**S1.** Search Strategy for electronic databases

Key concepts categorised using the SPICE framework: Setting (child protection/child abuse); Perspective (parents); phenomenon of Interest (support; interventions); Context/comparison (mental health); Evaluation (qualitative; experiences).

MeSH and free-text terms were used for the search connected by Boolean operators “OR” and “AND”.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No. | Framework | Free text terms | MeSH terms |
| 1 | Setting: child safeguarding | ("child protect\*" OR "family court" OR "care proceeding\*" OR "child\* welfare" OR "custody adj3 los\*" OR "custody adj5 remov\*" OR ((child\* OR infant\* OR baby OR babies OR adolescent\* OR teen\*) adj5 (abus\* OR neglect\* OR maltreat\* OR safeguard\* OR "social care" OR "social work\*" OR "social service\*" OR remov\* OR separation OR separated OR "edge of care" OR custody OR "tak\* into care"))).tw  [adj5 or near5 or N5 etc] | **Medline:** exp Child Welfare/ or exp Child Abuse/ or exp Infant Welfare/ or exp Child Protective Services/  **Embase:** exp child abuse/ OR exp child welfare/ OR exp infant welfare/  **Psycinfo:** exp Child Abuse/ OR exp Child Custody/ OR exp Child Welfare/ OR exp Child Neglect/  **HMIC:** exp Child Welfare/ OR exp Child protection services/ OR Child abuse/  **CINAHL:** MH "Child Welfare+"/ OR MH "Child Abuse+" |
| 2 | Perspective: parents | (parent\* OR mother\* OR father\* OR maternal OR paternal OR parental OR family OR families).tw | **Medline:** exp Parents/  **Embase:** exp parent/  **PsycInfo:** exp Parents/  **HMIC:** expParents/  **CINAHL:** MH "Parents+" |
| 3 | Context: mental health | ("mental health" OR "mental\* disorder\*" OR "mental\* ill\*" OR "mood disorder\*" OR depress\* OR schizophreni\* OR bipolar OR bi-polar OR anxiety OR "personality disorder" OR posttraumatic OR post-traumatic OR PTSD OR psychosis OR psychotic OR trauma OR distress\*).tw | |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Medline:** exp Mental Health/ OR exp Mental Disorders/ OR exp Depression/ OR exp Psychological Distress/ OR exp Depression, Postpartum/  **Embase:** exp mental health/ OR exp mental disease/  **PsycInfo:** exp Mental Health/ OR exp Mental Disorders/  **HMIC:** expMental health/ OR exp Mental disorders/  **CINAHL:** MH "mental health+" or MH "mental illness+" or MH "mental disorder+" or MH "psychiatric illness+" |  | |
| 4 | Phenomenon of Interest: support or interventions | (service\* OR support OR practice OR intervention\* OR program\* OR treat\* OR therap\* OR care OR counsel\* OR training OR psychiatr\* OR psycholog\* OR "social work\*" OR "health\* professional\*" OR "health\* practitioner\*" OR "health\* personel" OR "health\* worker\*").tw | **Medline:** exp Mental Health Services/ OR exp Psychotherapy/ OR exp Psychiatry/ OR exp Psychology/ OR exp Counseling/ OR exp Social Work/ OR exp Health Personnel/  **Embase:** exp mental health care/ OR exp psychiatry/ OR exp psychology OR exp psychiatric treatment/ OR exp counseling/ or exp social work/ OR exp health care personnel  **PsycInfo:** exp Mental Health Services/ OR exp Psychotherapy/ OR exp Psychiatry/ OR exp Psychology/ OR exp Counseling/ OR exp Social Casework/ OR exp Health Personnel/  **HMIC:** exp Mental Health Services/ OR exp Psychiatry/ OR exp Psychology/ OR Psychology services/ OR exp Counselling/ OR exp Psychotherapy/ OR exp Social work/ OR exp health service staff/  **CINAHL:** MH "Mental health services+" OR MH "Psychiatric Care+" OR MH "Psychiatry+" OR MH "Psychotherapy+" OR MH "Social Work+" OR MH "Psychology+" OR MH " OR MH "Mental Health Personnel+" |
| 5 | Evaluation | (qualitative\* OR interview\* OR "thematic\*" OR ethnograph\* OR "grounded theory" OR phenomenolog\* OR experiential OR "focus group\*" OR discourse\* OR "conversation analysis" OR "framework analysis" OR "narrative\*" OR "lived experience\*" OR account\* OR hermeneutic OR "mixed method\*" OR "mixed-method\*" OR "semi-structure\*" OR "semi structure" OR IPA OR "interpretative\*" OR "content analysis" OR "guided discussion\*" OR "group discussion\*" OR open-ended OR "open ended").tw | **Medline:** exp Qualitative Research/  **Embase:** exp qualitative research/  **PsycInfo:** exp Qualitative Methods/  **HMIC:** exp Qualitative research/ OR exp Qualitative analysis/  **CINAHL:** MH "Qualitative Studies+" |

**S2.** Adapted Critical Appraisal Skills Programme

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1.Aims** | **Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?** |
| **Key questions** | * What was the goal of the R? * Why is it important? * Is it relevant? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 2+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2.Appropriateness** | **Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?** |
| **Key questions** | * Does the R seek to interpret or illuminate the actions &/or subjective experiences of Pps? * Is quali R the right methodology for addressing the R goal? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 1+ conditions are met, otherwise score ‘No’. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3.Design** | **Was the research design appropriate to address the R aims?** |
| **Key questions** | * Has the Researcher (Rr) justified the R design e.g. have they discussed how they decided which method to use? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 1+ condition is met, otherwise score ‘No’. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4. Recruitment** | **Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the R?** |
| **Key questions** | * Has the Rr explained how Pps were selected * Has the Rr explained why the participants they selected were the most appropriate to provide access to the type of knowledge sought by the study? * Are there any discussions around recruitment e.g. why some people chose not to take part? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 2+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5. Data Collection** | **Was the data collected in a way that addressed the R issue?** |
| **Key questions** | * Is the setting for data collection justified? * Are the methods justified? * Is it clear how data was collected e.g. focus group, semi-structured interview etc? * Has the Rr made the methods explicit e.g. for interviews, is there an indication of how ints were conducted or did they use a topic guide? * If methods were modified during the study. If so, has the Rr explained how and why? * Is the form of data clear e.g. tape recordings, video material, notes? * Has the Rr discusssed data saturation? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 3+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6. Research relationships** | **Has the relationship between Rr and Pps been adequately considered?** |
| **Key questions** | * Has the Rr critically examined their own role, potential bias & influence during a) formulation of the RQs & b) data collection, including sample recruitment & choice of location * Has the Rr responded to events during the study & considered the implications of any changes in the R design? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 1+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7.Ethics** | **Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?** |
| **Key questions** | * Is there sufficient details of how the R was explained to Pps for the reader to assess whether ethical standards were maintained] * Has the Rr discussed issues raised by the study e.g. around informed consent or confidentiality or how they have handled the effects of the study on Pps during & after the study? * Has approval been sought from the ethics committee? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 2+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8. Data Analysis** | **Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?** |
| **Key questions** | * Is there is an in-depth description of the analysis process? * If thematic analysis is used: is it clear how the categories/themes were derived from the data? * Does the Rr explain how the data presented were selected from the original sample to demonstrate the analysis process? * Is sufficient data are presented to support the findings? * To what extent is contradictory data are taken into account?   *(Final question has been moved to additional Positionality section)* |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 3+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9. Findings** | **Is there a clear statement of findings?** |
| **Key questions** | * Are the findings explicit? * Is there adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the Rrs arguments? * Has the Rr discussed the credibility of their findings e.g. through triangulation, respondent validation, more than one analyst, inter-rater reliability etc? * Are the findings discussed in relation to the original RQ? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 2+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **10. Value** | **How valuable is the Research?** |
| **Key questions** | * Has the Rr discussed the contribution the study makes to existing knowledge or understanding e.g. do they consider the findings in relation to current practice or policy? Or relevant R-based literature? * Have they identified new areas where R is necessary * Have the Rr discussed whether or how the findings can be transferred to other populations or considered other ways the R may be used? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 2+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

**Additional areas 11 and 12:** Extracted from Sweeney et al. (2019)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **11. Intersectionality** | **Have issues relating to intersectionalities been fully considered?** |
| **Key questions** | * Were attempts made to obtain a diverse sample of the population in question? (Rees 2014) * Have sample characteristics been fully described, including as a minimum sex, age and ethnicity? * Has diversity of experience been explored in the findings in relation to intersectionalities (e.g. ethnicity etc)? * Have issues relating to intersectionalities been explored in the discussion or limitation sections? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 2+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **12. Service user Involvement** | **Have service users been appropriately involved in the research?** |
| **Key questions** | * Does the study use appropriate data collection methods to ensure findings are grounded in service users' experiences? * Are the methods appropriate to ensure that data analysis is grounded in service user's views? * Are service users actively involved in the design and conduct of the study? * Are service users leading or controlling the study? * Are service users involved in data analysis (e.g. member checking, reviewing transcript) |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 3+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |

**Additional area 13:** Adapted from Hermaszewska et al. (2022)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **13. Positionality** | **Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice- versa, addressed?** |
| **Key questions** | * Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically? * Does the Rr critically examine their own role, potential bias & influence during analysis & selection of data & presentation? |
| **Scoring** | Score ‘Yes’ if 1+ conditions are met, otherwise score 'No'. |
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