm.

<sup>o</sup> Only 3 included studies and CI consistent with both benefit and harm.
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The mixed evidence from our review is comparable with the findings from a recent review of interventions for managing colic (Lynæe & Eriksson, 2021), which concluded that preventive programs showed little or no effect on incidence of AHT. An older review (Lopes, Eisenstein, & Williams, 2013) reported that the eight studies they identified all reported positive effects of the intervention, and another review by the same author (Lopes & Williams, 2018) found weak evidence of effectiveness of interventions for reducing infant crying and raising awareness about AHT. However, neither of these reviews considered study design specific issues when assessing bias and quality of the included studies and overall certainty of evidence.

4.2. Strengths and limitations

Our review brings a comprehensive synthesis of effectiveness of educational interventions for AHT prevention. Few other reviews have addressed this topic (Iqbal O’Meara, Sequeira, & Miller, 2020; Lopes et al., 2013; Lopes & Williams, 2018; Lynæe & Eriksson, 2021), most of which were not systematic. Our comprehensive search strategy, developed by an experienced information specialist (SD) with input from clinical co-authors (ML, JM) and public health experts (JM, JW) imparts assurance that we identified all relevant studies. Our search and inclusion criteria did not impose any limitations by date or language. Cochrane guidance for conducting systematic reviews was rigorously followed.

There were several limitations. Our initial intention to include studies in which the intervention aim was to prevent AHT was challenging to operationalise in practice due to variations in how this was reported. Instead, we opted to examine the content of intervention packages for messaging regarding AHT to determine eligibility, and were sometimes required to contact authors to determine this.

No RCTs measured our primary outcome of AHT, and self-reported infant shaking was reported in three RCTs. Whilst other behaviour changes are proxies for intervention success, AHT reduction is the ultimate focus. We addressed this by including non-randomised studies that did measure AHT reduction. Most meta-analyses included the same three or four studies from two research groups, and several evaluated the same intervention (PURPLE Crying). Most studies assessed knowledge-based outcomes, which were not of interest for this review as they are process outcomes, early in the pathway to behaviour change. Such process or surrogate outcomes may be misleading as they may not accurately predict clinically important outcomes (AHT in this case) (McKenzie et al., 2021). Several studies included in this review concluded their intervention was effective based solely on these knowledge outcomes, a finding which is largely not supported based on the behaviour change outcomes. Further work is required to understand how to turn the gains made in knowledge acquisition into behaviour change.

We identified important gaps in the evidence. Most studies did not include fathers or male partners who are more frequent perpetrators of AHT (Schnitzer & Ewigman, 2005; Starling et al., 1995). Most included studies were from North America and Japan, with only one from Europe (France), and none reported cost-effectiveness outcomes. Only one study evaluated training for healthcare professionals delivering prevention programmes.

Issues with risk of bias contributed to the GRADE judgment of low certainty evidence for AHT, and risk of bias and imprecision led to the judgment of very low certainty evidence for incidence of infant shaking. Certainty of evidence for secondary outcomes varied from very low to moderate. Not all results from completed studies were publicly available, and some studies remain unpublished or inaccessible.

4.3. Implications for research and policy

Our review highlights large gaps in the evidence for effectiveness of educational and behavioural interventions which aim to reduce AHT. Such interventions are unlikely to be harmful (Fujiwara et al., 2020a), but there is very little robust evidence on whether they are effective.

Development of robust evidence to support or refute the role of educational interventions to prevent AHT is therefore needed, but any such evaluations are challenging for several reasons. Whilst a cluster RCT which linked patients to hospital records to accurately assess AHT rates may be possible, this would be difficult to conduct due to the rarity of the outcome, the large number of participants required, and challenges with linking safeguarding outcomes across health and social care agencies. Alternatively, large-scale, well-designed and conducted comparative NRSs utilising routinely recorded AHT outcome data could be used to assess effectiveness of preventative programmes. Future studies should consider in their designs the opportunity to address areas of limited evidence. Specifically, the ability of the intervention to reach and impact male carers and ensuring that study samples are representative of the population targeted by the intervention.

In summary, we found low certainty evidence that preventative interventions focused on educating parents on how to cope with infant crying do not reduce the incidence of AHT. Very low certainty evidence suggests that prevention programmes might reduce the incidence of infant shaking. There is very low to moderate certainty evidence that some of these interventions might marginally increase some intended parental behaviours (e.g. walking away from a crying infant, picking up a child). As RCTs are often not feasible to assess rare outcomes like AHT, more robust, large-scale, comparative NRSs that make use of routinely collected data and include assessment of cost-effectiveness should be conducted to inform decisions on preventative interventions.
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