ChatGPT

Restoring Parent–Child Relationships After Parental Alienation and Parental Disparagement

Executive summary

Parental alienation/parental disparagement (often operationalized as **parental alienating behaviors**, or **PABs**) refers to a sustained pattern of behaviors by a parent/caregiver that undermines a child's relationship with the other parent and can contribute to the child's **resistance/refusal** of contact. [1] The clinical priority in "reunification" referrals is **not** to assume alienation as the cause of estrangement; it is to **differentiate alienation from justified estrangement** (e.g., fear/avoidance driven by maltreatment, coercive control, or other safety threats), and to treat safety as a gatekeeper decision before any contact-expansion plan. [2]

The intervention evidence base is **uneven**. Direct empirical studies of alienation-specific reunification programs remain limited and commonly involve **uncontrolled designs**, court-selected samples, and outcomes reported by program-affiliated adults—features that inflate risk of bias and reduce causal certainty. [3] In contrast, there is **stronger randomized and meta-analytic evidence** for component interventions that address mechanisms relevant to alienation cases: (a) evidence-based parenting and parent–child relationship interventions that reduce harsh parenting and improve relational quality, [4] (b) post-separation parenting programs delivered via courts or community agencies that improve parenting and child mental health over months to years, [5] and (c) evidence-based child trauma/attachment treatments that reduce PTSD symptoms, depression/anxiety, and behavior problems when children have been exposed to chronic family stress or relational trauma. [6]

A practical, clinically rigorous approach is therefore **staged and measurement-based**: stop ongoing disparagement and coercive dynamics, stabilize the child's functioning and routines, rebuild safe, predictable contact (often starting with brief, structured, coached interactions), and intensify toward family-based repair only when safety and readiness thresholds are met. [7] Courts and systems should support this by clarifying roles and confidentiality, avoiding conflicting professional roles, ensuring both parents' perspectives are obtained when safe/feasible, and using time-sensitive procedures that reduce prolonged uncertainty and conflict exposure. [8]

Definition and clinical framing

Exposure and target populations

Exposure / presenting problem (definition used in this report):
Parental alienation/disparagement from birth through adolescence is treated here as a **developmentally patterned exposure to PABs**—repeated behaviors by a parent/caregiver that recruit the child into denigrating, fearing, or avoiding the other parent, and/or sabotage contact and the child's relationship, sometimes escalating into entrenched contact refusal. [1] In practice, referrals often describe "parental alienation" but include heterogeneous realities: (a) alienation without a legitimate basis for fear, (b) justified

estrangement due to maltreatment, (c) “hybrid” cases where both alienating behavior and problematic parenting/violence are present, and (d) cases driven mainly by developmental, mental health, or family-system factors not reducible to either label. [9]

Target populations and contexts:
Most interventions are described for **children and adolescents in separated/divorced, high-conflict custody contexts**, including court-involved referrals for “access/visitation refusal.” [10] The youngest group (infants/toddlers) is often not “alienated” in the usual sense; instead, the clinical problem is **blocked attachment formation** (e.g., the child has had minimal opportunity for a relationship with one parent). Evidence-supported approaches here are dyadic/attachment-focused rather than insight-oriented talk therapy. [11]

Why differential diagnosis matters

Several peer-reviewed forensic/clinical papers emphasize distinguishing **alienation** (rejection “without legitimate justification”) from **estrangement** (avoidance for “good reason,” such as maltreatment), partly because interventions that assume alienation may be harmful if the underlying driver is fear or trauma. [12] Psychometric approaches proposed to aid this distinction often focus on the child’s **splitting** (extreme idealization of one parent and devaluation of the other) and lack of ambivalence, which is described as more characteristic of severe alienation than of maltreatment-related estrangement. [13]

A large Scandinavian public-health survey study also reported dose–response associations between degree of parental alienation (as measured by internally reliable “strategy” items) and mental ill-health/impaired well-being, supporting construct validity while also underscoring that “alienation” overlaps ethically and clinically with broader domestic-relational harm constructs. [14]

Evidence on interventions to repair and restore relationships

What the direct alienation-specific intervention literature shows

The NLM-indexed clinical literature contains descriptions of **reunification therapy** approaches and family-based treatment models for “access refusal,” but many are **conceptual**, **case-illustrated**, or otherwise not designed to estimate causal effects (no randomization; outcomes not independently assessed). [15] One PubMed-indexed paper explicitly frames reunification therapy as a key treatment concept and argues for earlier identification when cases are mild rather than later when dynamics are entrenched. [16] Another PubMed-indexed paper outlines a **family-based treatment model** for parent–child reunification in high-conflict divorce and prolonged contact refusal, again primarily as a clinical model with case illustration rather than a controlled outcomes study. [17]

A separate stream of alienation-focused “intensive” programs is described in non-NLM family-law and family-court journals. One widely cited example reports pre/post changes after a four-day educational workshop delivered after court-ordered custody reversal, including a reported reduction in contact refusal from 85% pre to 6% post; however, the report is not randomized and is vulnerable to selection effects, expectancy effects, and allegiance bias. [18]

What is most defensible clinically: treat the alienation-specific evidence as **low-to-very-low certainty**, and use it mainly to inform *hypotheses about process* (e.g., rapid stabilization plus intensive coaching may help some severe cases) rather than as proof of broad effectiveness. [10]

Higher-certainty evidence for component interventions that match alienation mechanisms

Because direct evidence is limited, a clinically rigorous plan typically integrates interventions supported in adjacent, higher-quality literatures:

Post-separation parenting programs delivered via courts/community agencies (randomized evidence):
A large randomized effectiveness trial embedded in family court/community settings tested a 10-session parenting program (New Beginnings Program, NBP) against an active brief comparison and measured parenting, interparental conflict, and child mental health at post and 10-month follow-up (N≈830 parents of children age 3–18). [19] Long-term follow-up work in earlier trials reported substantially lower incidence of internalizing disorders over many years in intervention vs control participants, supporting durable impacts on child/young-adult mental health—outcomes relevant to relapse prevention and long-range functioning even when "reunification" is not the primary endpoint. [20]

Evidence-based parenting interventions for relationship repair (guideline-grade synthesis):
A recent WHO guideline (0–17 years) recommends accessible evidence-based parenting interventions to reduce maltreatment/harsh parenting and to enhance parent–child relationships, with strong recommendations in several age bands (noting that evidence certainty varies by age group and outcome). [21] This provides a rigorous basis for adopting parenting-skill, emotion-coaching, and nonviolent discipline components in alienation restoration plans, especially when the presenting system includes harsh parenting, intimidation, or chronic conflict. [22]

Child trauma and attachment treatments (meta-analytic/RCT evidence):
Trauma-Focused CBT (TF-CBT) shows moderate superiority vs control conditions for pediatric posttraumatic stress symptoms (e.g., g≈0.52 at post-treatment in a large meta-analysis of RCTs), with benefits also supported at longer follow-up in separate synthesis work. [23] For preschool children exposed to trauma, Child–Parent Psychotherapy (CPP) has randomized evidence and follow-up data supporting durable improvements in child behavior problems and caregiver distress in treatment completers (dyadic, relationship-focused model). [24] For disruptive behavior and coercive interaction cycles, PCIT has meta-analytic evidence for reducing externalizing behavior, including in RCTs and in high-risk/maltreated family contexts. [25]

Family attachment repair in adolescents (RCT evidence):
Attachment-Based Family Therapy (ABFT) has randomized evidence in suicidal adolescents showing large effects on suicidal ideation and clinically meaningful recovery proportions over follow-up, indicating that attachment-repair family work can produce substantial change when risk is high. [26] In alienation presentations with adolescent depression, suicidality, or entrenched attachment rupture, ABFT-like task structures can be adapted for reunification goals (while acknowledging the evidence base is indirect). [27]

Effect size snapshot for evidence-supported components

The following chart summarizes *magnitudes* of effects from higher-quality literatures that can be incorporated into reunification plans (sign direction simplified to magnitude). [28]

```
xychart-beta
title "Effect sizes for evidence-supported components relevant to reunification
planning"
x-axis ["TF-CBT vs control (PTSS)","ABFT vs EUC (suicidal ideation)","Parent
group training (externalizing)","Digital parent training (disruptive)"]
y-axis "Standardized effect size (approx.)" 0 --> 1.2
bar [0.52,0.97,0.38,0.44]
```

Practical clinical pathways by developmental stage

Core principles across ages

A court-involved therapy best-practice guideline emphasizes that court involvement changes treatment dynamics, that inappropriate treatment can escalate conflict and cause damage, and that therapists should clarify role boundaries, seek adequate data, and (when possible) obtain both parents' perspectives rather than relying on one-sided accounts. [29] These principles map cleanly onto alienation cases, where triangulation, loyalty binds, and legal incentives can distort reporting and engagement. [10]

A pragmatic intervention "stack" with the best safety profile is:

1) **Safety gate** (abuse/IPV/coercive control screening; clarify legal authority and consent)
2) **Stop active disparagement and sabotage** (behavioral limits, parenting plan structure, supervised exchanges if needed)
3) **Stabilize child functioning** (sleep, school, anxiety/trauma symptoms; child therapy if indicated)
4) **Rebuild relational safety through coached contact** (graduated exposure to the relationship, not forced emotional intimacy)
5) **Family-based repair and relapse prevention** (co-parenting boundaries, aftercare monitoring, recontact plans)

These steps are consistent with child welfare framing that reunification supports should be trauma-informed, strengths-based, and accessible, and should actively engage parents, youth, and kin. [30]

A stepwise triage and treatment pathway

```
flowchart TD
A[Referral for alienation / contact refusal] --> B[Clarify context: voluntary vs
court-ordered; legal custody/consent; role boundaries]
B --> C{Safety gate: credible abuse, coercive control, stalking, IPV, child
fear/trauma?}
C -- Yes / unclear --> D[Independent safety investigation + trauma-informed
```

```
stabilization]
D --> E{Contact plan safe now?}
E -- No --> F[Protective orders / supervised contact only / therapeutic
visitation; re-evaluate]
E -- Yes --> G[Differential diagnosis: alienation vs estrangement vs hybrid]
C -- No --> G
G --> H{Severity of refusal}
H -- Mild/early --> I[Psychoeducation + parenting coaching + conflict
containment + brief coached contact]
H -- Moderate --> J[Structured reunification plan + child symptom treatment +
parent coaching + monitoring]
H -- Severe/entrenched --> K[Specialized multidisciplinary plan; consider
intensive services only with safeguards; measure adverse events]
I --> L[Maintenance + relapse prevention]
J --> L
K --> L
L --> M[Measurement-based follow-up; adjust plan]
```

The key caution is that “severe” does not mean “more force.” It means higher need for safeguards, clear contraindication criteria, and monitoring for harm. [31]

Infants and toddlers

Infants/toddlers require **attachment formation**, not cognitive reframing. Dyadic trauma/attachment treatments (e.g., CPP) have randomized evidence in preschool-aged dyads and emphasize relationship-focused repair after adversity. [24]

Practical protocol (infants/toddlers):

- Build a **high-frequency, low-intensity contact schedule** (short, predictable, routine-based contact) to form familiarity and co-regulation, rather than long, infrequent visits. This is aligned with broad child welfare guidance that frequent, meaningful family time supports relationship integrity and reduces removal-associated trauma (principle-level guidance). [32]
- Use **coached interactions** (in vivo parenting support) focused on sensitivity, following the child’s cues, and calm transitions; structured parenting interventions can change sensitivity trajectories, and parenting-driven change is a plausible mechanism for relationship building. [33]
- Treat caregiver risk factors that impede attunement (depression, substance use, extreme hostility) in parallel, because dyadic repair depends on caregiver capacity. [22]

School-age children

School-age children can become rigidly polarized and may show anxiety, somatic complaints, behavioral dysregulation, or triangulation. [34] Intervention often needs both **skills** (emotion regulation, coping) and **relationship experiences** (predictable, non-defensive interactions with the rejected parent).

Practical protocol (school-age):

- Begin with **structured, coached contact** that prevents adult conflict exposure (neutral exchanges, predictable routines, concrete activities). [29]
- Address child symptoms with evidence-based care when indicated:
- If trauma symptoms are prominent, TF-CBT has RCT/meta-analytic support for reducing PTSS and related symptoms. [35]
- If disruptive/coercive interaction cycles dominate, PCIT has meta-analytic support for reducing externalizing behavior and improving parenting skills. [25]
- Run parent work in parallel: parent group interventions show modest but meaningful pooled effects on externalizing behaviors (g≈-0.38) and smaller effects on internalizing. [36] This is clinically relevant because reducing child behavior dysregulation can reduce the fuel for refusal episodes and improve contact quality.

Adolescents

Adolescents require a different stance: coercive approaches often backfire, adolescent autonomy is developmentally normative, and entrenched refusal can be maintained by identity narratives and peer/school ecosystems.

Practical protocol (adolescents):

- Treat reunification as a **process** potentially spanning long periods; qualitative work on voluntary reunification among adults who were alienated as children emphasizes that reunification may take years and can include cycles of connection and rejection. [37]
- Use **collaborative goal-setting** and a "choice-with-structure" framework: identify what the adolescent is willing to try (texts, short meetings in public with a coach present, shared projects), while keeping safety rules and adult boundary rules firm. [29]
- If depression, suicidality, or severe attachment rupture is present, attachment-repair family therapy models (e.g., ABFT) have RCT evidence for reducing suicidal ideation with large effects, supporting the plausibility of intensive family attachment work when risk is high. [27]

Assessment tools and measurement-based monitoring

Measuring alienation-related constructs

Validated measurement in this field is still developing, but several tools/frameworks appear in NLM-indexed literature:

- **PARQ-based splitting metrics** (including "gap" approaches) have been proposed to quantify extreme polarization between parents and help differentiate alienation from estrangement. [13]
- An "alienation strategies" approach with internally reliable items has been reported in population research and shows associations with visitation sabotage and dose–response relations with mental ill-health/well-being, supporting construct validity (though self-recruited designs still limit inference). [14]
- A pilot study proposed adding parental alienation items into ACE-type screening, which may help research tracking but should not be treated as diagnostic without further validation. [38]

Clinical recommendation: use alienation-related measures as **tracking tools** (severity/trajectory), not as sole determinants of causality in custody disputes. This is consistent with court-involved therapy cautions about limited information bases and the biasing effects of one-sided data. [29]

Core child and family outcome measures for reunification work

A high-rigor reunification plan should define outcomes in at least four domains:

- **Relationship/contact outcomes:** stability of the schedule, contact frequency, child distress before/during/after contact, and post-contact recovery time (tracked session-by-session). [29]
- **Child mental health:** broadband behavior and emotional symptoms (e.g., CBCL is used in randomized dyadic trauma work and other trials). [39]
- **Parenting and parent stress:** parenting stress, harsh discipline, positive parenting behaviors—aligned with WHO guideline targets for parenting interventions. [4]
- **Conflict exposure:** validated scales (e.g., divorce/postdivorce conflict measures are used as outcomes in divorce-related RCTs). [40]

Biomarkers (cortisol and related)

Biomarkers are **not** diagnostic for alienation and generally do not provide case-level decision rules. Their ethically defensible role is mainly **research** or, in rare cases, adjunctive longitudinal monitoring when part of a validated protocol.

That said, parenting interventions have shown physiological pathway effects in high-risk contexts: a randomized trial reported sustained effects of an attachment-focused parenting intervention on cortisol regulation in later childhood, with parental sensitivity proposed as a mediator. [41] This supports the plausibility of **stress-system normalization** as a mechanism of benefit in relational-repair interventions, but it does not validate cortisol testing as a forensic tool for alienation claims. [42]

Implementation guidance for courts, clinicians, and child welfare

Multidisciplinary structure and role clarity

Court-involved therapy guidelines define court-involved roles, warn against dual-role conflicts (e.g., therapist becoming evaluator), and emphasize informed consent, confidentiality/privilege boundaries, and the need to understand how court dynamics distort treatment information. [29] For alienation/reunification cases, this argues for a **team approach** with separated functions:

- A neutral **forensic evaluator** (if needed) answers psycho-legal questions. [29]
- A **treating clinician/team** applies a structured reunification plan and reports only within authorized limits. [29]
- The child has independent representation/advocacy where applicable; empirical work in legal psychiatry literature describes development of guidelines/training manuals for guardians ad litem, reflecting the recognized need for role clarity and competence. [43]

Timing and system design

Child welfare synthesis guidance frames reunification as requiring trauma-informed, family-centered approaches that actively engage parents, youth, and kin, and that identify safety issues and strengths/needs to support stable reunification. [32] The same logic applies in custody alienation cases: protracted unresolved conflict increases exposure to chronic stress dynamics, so systems should prioritize **timely assessment and decisive containment of conflict exposure** (e.g., rapid role assignment, quick initiation of structured contact, and early response to sabotage behaviors). [44]

Risk mitigation, contraindications, and "do no harm" safeguards

Two categories of risk require explicit guardrails:

1) **Safety-related contraindications**
If abuse/coercive control is credible or unresolved, interventions that presume alienation and push rapid contact expansion may retraumatize the child. [9]

2) **Coercive or physically forced "reunification" practices**
Professional policy statements in adjacent attachment-disorder contexts warn against coercive interventions that can be harmful, providing a safety-stance analog for reunification programs that use isolation, intimidation, or force. [45]

Legal developments also reflect this risk framing. For example, an enacted Arizona statute restricts courts from ordering "family reunification treatment" when participation requires or results in conditions such as no-contact orders with a parent, overnight/out-of-state/multiday stays, custody transfers, or the use of force/coercion or isolation from supports. [46] While statutes vary by jurisdiction, the clinical implication is stable: **program design must include adverse-event monitoring and child-safety thresholds**, not only reunification targets. [29]

Training, supervision, and fidelity

Given the high-bias environment of court-involved cases, training should include:

- Competence in evidence-based child/family treatments relevant to mechanisms (TF-CBT, dyadic trauma/attachment work, behavioral parent training). [47]
- Court-involved therapy ethics, role boundaries, and bias management consistent with best-practice guidelines. [29]
- Fidelity monitoring using session checklists, supervision with recorded-session review where appropriate, and routine outcome monitoring (child symptoms, parenting stress, contact distress). [48]

Tables comparing interventions, study types, outcomes, and quality

Alienation-specific reunification approaches (direct but generally lower-certainty evidence)

Intervention family	Typical target context	Dose/intensity (often variably specified)	Outcomes reported in literature	Best-available evidence type	Quality and bias considerations
Outpatient “reunification therapy” frameworks (conceptual)	High-conflict separation/ divorce; early-to-moderate alienation; clinical referrals	Variable; often not standardized	Model/ approach descriptions; emphasis on early identification	Narrative/ clinical overview	Low certainty for effectiveness because designs are not outcome-comparative. [16]
Family-based reunification treatment models for access refusal (conceptual + case illustration)	Prolonged contact refusal; court-requested involvement	Variable; family-based goals for each member	Clinical model and tips for practice	Narrative model article	Low certainty for effectiveness; useful for structuring treatment tasks. [17]
Intensive educational workshop after custody reversal (example program)	Severe alienation, often after court-ordered custody change	Multi-day (e.g., 4-day) intensive	Large pre/ post change in contact refusal reported in at least one program evaluation	Uncontrolled pre/post in court-selected sample	High risk of selection/ allegiance bias and limited independent verification; still provides candidate hypotheses and safety-screening criteria. [49]

Intervention family	Typical target context	Dose/intensity (often variably specified)	Outcomes reported in literature	Best-available evidence type	Quality and bias considerations
Family-camp style intensive programs for resist/refuse dynamics (example program descriptions)	High-conflict divorced families; child resisting contact	Multi-day program; multimodal psychoeducation + clinical elements	Primarily descriptive program accounts	Descriptive reports	Limited public outcomes data in accessible sources; treat as experimental without stronger trials. [50]

Evidence-supported components that can be integrated into reunification plans (higher-certainty but indirect)

Component intervention	Core mechanism(s) useful in alienation cases	Evidence base	Example outcomes and effect sizes (when available)	Follow-up horizon
Court/community-delivered parenting program for divorcing/ separating families	Improves parenting; reduces conflict exposure; improves child adjustment	Randomized effectiveness trial in family court/ community settings	Multi-informant outcomes at post and 10-month follow-up in a large RCT; long-term follow-up in earlier trials shows reduced incidence of internalizing disorders. [5]	Months to 15 years
TF-CBT (child-focused trauma therapy)	Reduces PTSS; improves coping; decreases comorbid depression/ anxiety/grief	Meta-analysis including many RCTs	PTSS: g≈0.52 vs control at post-treatment; durable gains at longer follow-up in separate synthesis. [23]	Post to ~12 months+
CPP (dyadic trauma/ attachment therapy, preschool)	Relationship repair; caregiver–child co-regulation; trauma processing in dyad	RCT + follow-up evidence	Durable improvements in child behavior problems and caregiver distress in completers; symptom reductions in broader cohorts. [24]	6 months post-treatment+

Component intervention	Core mechanism(s) useful in alienation cases	Evidence base	Example outcomes and effect sizes (when available)	Follow-up horizon
PCIT / behavioral parent–child coaching	Reduces coercive cycles; increases positive parenting; improves externalizing behavior	Meta-analyses including RCTs	Consistent reductions in externalizing behavior; evidence also in maltreatment-risk contexts. [25]	Variable; often post to months
Parent group interventions / parent management training	Builds consistent parenting; reduces externalizing; modest internalizing gains	Meta-analyses of RCTs	Externalizing g≈-0.38; internalizing g≈-0.18 in one meta-analysis. [36]	Post to months
ABFT (adolescent attachment repair)	Repairs attachment rupture; reduces suicidal ideation; improves emotion regulation	RCTs	Large ES≈0.97 for suicidal ideation in one RCT; additional RCT evidence. [26]	Up to ~24 weeks+
Attachment-focused parenting interventions (early childhood)	Increases parental sensitivity; supports stress regulation	RCT evidence with physiological outcomes	Parenting sensitivity mediates sustained cortisol effects in middle childhood in an RCT. [41]	Years (in some trials)

PubMed links (NLM citations used above):

- Reunification therapy overview: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21683914/` [16]
- Family-based reunification model: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27074348/` [17]
- Qualitative reunification process study: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37599742/` [37]
- NBP effectiveness trial: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30644774/` [19]
- NBP 15-year follow-up: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23750466/` [20]
- TF-CBT meta-analysis: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36155943/` [35]
- CPP RCT follow-up: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16865033/` [51]
- PCIT meta-analysis: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28860132/` [52]
- ABFT RCT (suicidal ideation): `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20215934/` [27]
- PARQ splitting measure: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28833110/` [53]
- PARQ-Gap differentiation study: `https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32069364/` [54]

Research agenda and prioritized trials

The current evidence base leaves several high-priority gaps: (a) lack of high-quality comparative trials of alienation-specific reunification therapies, (b) inconsistent definitions and measurement of alienation vs estrangement, and (c) inadequate adverse-event tracking (e.g., symptom worsening, runaway attempts, panic reactions, suicidal escalation) in intensive programs. [31]

Proposed study portfolio

Pragmatic randomized trial of a staged reunification care pathway vs usual court-ordered services

- **Design:** cluster randomization by court/docket or service region to reduce contamination; stepped-care protocol with safety gates.
- **Sample size:** aim for ≥300–600 families (power for moderate effects on contact stability and child symptoms; subgroup analyses for age bands).
- **Endpoints:** (1) contact stability at 6 and 12 months, (2) child symptom change (broadband + trauma), (3) adverse events, (4) re-litigation/relapse, (5) child-reported felt safety and agency.
- **Rationale:** builds on evidence that structured parenting and conflict-reduction programs can be delivered via court/community systems and improve child outcomes. [55]

Mechanism-focused trial embedding evidence-based components into reunification work

- **Design:** optimization or factorial approach (e.g., MOST) to test which components add value (parent coaching intensity; child trauma therapy inclusion; supervised-to-unsupervised transition speed).
- **Sample size:** ~200–400 depending on factors tested.
- **Endpoints:** mediation by parenting sensitivity/harshness, conflict exposure, child trauma symptoms; optional physiological measures in a research-only subcohort.
- **Rationale:** aligns with WHO guideline emphasis on scalable parenting interventions and with evidence that parenting interventions can influence stress physiology. [56]

Validation studies for alienation/estrangement measurement with known-groups and longitudinal prediction

- **Design:** prospective cohorts with independent verification of maltreatment where possible; preregistered analysis; multi-informant, multi-method assessment.
- **Sample size:** ≥500 to support stable psychometrics and subgroup analyses.
- **Rationale:** builds on PARQ/PARQ-gap concepts and population strategy measures but addresses current limitations of self-recruited sampling and construct circularity. [57]

Minimum safety and ethics standards for future trials

Trials should include: (1) independent child safety review, (2) explicit stopping rules for harm, (3) documentation of court orders and coercive elements, (4) separation of evaluator and therapist roles, and (5) child assent/voice procedures developmentally appropriate to age and cognitive capacity. [58]

---

1 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30475019/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30475019/

2 9 12 54 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32069364/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32069364/

3 18 49 https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10502556.2018.1529505?doi=10.1080%2F10502556.2018.1529505&forwardService=showFullText&journalCode=wjdr20&tokenAccess=XgUAi2nnTyNhmn
https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10502556.2018.1529505?doi=10.1080%2F10502556.2018.1529505&forwardService=showFullText&journalCode=wjdr20&tokenAccess=XgUAi2nnTyNhmmHT8JSd&tokenDomain=e

4 21 22 56 https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK589378/
https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK589378/

5 19 55 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30644774/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/30644774/

6 23 28 35 47 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36155943/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/36155943/

7 8 29 31 44 58 https://www.afccnet.org/Portals/0/PublicDocuments/ProfessionalResources/Therapy-2011-Family_Court_Review.pdf?ver=2017-01-18-222910-007
https://www.afccnet.org/Portals/0/PublicDocuments/ProfessionalResources/Therapy-2011-Family_Court_Review.pdf?ver=2017-01-18-222910-007

10 17 34 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27074348/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27074348/

11 24 39 51 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16865033/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16865033/

13 53 57 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28833110/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28833110/

14 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37089006/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37089006/

15 16 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21683914/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21683914/

20 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23750466/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/23750466/

25 52 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28860132/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28860132/

26 27 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20215934/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20215934/

30 32 https://api.childwelfare.gov/topics/permanency/reunifying-families/
https://api.childwelfare.gov/topics/permanency/reunifying-families/

33 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27548644/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27548644/

36 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28699101/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28699101/

37 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37599742/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37599742/

38 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39245223/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/39245223/

40 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41801723/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/41801723/

41 42 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32781397/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/32781397/

43 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2039848/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/2039848/

45 https://www.aacap.org/aacap/Policy_Statements/2022/Policy_Statement_Coercive_Interventions_Attachment_Disorders.aspx
https://www.aacap.org/aacap/Policy_Statements/2022/Policy_Statement_Coercive_Interventions_Attachment_Disorders.aspx

46 https://legiscan.com/AZ/text/SB1372/id/2903586
https://legiscan.com/AZ/text/SB1372/id/2903586

48 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35478465/
https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/35478465/

50 https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227601160_Overcoming_Barriers_Family_Camp_A_program_for_high-conflict_divorced_families_where_a_child_is_resisting_contact_with_a_parent
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227601160_Overcoming_Barriers_Family_Camp_A_program_for_high-conflict_divorced_families_where_a_child_is_resisting_contact_with_a_parent