

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: McAnuff, Jennifer, Gibson, Jenny L., Webster, Rob, Kaur-Bola, Kulwinder, Crombie, Sarah, Grayston, Aimee and Pennington, Lindsay (2023) School-based allied health interventions for children and young people affected by neurodisability: A systematic evidence map. *Disability and Rehabilitation*, 45 (7). pp. 1239-1257. ISSN 0963-8288

Published by: Informa Healthcare

URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2022.2059113>
<<https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2022.2059113>>

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<https://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/48777/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

Title Page

Title

School-based allied health interventions for children and young people affected by neurodisability: A systematic evidence map

Running Head

School-based allied health systematic evidence map

Article Category

Perspectives in rehabilitation

Authors and affiliations

- Dr Jennifer McAnuff, Department of Social Work, Education, and Community Wellbeing, Northumbria University, Coach Lane Campus, Benton, Newcastle, UK, NE7 7XA (ORCID ID 0000-0002-1636-0049) (corresponding author)
- Dr Jenny L. Gibson, Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK (ORCID ID 0000-0002-6172-6265)
- Dr Rob Webster, Institute of Education, University College London, London, UK (ORCID ID 0000-0003-1416-4439)
- Ms Kulwinder Kaur-Bola, Children's Services, Bedford Borough Council and Bedfordshire, Luton, and Milton Keynes Clinical Commissioning Group, Bedford, UK

- Dr Sarah Crombie, Chailey Clinical Services, Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust, Brighton, UK (ORCID ID 0000-0001-7516-2192)
- Ms Aimee Grayston, no institutional affiliation, Leeds, UK
- Dr Lindsay Pennington, Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK (ORCID ID 0000-0002-4540-2586)

Abstract

Purpose: To systematically map available evidence for school-based interventions led by allied health (i.e. occupational therapy, physiotherapy, and/or speech and language therapy).

Materials and Methods: We searched for studies in pre-school, primary, secondary, or post-secondary settings, published 2004-2020. We coded study, population, and intervention characteristics. Outcomes were coded inductively, categorised, and linked to the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health.

Results: We included 337 studies (33 countries) in an interactive evidence map. Participants were mainly pre-school and primary-aged, including individuals with neurodisability and whole-school populations. Interventions targeted wide-ranging outcomes, including educational participation (e.g. writing, reading) and characteristics of school environments (e.g. educators' knowledge and skills, peer support). Universal, targeted, and intensive interventions were reported in 21.7%, 38.9%, and 60.2% of studies, respectively. Teachers and teaching assistants delivered interventions in 45.4% and 22.6% of studies, respectively. 43.9% of studies conducted early feasibility testing/piloting and 54.9% had ≤ 30 participants. Sixty-two randomised controlled trials focused on intervention evaluation or implementation.

Conclusions: In the United Kingdom, future research should take forward school-based allied health interventions that relate directly to agreed research priorities. Internationally, future priorities include implementation of tiered (universal, targeted, intensive) intervention models and appropriate preparation and deployment of the education workforce.

Key words

Allied health, Occupational therapy, Physiotherapy, Speech and language therapy, Neurodisability, Schools, Evidence map

Implications for Rehabilitation

- Allied health professionals (occupational therapists, physiotherapists, and speech and language therapists) work in schools supporting children and young people affected by neurodisability but the content, impact, and cost-effectiveness of their interventions are not well-understood.
- We systematically mapped the available evidence and identified that allied health school-based interventions target highly diverse health-related outcomes and wider determinants of children and young people's health, including educational participation (e.g. literacy) and characteristics of the school environment (e.g. educators' knowledge and skills).
- Our interactive evidence map can be used to help stakeholders prioritise the interventions most in need of further evaluation and implementation research, including 'tiered' models of universal, targeted, and intensive allied health support.
- Teachers and teaching assistants play a central role in delivering allied health interventions in schools – appropriate preparation and deployment of the education workforce should therefore be a specific priority for future international allied health research.

Main Text

Introduction

Approximately 8% of 0-19 year olds are disabled and neurodisability comprises one of the largest groups of disabled children and young people [1, 2]. Neurodisability includes individuals affected by congenital or acquired long-term conditions related to impairment of the brain and/or neuromuscular system [3].

Disabled children and young people, including those affected by neurodisability, are at higher risk of adverse health, social, and educational outcomes than their non-disabled peers [4, 5].

For example, adolescents with cerebral palsy report significantly lower quality of life in terms of social support and peer relationships [6], disabled children and young people are more likely to experience bullying victimisation and violence [7, 8], and individuals identified as having special educational needs are more frequently excluded, absent, or missing from school, and are more likely to lag behind in educational and employment outcomes in adulthood [9-11]. Disabled children and young people also experience higher levels of poverty and social disadvantage, being more likely to live with low-income, deprivation, debt, and poor housing, to live in a lone-parent household, and to live with a disabled parent, all of which further compound their risk of adverse health outcomes [4, 5].

Allied health professionals, defined here as occupational therapists, physiotherapists, and speech and language therapists, are a key part of the workforce supporting children and young people affected by neurodisability. Although allied health professionals are commonly employed by health services, for example the National Health Service (NHS) in the United Kingdom (UK), much of their support is actually delivered in schools and education settings [12, 13]. As well as the practical reality that school is where children and young people spend most of their time during the day, the rationale for school-based allied health service delivery

is underpinned by a number of factors. Traditionally, allied health services have focused on reducing morbidity and impairment in children and young people and improving their capacities and skills. However, more contemporary practice is shifting towards targeting social environmental determinants of children and young people's health, particularly their participation in education [11-15]. Service delivery models over the last 15-20 years have been primarily consultative whereby allied health professionals design intervention programmes and advise teaching assistants, teachers, and parents on delivering them at school and home [12]. However, services are moving towards tiered intervention models whereby different levels of universal, targeted, and intensive support are embedded within school systems, with a particular emphasis on whole-school universal approaches that build educators' capacity to create inclusive environments for all children and young people's learning and development [16]. From a policy perspective, greater joint working between allied health and education systems is increasingly mandated as part of providing for the needs of individuals with special educational needs and disabilities in schools and improving their health, social, and educational outcomes [e.g. 17].

Whilst allied health support delivered in schools is part of usual care for children and young people affected by neurodisability, it is not well understood in terms of its content, impact, or cost-effectiveness. For example, across the UK, practice varies widely according to factors such as different philosophical positions on the purpose of allied health support, geographical area, and resource constraints [12, 18]. Furthermore, in some regions allied health support in schools is poorly integrated with other interventions and many parents report severe difficulties with accessing services and dissatisfaction with the amount of support their child receives [18]. This practice variation stems primarily from uncertainty about what works, a lack of consensus about what should be implemented, and inequitable provision of services between towns and regions, and does not reflect legitimate differences in how local service

commissioners provide appropriate support tailored to the unique needs and priorities of their own distinct populations [12, 18].

In the context of these issues, multidisciplinary professionals, parents, and children and young people have collectively identified and prioritised research topics focused on evaluating the effectiveness of allied health support, including in schools, for key health, social, and educational outcomes (e.g. self-care and independence, social participation, and educational inclusion [19-22]). Historically, allied health research conducted over the last 10-15 years has produced a number of landmark studies, including several randomised controlled trials and economic evaluations of language, social communication, handwriting, and exercise interventions, and service delivery models [e.g. 23, 24-27]. However, whilst these studies have certainly provoked discussion amongst practitioners and have likely had some influence on practice in some geographical areas, it is not clear how they could and should inform future evaluation and implementation research in the topics more recently prioritised by stakeholders.

In the present study, we aimed to identify and map the available evidence for allied health interventions in schools, i.e. interventions led by occupational therapists, physiotherapists, and/or speech and language therapists. We did not aim to synthesise evidence about intervention effectiveness, but rather to catalogue the available evidence base and make it more visible and accessible. This would support research funder, service commissioner, service provider, and researcher decision-making by: (i) highlighting clusters of evidence that could help guide future implementation efforts and evidence synthesis, (ii) identifying gaps in evidence where further primary research may be needed, and (iii) raising awareness of common elements in how diverse interventions are designed and delivered, which could help advance theory and research around intervention effectiveness.

Materials and Methods

Our study was designed to answer the research question: what evidence is available regarding allied health interventions in schools for children and young people affected by neurodisability? We used systematic evidence mapping as a method for identifying and bringing together a multi-faceted body of evidence involving diverse populations, interventions, outcomes, and study designs. Our intended outputs were a user-friendly interactive evidence map for stakeholders (i.e. research funders, service commissioners, service providers, and researchers) and a descriptive summary of the existing evidence base. Evidence maps have been defined as ‘a systematic search of a broad field to identify gaps in knowledge and/or future research needs that presents results in a user-friendly format, often a visual figure or graph, or a searchable database’ [28 p.18]. There are currently no agreed methodological standards for systematic evidence mapping; therefore, we drew on general principles proposed by the Campbell Collaboration and published systematic evidence mapping processes [28, 29]. For example, we determined the type of evidence to be included, developed a search strategy and coding framework in advance, included on-going studies by searching registries for primary studies and reviews, and produced a descriptive report [29]. We did not publish a study protocol in advance.

We convened a multidisciplinary research team with service user experience of neurodisability and allied health interventions in schools (KKB, AG) as well as expertise in allied health practice and research (JMc, JLG, LP, SC), mainstream and special education practice and research (RW, KKB), and health and education service commissioning for children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities (KKB). Our service user co-investigators (KKB, AG) were involved in preparing the funding application, developing the research question, conducting the evidence mapping, designing the interactive evidence map, and reviewing the present manuscript.

Search strategy

Our search strategy was structured around four core concepts: children and young people, neurodisability, allied health, and schools and education settings. We generated search terms by selecting key words and coupling these with relevant medical subject headings and thesaurus-controlled standard terms, where available. All key words were truncated as appropriate and variant spellings were used. Search terms within each concept were combined using the Boolean operator ‘OR’ and the results for each concept were combined using ‘AND’. We piloted the search strategy to ensure it was sensitive enough to identify seminal papers we would expect to see included.

The search strategy was developed in MEDLINE (see supplementary materials 1a) and then adapted for other bibliographic databases, specifically EMBASE, PsycINFO (both via Ovid), CINAHL, ERIC, British Education Index (all via EBSCO), Education Collection, IBSS, Social Science Database, Sociology Collection (all via Proquest), Cochrane Library, PEDro, OTseeker, speechBITE, and NIHR PROSPERO. Final searches were conducted 5-13 June 2019 and updated 15-21 May 2020. We also hand-searched the reference lists of relevant systematic reviews identified in the search results and two UK research funder websites (National Institute for Health Research and Education Endowment Foundation).

Eligibility criteria

One researcher (JMc) drafted preliminary eligibility criteria and piloted these using the results of MEDLINE searches. The criteria were critically discussed, refined, and finalised at a full research team meeting to ensure they could be consistently interpreted and applied systematically between researchers. The final eligibility criteria are presented in table 1.

[Table 1 near here]

Screening and selection

Search results were de-duplicated in EndNote X8 (Thomson Reuters, San Francisco, CA) and then exported into Covidence systematic review software (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia) for screening and selection. One researcher (JMc) screened titles and abstracts of all records and excluded those clearly not meeting population, intervention, or context criteria. Two researchers (LP, RW) each double checked 10% of the excluded titles and abstracts. One researcher (JMc) screened the remaining full-text records against the eligibility criteria. A proportion (25%) of the excluded full texts were checked by another researcher (JLG, LP, or SC). All included full texts were double checked (KKB or AG). Errors or disagreements at each stage were resolved through discussion.

Data analysis

The final included studies were transferred from Covidence to EPPI-Reviewer research synthesis software version 4.12.2.0 (EPPI-Centre, University College London) for coding and analysis. A coding framework with definitions and rules for each individual code was developed and refined through research team meetings (table 2). One researcher (JMc) completed all coding, drawing on topic expertise from research team members throughout the process.

[Table 2 near here]

For study characteristics, we coded study status (ongoing or completed), type, year, and country of publication. Quality assessments and risk of bias assessments have not consistently been incorporated into evidence mapping but are increasingly recommended. These were beyond the resources we had available, so instead we coded three methodological characteristics to characterise the overall nature of the evidence base: (i) study purpose, to establish how much of the existing evidence is concerned with feasibility testing/piloting,

evaluating, or implementing interventions [30], (ii) study design (e.g. before-after study, randomised controlled trial) [31], to enable consideration of the potential strengths and weaknesses associated with particular study design features, and (iii) sample size, to highlight the scale of the existing evidence overall and of particular study designs. For study populations, we coded participants' health conditions (e.g. cerebral palsy) and educational stages (e.g. pre-school). For interventions, we coded intervention leadership (i.e. occupational therapy, physiotherapy, speech and language therapy, or multidisciplinary), tier (i.e. universal, targeted, and/or intensive) [16, 32, 33], and delivery (e.g. by teaching assistants). Within comparative studies, we did not code usual or standard care interventions.

For study outcomes, we took an inductive approach to coding that was informed by the International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health [34] and responsive to the diversity in how included studies described their outcomes. First, we worked our way through the included studies individually and identified all outcomes. Where studies did not explicitly define their outcomes, we relied on background sections, measurement instruments, and results sections to aid our interpretation. Then, as we progressed through, we sorted conceptually similar outcomes into overall outcome categories and, embedded within these, more specific outcome sub-categories. We continuously checked and refined the consistency of our decision-making as we went along. Next, we selected verbatim examples of individual study outcomes to illustrate the variety within the sub-categories. Finally, we linked each sub-category to corresponding items within the ICF to further illustrate sub-categories' meaning and content.

When all coding was completed, we explored the included studies by using frequency counts and cross-tabulation in EPPI-Reviewer to produce graphs in Microsoft PowerPoint. These visual displays enabled the research team to summarise and critically discuss the existing evidence. We used EPPI-Mapper version 2.1.0 (Digital Solution Foundry and EPPI-Centre,

University College London) to create an interactive evidence map. To ensure the map would be a user-friendly and stand-alone resource, one researcher (JMc) produced multiple prototypes and obtained several rounds of feedback from both within the research team and from wider multidisciplinary stakeholders.

Results

Overview of included studies

Screening and selection is summarised in figure 1. We identified 16,249 potentially relevant records, of which 12,314 remained after 3,938 duplicates were removed. Screening of titles and abstracts resulted in exclusion of a further 9,815 records. The remaining 2,499 were subjected to full-text screening, of which we excluded 2,162 and included 337.

[Figure 1 near here]

The final 337 included studies are presented within the interactive evidence map (see supplementary materials 2), which contains the study titles, abstracts, digital object identifiers, and a downloadable Research Information Systems (RIS) file for importing the references into citation management software. Within the map, studies are displayed according to their outcome categories and sub-categories, participants' educational stages, and intervention leadership, which is colour-coded and can be presented in different styles (e.g. a bubble-map or heat-map) to show the proportion of studies led by the different allied health disciplines. The display can also be filtered according to each parameter in our coding framework. The references for the 337 studies are also available in the supplementary materials (1b).

Overall, 325/337 included studies (96.4%) were completed and 12 (3.6%) were ongoing (eight randomised controlled trials and four systematic reviews). The majority of studies were research papers (291/337, 86.3%), 23 were conference papers (6.8%), 12 were protocols for

the ongoing studies (3.6%), and 11 were PhD theses (3.3%). Speech and language therapy-led interventions accounted for 117/337 studies (34.7%), occupational therapy-led for 96 (28.5%), multidisciplinary-led for 85 (25.2%), and physiotherapy-led for 39 (11.6%). Across the studies of multidisciplinary-led interventions (n=85), occupational therapists and speech and language therapists were each involved in delivering 45/85 (52.9%) and physiotherapists in 23/85 (27.1%).

The studies were conducted in 33 countries (table 3) with the United States (US) accounting for almost half of included studies and the top five countries (US, UK, Australia, Canada, Israel) accounting for three quarters. The remaining 28 countries accounted for one quarter of included studies. As the two biggest producers of research, the US and UK produced considerably fewer physiotherapy-led studies, and the UK also produced relatively fewer occupational therapy-led studies, even when occupational and physiotherapy involvement in multidisciplinary-led studies was taken into account.

[Table 3 near here]

Year of publication is presented in table 4. Ignoring studies published between 2004 and 2008 (because we included selected exemplar studies only) and 2020 (because our final searches were conducted in May 2020), there appeared to be an overall slight upward trajectory in the number of studies being published each year between 2009 and 2019 (figure 2). This may be attributable to small increases in research from the UK and Australia across that time period (6/8 ongoing randomised controlled trials were UK-based and 4/4 ongoing systematic reviews were Australia-based) as well as a slight increase in the number of speech and language therapy-led studies (figure 3).

[Table 4 near here]

[Figure 2 near here]

[Figure 3 near here]

Methodological characteristics

Variable quality of reporting made it challenging to screen and analyse studies. For example, it was often difficult to establish whether interventions were delivered in schools as opposed to clinical or other community settings. Multiple publications arising from the same research programme and similar-looking studies from the same research groups were not always cross-referenced or differentiated, which necessitated further checking to identify related studies and compare them for duplication.

Methodological characteristics are presented in table 5. Overall, almost half the studies focused on feasibility testing/piloting, a third on evaluation, and almost a quarter on implementation. It was challenging to code for study purpose because studies were not usually framed in these terms. We made judgements on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the code definitions (table 2), study design and sample size, how the study rationale was presented in the background section, and what kinds of limitations were noted in the discussion section.

Before-after was the most common study design for included studies overall, for feasibility/pilot studies, and for implementation studies (table 5). Randomised controlled trial was the second most common study design overall and the most common design for evaluation studies. Of all included studies, just over half had a sample size of ≤ 30 , just over a quarter had ≤ 10 participants, just under half had a sample size of ≥ 31 , and almost one sixth had >100 participants (table 5).

[Table 5 near here]

Evaluation studies (114/337), particularly those using randomised controlled trial designs, were distributed across all four intervention leadership categories and a substantial proportion

fell within physiotherapy (figure 4 and table 5). This was noteworthy given that physiotherapy-led interventions accounted for only a small proportion of included studies overall. Conversely, very few implementation studies related to physiotherapy. Almost half of the implementation studies related to speech and language therapy and implementation was the purpose of almost a third of all speech and language therapy-led studies (figure 4). These proportions were greater than other intervention leadership categories, suggesting a more established tradition within speech and language therapy of research on topics such as training, models of intervention delivery, and service delivery models.

[Figure 4 near here]

Population characteristics

Participants' health conditions are presented in table 6. The five most commonly reported health conditions were autism spectrum disorder, physical disabilities (a broad code incorporating cerebral palsy, neuromuscular conditions, spinal cord injuries, spina bifida, multiple disabilities, and medical complexity), cerebral palsy only, developmental language disorder, and learning/intellectual disability. Almost a quarter of studies reported no health conditions, meaning that these studies either related to whole-school populations, which we assumed would include children and young people affected by neurodisability even if this was not explicitly reported, or used unspecific, descriptive terms such as 'fine motor difficulties' or 'speech and language difficulties', which were not coded (see table 2 for coding definitions).

[Table 6 near here]

Many studies included participants across different educational stages (e.g. pre-school *and* primary school). Overall, almost half of the studies included pre-school participants, almost two thirds included primary school participants, just over a quarter included secondary school

participants, and a very small proportion included post-secondary school participants or participants transitioning between educational stages (table 7). When studies focused specifically on participants at only one educational stage, this was more commonly only the primary school stage, followed by only pre-school, only secondary, only transitions, and only post-secondary (table 7).

[Table 7 near here]

Educational stage is set out by intervention leadership in figure 5. We noted that few studies including or focusing only on pre-school participants were led by physiotherapy and that over half of studies focusing specifically on secondary school participants were led by speech and language therapy.

[Figure 5 near here]

Intervention characteristics

It was challenging to differentiate and code for intervention tiers (i.e. universal, targeted, and intensive) because these are relatively recent concepts in allied health and studies were not usually framed in these terms. Universal interventions were reported in almost a quarter of included studies (73/337, 21.7%), targeted interventions in just over a third (131/337, 38.9%), and intensive interventions in almost two thirds (203/337, 60.2%).

Figures 6 and 7 present intervention tier and intervention leadership. We noted that almost half of all universal interventions were occupational therapy-led and that just over a third of all occupational therapy-led studies reported a universal intervention. The predominance of occupational therapy-led universal interventions is consistent with the finding that almost half of studies reporting no health conditions amongst participants were also occupational therapy-led (table 6). We noted few universal interventions involving physiotherapy. Studies reporting targeted interventions were distributed across all four intervention leadership

categories, suggesting an established tradition across allied health of research on topics such as ‘at risk’ groups and co-delivery of interventions with education staff.

[Figure 6 near here]

[Figure 7 near here]

Figures 8 and 9 set out intervention delivery both overall and according to intervention leadership. As would be expected, occupational therapy-led, physiotherapy-led, and speech and language therapy-led interventions were delivered in large part by occupational therapists, physiotherapists, and speech and language therapists, respectively. Otherwise, we noted the frequent involvement of teachers and teaching assistants in delivering interventions. Teachers were particularly involved in delivering occupational therapy-led and multidisciplinary-led interventions. Teaching assistants were particularly involved in delivering speech and language therapy-led and multidisciplinary-led interventions.

[Figure 8 near here]

[Figure 9 near here]

Outcomes

Across the included studies, our coding produced eight overall outcome categories and, embedded within these, 46 sub-categories (table 8).

[Table 8 near here]

Table 8 presents the eight overall outcome categories in order of number of studies included in each category. The eight overall outcome categories were: (i) social communication, interaction, and behaviour, (ii) support within the educational environment (e.g. teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills; support from peers; school and local authority policy), (iii) voice, speech, language, and communication, (iv) engaging in school and

education (e.g. writing and learning to write; reading, learning to read, and literacy; making academic progress), (v) mobility, movement, and motor skills, (vi) using assistive technology, (vii) other outcomes (e.g. quality of life and subjective wellbeing), and (viii) play, recreation, and leisure.

Table 9 presents the 46 sub-categories in order of number of studies included in each sub-category. The top ten outcome sub-categories were: (i) expressive language and communication, (ii) receptive language and communication, (iii) broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills), (iv) teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills, (v) gross motor skills, (vi) writing and learning to write, (vii) on task behaviour and engagement in the classroom, (viii) fine motor skills, (ix) using speech-generating devices, and (x) social interaction specifically with peers. Table 9 also sets out outcome sub-categories by intervention leadership. Overall, intervention leadership reflected field of expertise for outcome sub-categories, for example interventions targeting language and communication outcomes were primarily led by speech and language therapists. Otherwise, it was noteworthy that teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills was the fourth largest outcome sub-category, indicating that these professionals are commonly receiving as well as delivering allied health interventions.

[Table 9 near here]

The supplementary materials (1c) set out the outcome categories and sub-categories along with verbatim examples of individual study outcomes that illustrate each sub-category and corresponding items within the ICF. As much as was possible, we developed categories and sub-categories that were distinct from each other. However, study outcomes were not always clearly reported or explicitly defined and there was some overlap, particularly in corresponding ICF items.

Across the included studies, we identified sixty-two randomised controlled trials concerned with evaluation (47/62) or implementation (15/62) of allied health interventions. Collectively, the trials covered all eight outcome categories and 37/46 outcome sub-categories. The supplementary materials (1d) present the trials according to country, intervention leadership, sample size, educational stages, and outcome categories and sub-categories. Across the trials, the five most common overall outcome categories were: (i) mobility, movement and motor skills (21/62 trials), (ii) engaging in school and education (18/62), (iii) voice, speech, language, and communication (17/62), (iv) social communication, interaction, and behaviour (15/62), and (v) support within the educational environment (14/62). The ten most common outcome sub-categories were: (i) gross motor skills (12/62 trials), (ii) fine motor skills (11/62), (iii) expressive language and communication (11/62), (iv) receptive language and communication (9/62), (v) broad social communication and interaction (9/62), (vi) writing and learning to write (9/62), (vii) teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills (7/62), (viii) quality of life and subjective wellbeing (7/62), (ix) on-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom (6/62), and (x) confidence, self-efficacy, and self-perception (6/62).

Discussion

Summary of results

We systematically mapped 337 studies investigating the effectiveness of allied health interventions in schools and education settings for children and young people affected by neurodisability. A number of features were noteworthy across this evidence base. First, the interventions targeted highly diverse outcomes, many of which related to educational participation (e.g. writing and learning to write; reading, learning to read, and literacy; making academic progress) and characteristics of the school environment (e.g. teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills; support from peers; school and local authority policy). This suggests that, at least implicitly, allied health professionals emphasise

educational participation and school environments as central to children and young people's wider health and social outcomes. Second, many of the interventions were multidisciplinary, in that they involved multiple allied health disciplines, as well as teachers and teaching assistants, in their design and delivery. Third, a significant proportion of studies included universal and targeted interventions, reflecting an emphasis on tiered models of interventions. Fourth, interventions focused primarily on pre-school and primary school populations and settings, and considerably less on secondary, post-secondary, or transitions.

Finally, almost half the included studies conducted early feasibility testing/piloting of interventions and just over half had sample sizes of ≤ 30 participants, indicating that much of the evidence base is concerned with smaller-scale preliminary research rather than definitive evaluation and systematic implementation. We identified a significant number of randomised controlled trials ($n=62$) focused on evaluation and implementation. However, the trials were widely distributed over all eight of our overall outcome categories and 37/46 outcome sub-categories, suggesting a thinly spread evidence base with limited opportunity for synthesising evidence about effectiveness. It was beyond our scope to determine whether the randomised controlled trials had followed on from and directly built upon the results of preliminary feasibility testing/piloting studies. Therefore, we are unable to assess the extent to which research in this field is adopting a strategic and cumulative approach to developing, testing, evaluating, and implementing allied health interventions.

Strengths and limitations of the systematic evidence mapping

We have brought together a large and diverse body of evidence to be accessible for stakeholders including research funders, service commissioners, and allied health service providers, educators, and researchers. A key factor in achieving this was the multidisciplinary nature of our research team. Our sensitive search strategy, comprehensive eligibility criteria, and detailed screening mean we can state with certainty that the included allied health

interventions were delivered specifically in schools, which likely indicates their feasibility and acceptability in education settings. Our interactive evidence map can be continuously updated to incorporate relevant studies flagged by wider stakeholders and identified through regular searches. The evidence map could potentially be used to identify intervention options for particular outcomes or educational stages and cross-reference these with other peer-reviewed resources that summarise the strength of evidence for some interventions, for example the 'What Works' online database of interventions to support children and young people's speech, language and communication, hosted by the children's communication charity 'I CAN' and the 'Teaching and Learning Toolkit' summary of education evidence from the Education Endowment Foundation.

The main limitation is that we did not conduct a quality or risk of bias assessment of the included studies and our scope did not extend to synthesising evidence about intervention effectiveness. A further limitation is that our searches were most recently updated in May 2020 and more recent studies will not have been included. However, our study is comprehensive in that it includes 337 papers, and our search strategy and coding framework are clearly reported and can be replicated to further update the evidence map. We recognise that, as one researcher conducted the screening and only 20% of titles and abstracts and 25% of excluded records were double-checked, some relevant studies may have been missed. However, the topic expertise within our multidisciplinary research team likely mitigated this risk somewhat.

How the results compare with wider literature

Our study highlights the diverse health, social, and educational outcomes towards which school-based allied health interventions are directed internationally. As well as seeking to improve outcomes typically considered health-related (e.g. language, communication, and motor skills), the interventions also target educational participation (e.g. literacy, academic

achievement, participation across the school day) and characteristics of the school environment (e.g. educators' knowledge and skills, peer support, school policy). This illustrates how, across countries and health systems, allied health operates at the intersection of health and education, recognising at least implicitly that these outcomes are inextricably linked, and conceptualising educational participation as both a consequence and determinant of children and young people's health. Previous research has reported similar views amongst children and young people affected by neurodisability and their parents, exploring how they also conceptualise educational participation as an important health outcome that impacts on and is impacted by other aspects of health [35].

From a UK perspective, our results are directly relevant to recent Priority Setting Partnerships (PSPs) facilitated by the James Lind Alliance (JLA). The JLA brings service users, carers, and professionals together in PSPs to identify and prioritise unanswered questions or evidence uncertainties that they agree are the most important [36]. The PSPs aim to make sure that health research funders are aware of the issues that matter most to the people who need to use the research in their everyday lives and the methods used are designed to change the way research funding is granted [36]. As children and young people spend a good deal of their time in school, it is unsurprising that stakeholders in the PSPs for autism [21], childhood disability [19], learning difficulties [20], and mental health [22], all of which included children and young people, parents, and professionals, highly prioritised research questions related to supporting educational participation and improving characteristics of school environments (Box 1). Our study has demonstrated that allied health interventions delivered in schools are geared towards many of the same outcomes and should therefore be eligible for future health research funding to better understand their impact and cost-effectiveness.

One important finding of our study is that teachers and teaching assistants play a central role in allied health interventions in schools. They deliver many of the interventions and our

results suggest that improving teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills is a common mechanism of how allied health supports children and young people's health outcomes. Our research team's lived experience suggests that teaching assistants in particular are significantly more involved than our results estimate in both delivering and receiving allied health interventions. For example, in the UK health and education system, teaching assistants are relied heavily upon to deliver school-based programmes designed by physiotherapists, as well as occupational therapists and speech and language therapists, particularly for children and young people whose special educational needs and disabilities are legally recognised within education, health, and care plans. Allied health professionals spend significant amounts of time training teaching assistants to carry out school-based tasks such as using hoists and toilet seats, delivering postural care and mobility programmes, and facilitating language interventions in small groups. In addition, many individuals employed as teaching assistants in schools also perform personal assistant roles at home and in the wider community, supporting children and young people's participation in self-care, recreation, and leisure. Therefore, optimally preparing and appropriately deploying this section of the education workforce in relation to allied health interventions could enhance children and young people's wider health and social outcomes. Wider evidence has demonstrated that a comprehensive, whole-school approach to preparing, deploying, and training teaching assistants has a positive impact on students' outcomes, including students with special educational needs and disabilities [37]. This existing evidence base could form a theoretical and practical starting point for developing, testing, evaluating, and implementing a programme to maximise how allied health professionals work with teaching assistants to support children and young people affected by neurodisability.

It is noteworthy that, along with intensive, individualised support for children and young people with the most complex and persistent needs, universal and targeted support are key

features of tiered allied health intervention models (see table 2 for definitions). A recent evidence review of approaches to supporting children and young people with special educational needs and disabilities concluded that tiered models are an effective way for allied health professionals and mainstream schools to work together to improve health, social, and educational outcomes [38]. Such models are well-established in North America and are of increasing interest to UK allied health professionals and their commissioners [e.g. 27]. However, whilst specific models have been proposed [e.g. 39] and comprehensive universal resources are available [e.g. 40], formal testing of tiered models is lagging behind in the UK compared to our international colleagues.

Implications for future research

Our study has established that allied health interventions in schools directly relate to existing research priorities around improving educational participation and characteristics of school environments (Box 1). However, we understand that these research priorities have so far received limited attention from major health research funders in the UK [41]. For example, the JLA PSP for childhood disability has been one of the most successful PSPs, attracting much-needed investment in at least twelve research priorities but little if any investment in the priorities set out in Box 1 [41, 42]. Three factors might explain this discrepancy. First, it may not be immediately clear how research priorities around educational participation and school environments fit within the scope of health research funding programmes accustomed to working with more conventional physical and mental health-related topics. Second, funders may be unaware of the extent to which NHS allied health professionals actually work in schools supporting children and young people's function, participation, and inclusion in school environments. Third, allied health may need to put forward to funders more clearly and convincingly the candidate interventions they would prioritise for further research and set out how these could be compared with usual NHS care. The wider childhood neurodisability

community has a strong track record in working with UK health research funders to develop commissioned calls based on JLA PSP research priorities [42]. This approach could be extended to address the remaining unanswered research questions that children and young people, parents, and professionals have identified as the most important (Box 1).

Preparation and deployment of teaching assistants within allied health interventions and evaluation and implementation of tiered intervention models should be specific priorities for future research across allied health disciplines, both in the UK and in similar health and education systems internationally. These topics would also help to address the stakeholder research priorities set out in Box 1 and would respond to parents' concerns about the delivery and accessibility of allied health support [18]. Research on the preparation and deployment of teaching assistants would need to take into account known concerns and potential unintended consequences identified in wider evidence, for example any potential risk of inappropriate over-reliance on teaching assistants to the detriment of direct support from an allied health professional [43]. Within tiered intervention models, the relative benefits and cost-effectiveness of many of the interventions at each tier also need to be established [39]. Our interactive evidence map can now be used to help stakeholders select candidate universal, targeted, and intensive interventions most in need of further evaluation and implementation research.

Summary

Whilst allied health professionals are largely employed by health services, much of their support for children and young people affected by neurodisability is delivered in schools and education settings. As well as targeting outcomes typically considered health-related (e.g. language, communication, and motor skills), allied health interventions routinely seek to support and improve wider determinants of children and young people's health, including educational participation (e.g. literacy, academic progress) and characteristics of school

environments (e.g. educators' knowledge and skills, support from peers). In the UK, school-based allied health interventions relate directly to unanswered research questions prioritised highly by diverse stakeholders. The onus is now on the allied health and wider childhood neurodisability community to highlight for research funders the candidate interventions they would prioritise for further research. We have presented an interactive evidence map and descriptive summary of the existing evidence base that will support this decision-making.

We have also identified two common elements across diverse allied health interventions.

First, the interventions rely heavily on teachers and particularly teaching assistants in terms of both their practical delivery and their underlying theory that improving these educators' knowledge and skills in turn improves outcomes for children and young people. Second, tiered models of universal, targeted, and intensive allied interventions are common and their effectiveness is supported in the wider evidence. However, formal testing of tiered models is lagging behind in the UK compared to internationally. Therefore, preparation and deployment of teaching assistants within allied health interventions and evaluation and implementation of tiered intervention models should be specific priorities for future research across allied health disciplines, both in the UK and in similar health and education systems internationally.

Word count = 6060

Individual authors' contributions

JMc and JLG conceived the study and all authors contributed to the study funding application. All authors contributed to developing the search strategy and eligibility criteria, JMc executed the searches, and all authors were involved in screening and selecting studies. All authors contributed to developing the coding framework. JMc, JLG, LP, RW, and SC coded included papers. All authors critically discussed the results, were involved in developing and testing prototype evidence maps, and contributed to writing up the study for publication.

Acknowledgements

We are very grateful for the input we received from Dr Melissa Bond (EPPI-Reviewer Support Officer & Trainer, University College London), Mr Zak Ghouze (Software and Information Technology Officer, University College London), and Dr Penny Williams (Consultant Speech and Language Therapist, Guy's and St. Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust).

We would also like to acknowledge Newcastle University (Population Health Sciences Institute), Cambridge University (Faculty of Education), University College London (Institute of Education), Sussex Community NHS Foundation Trust, and Leeds Community Healthcare NHS Trust.

We are particularly grateful to our service user co-investigators (KKB, AG) and to Ria (young disability artist, Leeds) who designed a logo for the wider research programme towards which the systematic evidence mapping contributed. We also thank the peer reviewers whose constructive feedback improved our manuscript.

Funding statement

This study was funded by the Castang Foundation in partnership with the British Academy of Childhood Disability (grant number – not applicable). The funder was not involved in conducting the research.

Declaration of interests

JMc, RW, KKB, and AG had financial support for salary costs from the Castang Foundation for the submitted work. No authors have financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years. No authors have other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

Table 1 – Final eligibility criteria

	Include	Exclude
Population	<p>Children and young people affected by neurodisability.</p> <p>Whole-school populations, which we assumed would include children and young people affected by neurodisability even if this was not explicitly reported.</p>	<p>Sensory impairment, critical illness, dyslexia, asthma, human immunodeficiency virus, burns, juvenile arthritis, stuttering, selective mutism, cleft lip and palate, reading difficulties, overweight/obese (unless specifically in the context of neurodisability).</p>
Intervention	<p>Interventions with allied health involvement in their design or implementation.</p> <p>Interventions published in allied health journals where allied health involvement was not explicitly reported but could be assumed by the research team based on our practice expertise</p> <p>Interventions where allied health involvement was not explicitly reported but which are commonly implemented by allied health in the UK (e.g. Social Stories).</p>	<p>Pharmacological or surgical interventions, botulinum toxin, cochlear implants, electrical stimulation, diet or nutritional supplementation, vagus nerve stimulation.</p> <p>Allied health assessment tools or processes, general intervention principles (e.g. family-centred care, collaboration).</p> <p>Whole-school public health interventions (e.g. for weight, physical activity) unless allied health involvement was explicit.</p>
Context	<p>Pre-school to post-secondary settings.</p> <p>Mainstream, special, specialist, simulated, alternative schools or education settings.</p> <p>Child-care settings.</p>	<p>Play groups, hospital-based schools, summer camps, intensive day camps.</p> <p>After-school clubs held on school premises but otherwise unconnected to the school setting (e.g. after-school sports activities held in rented school premises).</p>
Outcome	<p>Any outcome related to children and young people, parents/carers, service providers, or any aspect of children and young people's environment.</p>	<p>Allied health caseload sizes, job satisfaction, work-related stress (unless specific to the UK context).</p> <p>Studies describing uptake of or access to allied health services (unless an analysis of factors explaining differential access or uptake was reported).</p> <p>Reimbursement for allied health services in non-publicly funded health systems (e.g. Medicaid programme).</p>
Type of study	<p>Studies reporting feasibility testing/piloting, evaluation, implementation of allied health interventions.</p> <p>Research papers, conference abstracts, PhD theses reporting completed quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods studies. Where a research paper and conference abstract were available pertaining to the same study, we included only the research paper.</p> <p>Registered protocols for ongoing primary studies and systematic reviews.</p> <p>Primary studies within completed systematic reviews were screened against eligibility criteria.</p> <p>Reports of substantial service evaluations or audit and feedback interventions.</p> <p>We only included studies with an English language abstract.</p>	<p>Intervention development studies, unless an evaluative of outcomes was reported.</p> <p>Descriptive clinical case studies, instrument validation studies, guidelines, studies about classification systems, discussion papers, commentaries, books, magazines, opinion pieces.</p>
Timeframe	<p>Published since 2009 (i.e. covering the ten years prior to searches being conducted).</p> <p>Exemplar studies published between 2004-2008 reporting economic evaluations, randomised controlled trials, or novel/under-represented interventions of particular interest in the UK.</p>	<p>Published before 2004.</p>

Table 2 – Coding framework

Coding Categories	Individual Codes	Code Definitions	Coding Rules
Study status	Ongoing	Study was identified through a trial or systematic review registry or funder website and results were not yet available.	One code assigned per study (i.e. studies were either ongoing or complete). All studies were coded.
	Completed	Study was identified through a bibliographic database or systematic review reference list or funder website and results were reported.	
Type of publication	Research paper	Study was published in a peer-reviewed academic journal.	One code assigned per study. All studies were coded.
	Registered protocol	Study protocol was published in a trial or systematic review registry or on a funder website.	
	Conference paper	Study was published in an academic journal and clearly reported as a conference paper.	
	PhD thesis	Study was identified through a bibliographic database and clearly reported as a PhD thesis.	
Year of publication	2009-2020	The year the study was published in an academic journal, registered with a trial or systematic review registry, or completed as a PhD thesis. Studies of interest published between 2004 and 2008 were coded together into one category.	One code assigned per study. All studies were coded.
	Selected studies 2004-2008		
Country of publication	Individual countries (e.g. Australia, Brazil, Canada)	The location in which participants were recruited and data were collected.	More than one code could be assigned per study. All studies were coded.
Purpose of study	Feasibility testing/piloting	Authors described their study as a ‘pilot’ or reported ‘preliminary’ results. Research objectives and results were largely concerned with feasibility and acceptability of the intervention or testing out study design features with a view to a future evaluation. Studies typically had smaller sample sizes and included a range of designs (e.g. before-after studies, randomised controlled trials).	One code assigned per study. All studies were coded.
	Evaluation	Research objectives and results were largely concerned with intervention effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. Studies usually compared different interventions or a novel intervention to usual care or no intervention. Study designs included randomised controlled trials, non-randomised designs, or qualitative designs exploring perceived benefits and disadvantages. Non-comparative designs were also included, where authors reported the impact of an overall service or programme.	
	Implementation	Research objectives and results were largely concerned with training individuals to implement specific interventions or strategies, the differential effectiveness of broadly similar interventions implemented in different ways (e.g. delivered by therapists versus assistants), the effectiveness of overall service delivery models (e.g. consultation versus direct delivery), or the quality, fidelity or extent of implementation of an intervention.	

Coding Categories	Individual Codes	Code Definitions	Coding Rules
Study design	Non-comparative study, before-after study, interrupted time series, prospective cohort study, non-concurrent cohort study, retrospective cohort study, randomised controlled trial, non-randomised controlled trial, case-control study, qualitative study, systematic review protocol, or other study design	Study designs were classified based on the Study Design Algorithm for Medical Literature on Intervention (31). For before-after and interrupted time series designs, we did not differentiate between studies with and without a control group.	One code assigned per study. All studies were coded.
Sample size	1 – 10 11 – 30 31 – 100 >100	Sample sizes were coded according to authors' reporting of study populations.	One code assigned per study. All studies were coded.
Health conditions	Health conditions (e.g. acquired brain injury, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder, autism, cerebral palsy, developmental coordination disorder, developmental language disorder, genetic conditions and syndromes, learning or intellectual disability, neuromuscular conditions, physical disabilities, speech sound disorder, spina bifida, spinal cord injury, and/or vision and/or hearing impairment)	Health conditions were coded according to authors' reporting of study populations. 'Physical disabilities' included studies also coded separately for cerebral palsy, neuromuscular conditions, spinal cord injuries, or spina bifida, and studies in which authors reported children and young people with 'multiple disabilities' or 'medical complexity'. Unspecific, descriptive terms such as 'fine motor difficulties' or 'speech and language difficulties' were not coded.	More than one code could be assigned per study. Some studies were not coded (e.g. if health conditions were not reported).
Educational stage	Pre-school, primary school, secondary school, post-secondary school, and/or transition	Educational stage was coded according to authors' reporting of study populations. Where reporting was unclear, children and young people's ages and international differences in educational stages were taken into account. For example, studies reporting a 'kindergarten' population could include a wide age range internationally but were always coded as 'pre-school'.	More than one code could be assigned per study. All studies were coded.
Intervention leadership (i.e. lead discipline)	Occupational therapy, physiotherapy, speech and language therapy, or multidisciplinary	Intervention design, supervision, or implementation was led from within occupational therapy, physiotherapy, or speech and language therapy or by a multidisciplinary team. A multidisciplinary team involved at least two of occupational therapy, physiotherapy, or speech and language therapy, or one of these disciplines plus another discipline (e.g. speech and language therapy and educational psychology).	One code assigned per study. All studies were coded.

Coding Categories	Individual Codes	Code Definitions	Coding Rules
Intervention tier	Universal	Interventions were targeted towards and implemented with the whole school or whole class. They may involve allied health contributing to overall school or classroom policy, curriculum design, environmental design, resource development, or training. Or, they may involve allied health leading activities for a whole class or co-delivering activities alongside teachers.	More than one code could be assigned per study. All studies were coded.
	Targeted	Interventions were targeted towards groups of children and young people identified as 'at risk' because of, for example, socio-economic or clinical factors, or because screening results indicate limited progress towards desired outcomes. Interventions may be implemented inside or outside the classroom and may be delivered by teachers or teaching assistants under allied health supervision/guidance or co-delivered with allied health. Interventions were not highly personalised or tailored and may include, for example, programmes delivered regularly by educational staff or basic equipment/environmental adaptation overseen by educational staff.	
	Intensive	Interventions were targeted towards individual children and young people with persistent needs and may be highly personalised and tailored for individual needs and circumstances. They may be delivered by allied health professionals or within a multi-disciplinary model of delivery.	
Intervention delivery	Occupational therapist, physiotherapist, speech and language therapist, therapy assistant, teacher, teaching assistant, parent/carer, and/or peer	Individuals who, in practical terms, delivered parts of the intervention or the overall intervention. Intervention delivery was coded in line with authors' reporting of study interventions.	More than one code could be assigned per study. All studies were coded.
Outcomes	Overall outcome categories and sub-categories were produced through an inductive coding process informed by the International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health (32).	Outcomes were defined as child- or environment-related factors that interventions were seeking to change and in which any change (or lack thereof) had been measured quantitatively or reported qualitatively as part of a substantial theme. We did not differentiate between primary outcomes, secondary outcomes, and hypothesised mechanisms of change as studies were not usually framed or reported in those terms.	All outcomes in all studies were coded.

Table 3 – Country of publication for the included studies (n=337)

Country (n/337, %)*	Occupational Therapy n (%)	Physiotherapy n (%)	Speech and Language Therapy n (%)	Multidisciplinary n (%)
United States (138, 40.9%)	51/138 (37%)	3/138 (2.2%)	53/138 (38.4%)	31/138 (22.5%)
United Kingdom (55, 16.3%)	3/55 (5.5%)	3/55 (5.5%)	35/55 (63.6%)	14/55 (25.5%)
Australia (38, 11.3%)	10/38 (26.3%)	6/38 (15.8%)	14/38 (36.8%)	8/38 (21.1%)
Canada (14, 4.2%)	8/14 (57.1%)	2/14 (14.3%)	1/14 (7.1%)	3/14 (21.4%)
Israel (11, 3.3%)	6/11 (54.5%)	1/11 (9.1%)	0/11 (0%)	4/11 (36.4%)
South Africa (10, 3%)	1/10 (10%)	4/10 (40%)	4/10 (40%)	1/10 (10%)
Ireland (8, 2.4%)	3/8 (37.5%)	1/8 (12.5%)	1/8 (12.5%)	3/8 (37.5%)
Netherlands (8, 2.4%)	0/8 (0%)	5/8 (62.5%)	0/8 (0%)	3/8 (37.5%)
New Zealand (6, 1.8%)	1/6 (16.7%)	1/6 (16.7%)	3/6 (50%)	1/6 (16.7%)
India (5, 1.5%)	1/5 (20%)	3/5 (60%)	0/5 (0%)	1/5 (20%)
Sweden (5, 1.5%)	1/5 (20%)	1/5 (20%)	0/5 (0%)	3/5 (60%)
Singapore (4, 1.2%)	2/4 (50%)	2/4 (50%)	0/4 (0%)	0/4 (0%)
Brazil (3, <1%)	2/3 (66.7%)	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
China (3, <1%)	1/3 (33.3%)	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	2/3 (66.7%)
France (3, <1%)	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	3/3 (100%)
Germany (3, <1%)	1/3 (33.3%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Iran (3, <1%)	2/3 (66.7%)	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Spain (3, <1%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	2/3 (66.7%)	0/3 (0%)
Taiwan (3, <1%)	1/3 (33.3%)	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	2/3 (66.7%)
Turkey (3, <1%)	0/3 (0%)	2/3 (66.7%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Norway (2, <1%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)
Chile (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)
Denmark (1, <1%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Greece (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Jordan (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Malaysia (1, <1%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Pakistan (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Palestine (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Portugal (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)
Romania (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)
Sri Lanka (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)
Switzerland (1, <1%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Thailand (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)

*The systematic evidence map contains 337 separate studies. The total number of countries is 340 because two studies were conducted in multiple countries.

Table 4 – Year of publication for the included studies (n=337)

Year (n/337, %)	Occupational Therapy n (%)	Physiotherapy (%)	n	Speech and Language Therapy n (%)	Multidisciplinary n (%)
2004 – 2008 (30, 8.9% ^a)	3/30 (10%)	2/30 (6.7%)		15/30 (15%)	10/30 (33.3%)
2009 (21, 6.2%)	9/21 (42.9%)	1/21 (4.8%)		9/21 (42.9%)	2/21 (9.5%)
2010 (23, 6.8%)	8/23 (34.8%)	4/23 (17.4%)		7/23 (30.4%)	4/23 (17.4%)
2011 (30, 8.9%)	9/30 (30%)	3/30 (10%)		4/30 (13.3%)	14/30 (46.7%)
2012 (25, 7.4%)	7/25 (28%)	2/25 (8%)		9/25 (36%)	7/25 (28%)
2013 (28, 8.3%)	7/28 (25%)	5/28 (17.9%)		11/28 (39.3%)	5/28 (17.9%)
2014 (28, 8.3%)	5/28 (17.9%)	1/28 (3.6%)		13/28 (46.4%)	9/28 (32.1%)
2015 (20, 5.9%)	9/20 (45%)	6/20 (30%)		3/20 (15%)	2/20 (10%)
2016 (20, 5.9%)	6/20 (30%)	0/20 (0%)		7/20 (35%)	7/20 (35%)
2017 (40, 11.9%)	13/40 (32.5%)	4/40 (10%)		12/40 (30%)	11/40 (27.5%)
2018 (28, 8.3%)	8/28 (28.6%)	6/28 (21.4%)		9/28 (32.1%)	5/28 (17.9%)
2019 (36, 10.7%)	8/36 (22.2%)	4/36 (11.1%)		18/36 (50%)	6/36 (16.7%)
2020 (8, 2.4% ^b)	4/8 (50%)	1/8 (12.5%)		0/8 (0%)	3/8 (37.5%)

^aWe included only selected exemplar studies published between 2004-2008 reporting economic evaluations, randomised controlled trials, or novel/under-represented interventions of particular interest in the UK context.

^bFinal searches were conducted in May 2020.

Table 5 – Methodological characteristics of included studies (n=337)

Methodological Characteristics (n/337, %)	Occupational Therapy n (%)	Physiotherapy n (%)	Speech and Language Therapy n (%)	Multidisciplinary n (%)
<i>Study purpose:</i>				
Feasibility/piloting (148, 43.9%)	50/148 (33.8%)	15/148 (10.1%)	49/148 (33.1%)	34/148 (23%)
Evaluation (114, 33.8%)	28/114 (24.6%)	20/114 (17.5%)	33/114 (28.9%)	33/114 (28.9%)
Implementation (75, 22.3%)	18/75 (24%)	4/75 (5.3%)	35/75 (46.7%)	18/75 (24%)
<i>Study design:</i>				
Before-after (131, 38.9%)	41/131 (31.3%)	11/131 (8.4%)	47/131 (35.9%)	32/131 (24.4%)
Randomised controlled trial (82, 24.3%)	21/82 (25.6%)	16/82 (19.5%)	23/82 (28%)	22/82 (26.8%)
Non-randomised controlled trial (35, 10.4%)	13/35 (37.1%)	2/35 (5.7%)	14/35 (40%)	6/35 (17.1%)
Interrupted time series (25, 7.4%)	4/25 (16%)	1/25 (4%)	13/25 (52%)	7/25 (28%)
Non-comparative design (25, 7.4%)	3/25 (12%)	3/25 (12%)	8/25 (32%)	11/25 (44%)
Qualitative (21, 6.2%)	9/21 (42.9%)	3/21 (14.3%)	6/21 (28.6%)	3/21 (14.3%)
Prospective cohort (4, 1.2%)	0/4 (0%)	0/4 (0%)	1/4 (25%)	3/4 (75%)
Non-concurrent cohort (4, 1.2%)	2/4 (50%)	0/4 (0%)	2/4 (50%)	0/4 (0%)
Systematic review protocol (4, 1.2%)	1/4 (25%)	2/4 (50%)	0/4 (0%)	1/4 (25%)
Retrospective cohort (2, <1%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
Unknown (2, <1%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)	1/2 (50%)	0/2 (0%)
Case-control (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Other design (1, <1%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)
<i>Sample size:</i>				
1-10 (93, 27.6%)	27/93 (29%)	5/93 (5.4%)	40/93 (43%)	21/93 (22.6%)
11-30 (92, 27.3%)	24/92 (26.1%)	15/92 (16.3%)	30/92 (32.6%)	23/92 (25%)
31-100 (91, 27%)	27/91 (29.7%)	13/91 (14.3%)	28/91 (30.8%)	23/91 (25.3%)
>100 (52, 15.4%)	15/52 (28.8%)	4/52 (7.7%)	16/52 (30.8%)	17/52 (32.7%)
Not applicable (5, 1.5%)	1/5 (20%)	2/5 (40%)	1/5 (20%)	1/5 (20%)
Unknown (4, 1.2%)	2/4 (50%)	0/4 (0%)	2/4 (50%)	0/4 (0%)

Table 6 – Health conditions of participants across the included studies (n=337)

Health Conditions (n, %) ^a	Occupational Therapy n (%)	Physiotherapy n (%)	Speech and Language Therapy n (%)	Multidisciplinary n (%)
Autism (85/337, 25.2%)	31/85 (36.5%)	1/85 (1.2%)	23/85 (27%)	30/85 (35.3%)
No health conditions reported (82/337, 24.3%)	40/82 (48.8%)	4/82 (4.9%)	17/82 (20.7%)	21/82 (25.6%)
Physical disabilities ^b (82/337, 24.3%)	14/82 (17.1%)	30/82 (36.6%)	18/82 (22%)	20/82 (24.4%)
Cerebral palsy (71/337, 21.1%)	14/71 (19.7%)	28/71 (39.4%)	15/71 (21.1%)	14/71 (19.7%)
Developmental language disorder (56/337, 16.6%)	0/56 (0%)	0/56 (0%)	52/56 (92.9%)	4/56 (7.1%)
Learning/intellectual disability (53/337, 15.7%)	15/53 (28.3%)	4/53 (7.5%)	12/53 (22.6%)	22/53 (41.5%)
Genetic conditions/syndromes (30/337, 8.9%)	6/30 (20%)	2/30 (6.7%)	13/30 (43.3%)	9/30 (30%)
Speech sound disorder (24/337, 7.1%)	0/24 (0%)	0/24 (0%)	21/24 (87.5%)	3/24 (12.5%)
Developmental coordination disorder (15/337, 4.5%)	7/15 (46.7%)	3/15 (20%)	1/15 (6.7%)	4/15 (26.7%)
Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (14/337, 4.2%)	8/14 (57.1%)	0/14 (0%)	4/14 (28.6%)	2/14 (14.3%)
Vision/hearing impairment (14/337, 4.2%)	2/14 (14.3%)	1/14 (7.1%)	4/14 (28.6%)	7/14 (50%)
Acquired brain injury (8/337, 2.4%)	0/8 (0%)	1/8 (12.5%)	3/8 (37.5%)	4/8 (50%)
Neuromuscular conditions (3/337, 0.9%)	1/3 (33.3%)	0/3 (0%)	0/3 (0%)	2/3 (66.7%)
Spina bifida (3/337, 0.9%)	2/3 (66.7%)	0/3 (%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Spinal cord injury (2/337, 0.6%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)	2/2 (100%)

^aTotal exceeds 337 because individual studies may report participants with a range of different health conditions.

^b'Physical disabilities' includes cerebral palsy, neuromuscular conditions, spinal cord injuries, or spina bifida, and studies in which authors reported children and young people with 'multiple disabilities' or 'medical complexity'.

Table 7 – Educational stages of participants in the included studies (n=337)

Educational Stage (n/337, %)	Occupational Therapy n (%)	Physiotherapy n (%)	Speech and Language Therapy n (%)	Multidisciplinary n (%)
Including pre-school (145, 43%) ^a	36/145 (24.8%)	9/145 (6.2%)	54/145 (37.2%)	46/145 (31.7%)
Only pre-school (92, 27.3%) ^b	24/92 (26.1%)	4/92 (4.4%)	34/92 (37%)	30/92 (32.6%)
Including primary school (210, 62.3%) ^a	61/210 (29%)	31/210 (14.8%)	69/210 (32.9%)	49/210 (23.3%)
Only primary school (115, 34.1%) ^b	39/115 (33.9%)	10/115 (8.7%)	41/115 (35.7%)	25/115 (21.7%)
Including secondary school (88, 26.1%) ^a	18/88 (20.5%)	22/88 (25%)	25/88 (28.4%)	23/88 (26.1%)
Only secondary school (23, 6.8%) ^b	5/23 (21.7%)	2/23 (8.7%)	12/23 (52.2%)	4/23 (17.4%)
Including post-secondary (12, 3.6%) ^a	5/12 (41.7%)	1/12 (8.3%)	2/12 (16.7%)	4/12 (33.3%)
Only post-secondary (4, 1.2%) ^b	2/4 (50%)	0/4 (0%)	1/4 (25%)	1/4 (25%)
Including transitions (7, 2.1%) ^a	3/7 (42.9%)	1/7 (14.3%)	1/7 (14.3%)	2/7 (28.6%)
Only transitions (5, 1.5%) ^b	3/5 (60%)	1/5 (20%)	0/5 (0%)	1/5 (20%)
Unknown (3, 0.9%)	1/3 (33.3%)	1/3 (33.3%)	1/3 (33.3%)	0/3 (0%)

^aTotal exceeds 337 because many studies included participants across different educational stages (e.g. pre-school *and* primary school).

^bTotal is less than 337 because many studies did not focus specifically on participants at only one educational stage.

Table 8 – Outcome categories and sub-categories across the included studies (n=337)

Overall outcome categories n=8 (n studies included, %) ^a	Outcome sub-categories n=46 embedded within each overall outcome category (n studies included, %) ^b
Social Communication, Interaction and Behaviour (102/337, 30.3%)	Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) (42/102, 41.2%) On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom (36/102, 35.3%) Social interaction specifically with peers (27/102, 26.3%) Self-regulation, emotions, mental health, ‘challenging behaviour’ (24/102, 23.5%)
Support Within the Educational Environment (96/337, 28.5%)	Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills (40/96, 41.7%) Health professional knowledge and skills (22/96, 22.9%) Support from peers (including peer-mediated interventions) (16/96, 16.7%) Access to allied health services (13/96, 13.5%) Parent knowledge, skills, and actions in supporting their child (12/96, 12.5%) Cost-effectiveness of allied health services (12/96, 12.5%) Access to allied health services through tele-practice (7/96, 7.3%) School and local authority policy (5/96, 5.2%)
Voice, Speech, Language and Communication (92/337, 27.3%)	Expressive language and communication (57/92, 62%) Receptive language and communication (52/92, 56.5%) Voice functions and speech sounds (23/92, 25%) Narrative skills (19/92, 20.7%) Phonological skills (15/92, 16.3%)
Engaging in School and Education (86/337, 25.5%)	Writing and learning to write (39/86, 45.3%) Reading, learning to read, and literacy (23/86, 26.7%) Self-care skills (e.g. eating & drinking at mealtimes, dressing, toileting, hygiene) (18/86, 20.9%) Making academic progress (10/86, 11.6%) Transition between settings and stages (6/86, 7%) Participation across the school day (e.g. classroom activities, assemblies, playground) (6/86, 7%) Enrolling in settings and attending (4/86, 4.7%) Doing homework (1/86, 1.2%)
Mobility, Movement and Motor Skills (66/337, 19.6%)	Gross motor skills (40/66, 60.6%) Fine motor skills (36/66, 54.5%) Developing strength (11/66, 16.7%) Protecting joints and muscles and preventing pain (9/66, 13.6%) Physical activity (3/66, 4.5%)
Using Assistive Technology (60/337, 17.8%)	Using speech-generating devices (SGDs) (28/60, 46.7%) Using symbols, signs, and visual support (24/60, 40%) Using assistive technology for literacy or numeracy (15/60, 25%) Using assistive technology for mobility and movement (6/60, 10%) Using assistive technology for play, leisure, and physical activity (5/60, 8.3%)

Overall outcome categories n=8 (n studies included, %) ^a	Outcome sub-categories n=46 embedded within each overall outcome category (n studies included, %) ^b
Other Outcomes (52/337, 15.4%)	Using assistive technology for self-care (2/60, 3.3%) Quality of life and subjective wellbeing (15/52, 28.8%) Confidence, self-efficacy, and self-perception (15/52, 28.8%) Sensory and perceptual functions (14/52, 26.9%) Fitness (7/52, 13.5%) Memory functions (6/52, 11.5%) Executive functions (4/52, 7.7%) Weight maintenance (3/52, 5.8%) Respiratory functions (1/52, 1.9%)
Play, Recreation and Leisure (27/337, 8%)	Play (22/27, 81.5%) Recreation and leisure (7/27, 25.9%)

^aTotal across the categories exceeds 337 because individual studies usually report multiple outcomes.

^bTotals exceed category total because individual studies may report multiple outcomes.

Table 9 – Outcome sub-categories by intervention leadership

Outcome sub-categories n=46 (n, %) ^a	OT n (%)	PT n (%)	SLT n (%)	MDT n (%)
Expressive language and communication (57/377, 16.9%)	1/57 (1.8%)	0/57 (0%)	45/57 (78.9%)	11/57 (19.3%)
Receptive language and communication (52/377, 15.4%)	1/52 (1.9%)	0/52 (0%)	41/52 (78.8%)	10/52 (19.2%)
Broad social communication and interaction (42/377, 12.5%)	4/42 (9.5%)	1/42 (2.4%)	19/42 (45.2%)	18/42 (42.9%)
Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills (40/377, 11.9%)	13/40 (32.5%)	1/40 (2.5%)	13/40 (32.5%)	13/40 (32.5%)
Gross motor skills (40/377, 11.9%)	2/40 (5%)	24/40 (60%)	0/40 (0%)	14/40 (35%)
Writing and learning to write (39/377, 11.6%)	24/39 (61.5%)	2/39 (5.1%)	7/39 (17.9%)	6/39 (15.4%)
On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom (36/377, 10.7%)	25/36 (69.4%)	1/36 (2.8%)	5/36 (13.9%)	5/36 (13.9%)
Fine motor skills (36/377, 10.7%)	15/36 (41.7%)	8/36 (22.2%)	1/36 (2.8%)	12/36 (33.3%)
Using speech-generating devices (28/377, 8.3%)	3/28 (10.7%)	0/28 (0%)	16/28 (57.1%)	9/28 (32.1%)
Social interaction specifically with peers (27/377, 8%)	3/27 (11.1%)	1/27 (3.7%)	11/27 (40.7%)	12/27 (44.4%)
Using symbols, signs and visual support (24/377, 7.1%)	2/24 (8.3%)	0/24 (0%)	14/24 (58.3%)	8/24 (33.3%)
Self-regulation, emotions, mental health, and 'challenging behaviour' (24/377, 7.1%)	13/24 (54.2%)	1/24 (4.2%)	3/24 (12.5%)	7/24 (29.2%)
Reading, learning to read, and literacy (23/377, 6.8%)	4/23 (17.4%)	1/23 (4.3%)	13/23 (56.5%)	5/23 (21.7%)
Voice functions and speech sounds (23/377, 6.8%)	0/23 (0%)	0/23 (0%)	22/23 (95.7%)	1/23 (4.3%)
Health professional knowledge and skills (22/377, 6.5%)	8/22 (36.4%)	0/22 (0%)	9/22 (40.9%)	5/22 (22.7%)
Play (22/377, 6.5%)	6/22 (27.3%)	2/22 (9.1%)	2/22 (9.1%)	12/22 (54.5%)
Narrative skills (19/377, 5.6%)	0/19 (0%)	0/19 (0%)	19/19 (100%)	0/19 (0%)
Self-care skills (18/377, 5.3%)	9/18 (50%)	2/18 (11.1%)	2/18 (11.1%)	5/18 (27.8%)
Support from peers (including peer-mediated interventions) (16/377, 4.7%)	2/16 (12.5%)	0/16 (0%)	8/16 (50%)	6/16 (37.5%)
Phonological skills (15/377, 4.5%)	0/15 (0%)	0/15 (0%)	14/15 (93.3%)	1/15 (6.7%)
Using assistive technology for literacy or numeracy (15/377, 4.5%)	8/15 (53.3%)	1/15 (6.7%)	0/15 (0%)	6/15 (40%)
Quality of life and subjective wellbeing (15/377, 4.5%)	1/15 (6.7%)	7/15 (46.7%)	5/15 (33.3%)	2/15 (13.3%)
Confidence, self-efficacy, and self-perception (15/377, 4.5%)	6/15 (40%)	4/15 (26.7%)	2/15 (13.3%)	3/15 (20%)
Sensory and perceptual functions (14/377, 4.2%)	11/14 (78.6%)	1/14 (7.1%)	1/14 (7.1%)	1/14 (7.1%)
Access to allied health services (13/377, 3.9%)	2/13 (15.4%)	2/13 (15.4%)	6/13 (46.2%)	3/13 (23.1%)
Parent knowledge, skills, and actions in supporting their child (12/377, 3.7%)	3/12 (25%)	0/12 (0%)	3/12 (25%)	6/12 (50%)
Cost-effectiveness of allied health services (12/377, 3.7%)	0/12 (0%)	1/12 (8.3%)	8/12 (66.7%)	3/12 (25%)
Developing strength (11/377, 3.3%)	1/11 (9.1%)	7/11 (63.6%)	0/11 (0%)	3/11 (27.3%)

Outcome sub-categories n=46 (n, %) ^a	OT n (%)	PT n (%)	SLT n (%)	MDT n (%)
Making academic progress (10/377, 3%)	4/10 (40%)	0/10 (0%)	4/10 (40%)	2/10 (20%)
Protecting joints and muscles and preventing pain (9/377, 2.7%)	0/9 (0%)	6/9 (66.7%)	0/9 (0%)	3/9 (33.3%)
Access to allied health services through tele-practice (7/377, 2.1%)	0/7 (0%)	1/7 (14.3%)	6/7 (85.7%)	0/7 (0%)
Fitness (7/377, 2.1%)	0/7 (0%)	7/7 (100%)	0/7 (0%)	0/7 (0%)
Recreation and leisure (7/377, 2.1%)	1/7 (14.3%)	4/7 (57.1%)	0/7 (0%)	2/7 (28.6%)
Transition between settings and stages (6/377, 1.8%)	3/6 (50%)	1/6 (16.7%)	0/6 (0%)	2/6 (33.3%)
Participation across the school day (6/377, 1.8%)	3/6 (50%)	1/6 (16.7%)	1/6 (16.7%)	1/6 (16.7%)
Memory functions (6/377, 1.8%)	1/6 (16.7%)	0/6 (0%)	3/6 (50%)	2/6 33.3(%)
Using assistive technology for mobility and movement (6/377, 1.8%)	0/6 (0%)	2/6 (33.3%)	0/6 (0%)	4/6 (66.7%)
Using assistive technology for play, leisure, and physical activity (5/377, 1.5%)	0/5 (0%)	1/5 (20%)	0/5 (0%)	4/5 (80%)
School and local authority policy (5/377, 1.5%)	1/5 (20%)	0/5 (0%)	1/5 (20%)	3/5 (60%)
Executive functions (4/377, 1.2%)	2/4 (50%)	0/4 (0%)	1/4 (25%)	1/4 (25%)
Enrolling in settings and attending (4/377, 1.2%)	1/4 (25%)	0/4 (0%)	1/4 (25%)	2/4 (50%)
Weight maintenance (3/377, 0.9%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)	0/3 (0%)	2/3 (66.7%)
Physical activity (3/377, 0.9%)	0/3 (0%)	2/3 (66.7%)	0/3 (0%)	1/3 (33.3%)
Using assistive technology for self-care (2/377, 0.6%)	2/2 (100%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)	0/2 (0%)
Doing homework (1/377, 0.3%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)
Respiratory functions (1/377, 0.3%)	0/1 (0%)	1/1 (100%)	0/1 (0%)	0/1 (0%)

^aTotal exceeds 337 because individual studies may report multiple outcomes.

OT Occupational Therapy, PT Physiotherapy, SLT Speech and Language Therapy, MDT Multidisciplinary

Box 1 – Stakeholder research priorities related to the educational participation and school environments of children and young people affected by neurodisability

James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership for Autism¹:

- Priority 5 – Which environments / supports are most appropriate in terms of achieving the best education / life / social skills outcomes in autistic people?
- Priority 17 – What training do school and nursery teachers need to achieve the best possible experiences / outcomes / employment prospects for children with autism and / or identify the early signs of autism?

We identified:

- 96 studies of allied health interventions targeting the support available within children and young people's educational environments (32/96 included autistic children and young people).
- 63 studies of interventions targeting educational outcomes including making academic progress, learning to read, and learning to write (9/63 included autistic children and young people).
- 102 studies of interventions targeting social communication, interaction, and behaviour (52/102 included autistic children and young people).
- 40 studies of interventions targeting teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills (32/40 included children and young people with autism).

James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership for Childhood Disability²:

- Priority 3 – Are child-centred strategies to improve children's (i.e. peers') attitudes towards disability (e.g. buddy or Circle of Friends etc) effective to improve inclusion and participation within educational, social, and community settings?
- Priority 9 – Which school characteristics (e.g. policies, attitudes of staff etc) are most effective to promote inclusion of children and young people with neurodisability in education and after-school clubs?

We identified:

- 16 studies of allied health interventions targeting support from peers, including peer-mediated interventions.
- 86 studies of interventions targeting engagement in school and education, including participation across the school day.
- 96 studies of interventions targeting the support available within children and young people's educational environments, including school policies and teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills.

James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership for Learning Difficulties (Scotland)³:

- Priority 1 – What knowledge, skills, and training do educational professionals need to identify the early signs of learning difficulties and provide optimal support for children and young people affected to help them achieve the best possible outcomes?
- Priority 2 – What is the best educational and community environment for children and young people with learning difficulties?
- Priority 13 – Which family, school, and community supports are effective in preparing children, young people, and their families / carers to transition through different stages of schooling / education and through children and young people’s services into adult services?
- Priority 16 – Which information and communication technologies (ICT) (e.g. augmentative and alternative communication (AAC) devices, ICT-based communication aids, assistive technology, iPads / writing aids / tablet / phone) are effective and how can they best be accessed by children and young people with learning difficulties?

We identified:

- 40 studies of allied health interventions targeting teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills.
- 96 studies of interventions targeting the support available within children and young people’s educational environments, including parent, teacher, and teaching assistant knowledge and skills and school policies.
- 6 studies of interventions targeting transition between educational settings and stages.
- 60 studies of interventions targeting use of assistive technology.

James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership for Mental Health in Children and Young People⁴:

- Priority 3 – How can Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), education providers, and health and social care departments work together in a more effective manner in order to improve the mental health outcomes of children and young people?
- Priority 10 – What is the most effective way of training teachers and other staff in schools and colleges to detect early signs of mental health difficulties in children and young people?
- Priority 18 – Which school-based interventions are most effective at promoting and developing emotional wellbeing in children and young people?
- Priority 19 – Which school-based interventions are most effective in building mental health resilience in children and young people?

We identified:

- 24 studies of allied health interventions targeting children and young people’s self-regulation, emotions, mental health, and ‘challenging behaviour’.

- 40 studies of interventions targeting teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills.

¹<https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/autism/>

²<https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/childhood-disability/>

³<https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/learning-difficulties-scotland/top-10-priorities.htm>

⁴<https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/Mental-health-in-children-and-young-people/top-10-priorities.htm>

Figure 1 – PRISMA flowchart

Figure 1 – PRISMA flowchart




Figure 2 – Total number of studies published per year




Figure 3 – Total number of studies published per year by intervention leadership

Figure 3 – Total number of studies published per year by intervention leadership






Figure 4 – Study purpose by intervention leadership

Figure 4 – Study purpose by intervention leadership

Feasibility/piloting Studies (n=148) by Intervention Leadership



Evaluation Studies (n=114) by Intervention Leadership



Implementation Studies (n=75) by Intervention Leadership






Figure 5 – Educational stage by intervention leadership

Figure 5 – Educational stage by intervention leadership


Studies Including Pre-school (n=145)
by Intervention Leadership




Studies Including Primary School (n=210)
by Intervention Leadership




Studies Including Secondary School (n=88)
by Intervention Leadership




Studies of Only Pre-school (n=92)
by Intervention Leadership



Studies of Only Primary School (n=115)
by Intervention Leadership



Studies of Only Secondary School (n=23)
by Intervention Leadership



■ Occupational Therapy ■ Physiotherapy ■ Speech and Language Therapy ■ Multidisciplinary

Figure 6 – Intervention tier by intervention leadership

Figure 6 – Intervention tier by intervention leadership




Figure 7 – Intervention leadership by intervention tier

Figure 7 – Intervention leadership by intervention tier




Figure 8 – Intervention delivery across included studies

Figure 8 – Intervention delivery across included studies (n=337)





Figure 9 – Intervention leadership by intervention delivery

Figure 9 – Intervention leadership by intervention delivery (%)



References

1. Department for Work and Pensions, *National Statistics. Family Resources Survey: financial year 2019 to 2020*. 2021, Crown Copyright.
2. Department of Health, *Annual Report of the Chief Medical Officer 2012, Our Children Deserve Better: Prevention Pays*. 2013, Crown Copyright.
3. Morris, C., et al., *Towards a definition of neurodisability: a Delphi survey*. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 2013. **55**(12): p. 1103-1108.
4. Blackburn, C., N. Spencer, and J. Read, *Prevalence of childhood disability and the characteristics and circumstances of disabled children in the UK: secondary analysis of the Family Resources Survey*. *BMC Pediatrics*, 2010. **10**(1).
5. Spencer, N.J., C.M. Blackburn, and J.M. Read, *Disabling chronic conditions in childhood and socioeconomic disadvantage: a systematic review and meta-analyses of observational studies*. *BMJ Open*, 2015. **5**(9).
6. Colver, A., et al., *Self-reported quality of life of adolescents with cerebral palsy: a cross-sectional and longitudinal analysis*. *The Lancet*, 2015. **385**(9969): p. 705-716.
7. Chatzitheochari, S., S. Parsons, and L. Platt, *Doubly Disadvantaged? Bullying Experiences among Disabled Children and Young People in England*. *Sociology*, 2016. **50**(4): p. 695-713.
8. Jones, L., et al., *Prevalence and risk of violence against children with disabilities: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies*. *Lancet*, 2012. **380**(9845): p. 899-907.
9. Chatzitheochari, S. and L. Platt, *Disability differentials in educational attainment in England: primary and secondary effects*. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 2019. **70**(2): p. 502-525.
10. Office for National Statistics, *Outcomes for disabled people in the UK: 2020*. 2021.
11. World Health Organization, *World report on disability*. 2011: Geneva.
12. Beresford, B., S. Clarke, and J. Maddison, *Therapy interventions for children with neurodisabilities: a qualitative scoping study*. *Health Technology Assessment*, 2018. **22**(3).
13. Anaby, D.R., et al., *Recommended practices to organize and deliver school-based services for children with disabilities: A scoping review*. *Child: Care, Health and Development*, 2019. **45**(1): p. 15-27.
14. Maciver, D., et al., *Participation of children with disabilities in school: A realist systematic review of psychosocial and environmental factors*. *PLOS ONE*, 2019. **14**(1).
15. Ford, J., et al., *Rapid Review of the Impact of Allied Health Professionals on Health Inequalities*. 2021, Cambridge: University of Cambridge. .
16. World Federation of Occupational Therapists, *Position statement on occupational therapy services in school-based practice for children and youth*. 2016.
17. *Children and Families Act*. 2014: United Kingdom.
18. Office for Standards in Education Children's Services and Skills, *SEND: old issues, new issues, next steps*. 2021: United Kingdom.
19. Morris, C., et al., *Setting research priorities to improve the health of children and young people with neurodisability: a British Academy of Childhood Disability-James Lind Alliance Research Priority Setting Partnership*. *BMJ Open*, 2015. **5**(1).
20. Lim, A.K., et al., *Joint production of research priorities to improve the lives of those with childhood onset conditions that impair learning: the James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership for 'learning difficulties'*. *BMJ Open*, 2019.
21. Autistica, *Your questions: shaping future autism research*. 2016: United Kingdom.
22. McPin Foundation, *Research priorities for children and young peoples mental health - interventions and services*. 2018: United Kingdom.
23. Boyle, J.M., et al., *Direct versus indirect and individual versus group modes of language therapy for children with primary language impairment: principal outcomes*

- from a randomized controlled trial and economic evaluation. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 2009. **44**(6): p. 826-846.
24. Adams, C., et al., *The Social Communication Intervention Project: a randomized controlled trial of the effectiveness of speech and language therapy for school-age children who have pragmatic and social communication problems with or without autism spectrum disorder*. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 2012. **47**(3): p. 233-244.
 25. Zwicker, J.G. and A.F. Hadwin, *Cognitive versus Multisensory Approaches to Handwriting Intervention: A Randomized Controlled Trial*. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation and Health*, 2009. **29**(1): p. 40-48.
 26. Verschuren, O., et al., *Exercise Training Program in Children and Adolescents With Cerebral Palsy: A Randomized Controlled Trial*. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 2007. **161**(11): p. 1075-1081.
 27. Missiuna, C.A., et al., *Partnering for Change: An Innovative School-Based Occupational Therapy Service Delivery Model for Children with Developmental Coordination Disorder*. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 2012. **79**(1): p. 41-50.
 28. Miake-Lye, I.M., et al., *What is an evidence map? A systematic review of published evidence maps and their definitions, methods, and products*. *Systematic Reviews*, 2016. **5**(1).
 29. Saran, A. and H. White, *Evidence and gap maps: a comparison of different approaches*. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, 2018. **14**(1): p. 1-38.
 30. Craig, P., et al., *Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance*. *BMJ*, 2008. **337**.
 31. Seo, H., et al., *A newly developed tool for classifying study designs in systematic reviews of interventions and exposures showed substantial reliability and validity*. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 2016. **70**: p. 200-205.
 32. Chu, S., *Supporting children with special educational needs (SEN): An introduction to a 3-tiered school-based occupational therapy model of service delivery in the United Kingdom*. *World Federation of Occupational Therapists Bulletin*, 2017. **73**(2): p. 107-116.
 33. Hutton, E., S. Tuppeny, and A. Hasselbusch, *Making a case for universal and targeted children's occupational therapy in the United Kingdom*. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 2016. **79**(7): p. 450-453.
 34. World Health Organization, *International classification of functioning, disability and health: ICF*. 2001: Geneva: World Health Organization.
 35. Allard, A., et al., *Key health outcomes for children and young people with neurodisability: qualitative research with young people and parents*. *BMJ Open*, 2014. **4**(4).
 36. James Lind Alliance. *The James Lind Alliance*. Available from: <https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/>.
 37. Webster, R., et al., *Maximising the impact of teaching assistants in primary schools: A practical guide for school leaders*. 2021: Routledge.
 38. Cullen, M., et al., *Special Educational Needs in Mainstream Schools: Evidence Review*. Education Endowment Foundation, 2020.
 39. Ebbels, S.H., et al., *Evidence-based pathways to intervention for children with language disorders*. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*, 2019. **54**(1): p. 3-19.
 40. Maciver, D., et al., *Using Stakeholder Involvement, Expert Knowledge and Naturalistic Implementation to Co-Design a Complex Intervention to Support Children's Inclusion and Participation in Schools: The CIRCLE Framework*. *Children*, 2021. **8**(3): p. 217.
 41. James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnerships. *Funded research*. 2020; Available from: <https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/making-a-difference/funded-research.htm>.

42. Parr, J., *Ten years of the BACD Strategic Research Group: maximizing opportunities for paediatric neurodisability research*. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 2018. **60**(6): p. 531-531.
43. Webster, R. and A.A. De Boer, *Where next for research on teaching assistants: the case for an international response*. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 2021. **36**(2): p. 294-305.

Supplement 1a – MEDLINE Search Strategy

- 1 disab* student*.mp. (290)
- 2 Disabled Children/ or disab* child*.mp. (7906)
- 3 child* with disab*.mp. (1841)
- 4 adolescent* with disab*.mp. (166)
- 5 disab* you*.mp. (210)
- 6 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 (9135)
- 7 child*.mp. (2325328)
- 8 adolescent/ or young adult/ or exp child/ or child, preschool/ or infant/ (3442428)
- 9 toddler*.mp. (10067)
- 10 pre-school*.mp. (4759)
- 11 preschool*.mp. (887167)
- 12 school-child*.mp. (22434)
- 13 school child*.mp. (22434)
- 14 student*.mp. (291581)
- 15 Students/ (53269)
- 16 (youth* or young person* or young people*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms] (96844)
- 17 7 or 8 or 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 (4010446)
- 18 (neurodisab* or neuro-disab*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms] (342)
- 19 ((neurodevelopment* or development*) adj3 (disease* or disab* or disorder* or dysfunction* or impair* or difficult*)).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms] (139571)
- 20 exp *Neurodevelopmental Disorders/ (136541)
- 21 exp *Mental Disorders/ (982655)
- 22 exp *heredodegenerative disorders, nervous system/ or exp *neuromuscular diseases/ (292315)
- 23 exp *Epilepsy/ or epilep*.mp. (155951)
- 24 exp *Movement Disorders/ or exp *Cerebral Palsy/ or cerebral pals*.mp. (134719)
- 25 exp *Autistic Disorder/ or exp *Developmental Disabilities/ or exp *Intellectual Disability/ (96795)
- 26 autis*.mp. or exp *Autism Spectrum Disorder/ (46721)
- 27 dyspraxi*.mp. (563)
- 28 developmental co* disorder*.mp. (1058)
- 29 exp *Attention Deficit Disorder with Hyperactivity/ (21878)
- 30 learning disab*.mp. (8780)
- 31 learning diff*.mp. (2576)
- 32 exp *Brain Injuries/ (54067)
- 33 exp *Brain Damage, Chronic/ (26390)
- 34 exp *Communication Disorders/ (47224)
- 35 exp *Chronic Disease/ (25146)
- 36 disab*.mp. (312411)
- 37 special* need*.mp. (4558)
- 38 special* education* need*.mp. (330)

- 39 additional need*.mp. (342)
- 40 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23 or 24 or 25 or 26 or 27 or 28 or 29 or 30 or 31 or 32 or 33 or 34 or 35 or 36 or 37 or 38 or 39 (1902177)
- 41 17 and 40 (577006)
- 42 6 or 41 (577047)
- 43 exp *occupational therapy/ or exp *physical therapy specialty/ or exp *speech-language pathology/ (13408)
- 44 occupational therap*.mp. (18788)
- 45 physical therap*.mp. (51701)
- 46 physiotherap*.mp. (24152)
- 47 (speech and language therap*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms] (2227)
- 48 (speech and language path*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms] (4771)
- 49 exp *Speech Therapy/ or speech therap*.mp. (8159)
- 50 allied health profession*.mp. (2194)
- 51 exp *Rehabilitation/ (176756)
- 52 43 or 44 or 45 or 46 or 47 or 48 or 49 or 50 or 51 (231436)
- 53 exp *needs assessment/ or exp *schools/ or exp *schools, nursery/ or exp *universities/ (63838)
- 54 exp *Child Day Care Centers/ (3122)
- 55 exp *education, nonprofessional/ or exp *education, special/ or exp *"physical education and training"/ or exp *vocational education/ (155709)
- 56 exp *Nurseries/ (1668)
- 57 classroom*.mp. (15735)
- 58 high school*.mp. (29759)
- 59 kindergarten*.mp. (6150)
- 60 (pre-school* or preschool*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms] (888269)
- 61 (education health and care plan*).mp. [mp=title, abstract, original title, name of substance word, subject heading word, floating sub-heading word, keyword heading word, organism supplementary concept word, protocol supplementary concept word, rare disease supplementary concept word, unique identifier, synonyms] (16)
- 62 statement* of special education* need*.mp. (20)
- 63 53 or 54 or 55 or 56 or 57 or 58 or 59 or 60 or 61 or 62 (1131890)
- 64 42 and 52 and 63 (6017)
- 65 limit 64 to last 15 years (3385)

Supplement 1b – Full references for the included studies (n=337)

1. Abbott Barbara L, Provident I. Changing Occupational Therapists' Knowledge of Their Role in Secondary Transition Planning. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools & Early Intervention*. 2016. p. 382-96.
2. Abdoola SS, Mosca R, Pillay BS. Responsive communication coaching for early childhood practitioners in underserved South African contexts: Clinical perspectives. *The South African Journal of Communication Disorders*. 2019. p. e1-e7.
3. Acosta V, Hernandez S, Ramirez G. Effectiveness of a working memory intervention program in children with language disorders. *Applied Neuropsychology Child*. 2019. p. 15-23.
4. Acosta V, Moreno A, Axpe A, Lorenzo M. Support for the development of narrative abilities in children with specific language impairment in inclusive contexts. *Revista de Logopedia, Foniatria y Audiologia*. 2010. p. 196-205.
5. Adams C, Lockton E, Freed J, Gaile J, Earl G, McBean K, et al. The Social Communication Intervention Project: a randomized controlled trial of the effectiveness of speech and language therapy for school-age children who have pragmatic and social communication problems with or without autism spectrum disorder. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*. 2012.
6. Afzal F, Manzoor S, Afzal A. Strength training by using universal exercise unit to improve the motor functions in cerebral palsy. *Rawal Medical Journal*. 2018. p. 120-3.
7. Allen Jennifer L, Keiser Kay A. The impact of speech-language pathologist service delivery models for concept imagery formation instruction on second grade students' language achievement outcomes. 2008.
8. Allen MM. Intervention efficacy and intensity for children with speech sound disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing research*. 2013. p. 865-77.
9. Alzrayer Nouf M, Banda Devender R, Koul R. Teaching children with autism spectrum disorder and other developmental disabilities to perform multistep requesting using an iPad. *AAC: Augmentative & Alternative Communication*. 2017. p. 65-76.
10. Atasavun U, Duger T. Visual perception training on social skills and activity performance in low-vision children. *Scandinavian Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2012. p. 33-41.
11. Axford C, Joosten Annette V, Harris C. iPad applications that required a range of motor skills promoted motor coordination in children commencing primary school. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 2018. p. 146-55.
12. Bagatell N, Mirigliani G, Patterson C, Reyes Y, Test L. Effectiveness of Therapy Ball Chairs on Classroom Participation in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorders. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2010. p. 895-903.
13. Bailey Rita L, Angell Maureen E. Effects of an Oral-Sensory/Oral-Motor Stimulation/Positive Reinforcement Program on the Acceptance of Non-preferred Foods by Youth with Physical and Multiple Disabilities. *Physical Disabilities: Education and Related Services*. 2005. p. 41-61.
14. Ballin L, Balandin S, Stancliffe Roger J. The Speech-Generating Device (SGD) Mentoring Program: Training Adults who use an SGD to Mentor. *Augmentative and*

Alternative Communication. 2012. p. 254-65.

15. Balthazar Catherine H, Scott Cheryl M. Targeting Complex Sentences in Older School Children With Specific Language Impairment: Results From an Early-Phase Treatment Study. *Journal of Speech, Language & Hearing Research*. 2018. p. 713-28.
16. Bardsen A. Play or practice? Exploring a play-based intervention approach to enhance the quality of physiotherapy treatment in kindergartens. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2012. p. 44.
17. Bar-Haim S, Harries N, Nammourah I, Oraibi S, Malhees W, Loeppky J, et al. Effectiveness of motor learning coaching in children with cerebral palsy: a randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation*. 2010. 24(11):1009-10202010.
18. Bartolotta TE, Remshifski PA. Coaching communication partners: A preliminary investigation of communication intervention during mealtime in Rett syndrome. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*. 2013. p. 162-71.
19. Bastos P, Carolina, Guillaumon E, Maria Ls, Cezar da C, Daniel M. Utilization of assistive devices for students with disabilities in the public schools. *Cadernos de Terapia Ocupacional da UFSCar*. 2013. p. 35-42.
20. Bauminger-Zviely N, Eden S, Zancanaro M, Weiss PL, Gal E. Increasing social engagement in children with high-functioning autism spectrum disorder using collaborative technologies in the school environment. *Autism*. 2013. p. 17(3): 317-39.
21. Baxendale J, Lockton E, Adams C, Gaile J. Parent and teacher perceptions of participation and outcomes in an intensive communication intervention for children with pragmatic language impairment. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2013. p. 41-53.
22. Bazyk S, Bazyk J. Meaning of Occupation-Based Groups for Low-Income Urban Youths Attending After-School Care. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2009. p. 69-80.
23. Bazyk S, Cimino J, Hayes K, Goodman G, Farrell P. The Use of Therapeutic Listening with Preschoolers with Developmental Disabilities: A Look at the Outcomes. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2010. p. 124-38.
24. Bazyk S, Demirjian L, Horvath F, Doxsey L. The Comfortable Cafeteria Program for Promoting Student Participation and Enjoyment: An Outcome Study. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2018. p. 1-9.
25. Bazyk S, Michaud P, Goodman G, Papp P, Hawkins E, Welch MA. Integrating occupational therapy services in a kindergarten curriculum: a look at the outcomes. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2009. p. 160-71.
26. Beck AR, Stoner JB, Bock SJ, Parton T. Comparison of PECS and the Use of a VOCA: A Replication. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*. 2008. 43(2): 198-216.
27. Beesley Leigh A. Total communication methods for preschool children with autism: A transcendental phenomenological study of parent and professional perceptions. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*. 2017.
28. Bellon-Harn ML, Byers BA, Lappi J. Treatment Intensity: Effects of Interactive Book Reading on Narrative Abilities in Preschool Children With SLI. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*. 2014. p. 35(4): 226-36.

29. Bellon-Harn ML, Hoffman PR, Harn WE. Use of cloze and contrast word procedures in repeated storybook reading: Targeting multiple domains. *Journal of Communication Disorders*. 2004. p. 53-75.
30. Bellon-Harn Monica L. Dose frequency: Comparison of language outcomes in preschool children with language impairment. *Child Language Teaching & Therapy*. 2012. p. 225-40.
31. Bellows Laura L, Davies Patricia L, Anderson J, Kennedy C. Effectiveness of a Physical Activity Intervention for Head Start Pre-schoolers: A Randomized Intervention Study. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2013. p. 28-36.
32. Bellows LL, Davies PL, Courtney JB, Gavin WJ, Johnson SL, Boles RE. Motor skill development in low-income, at-risk preschoolers: A community-based longitudinal intervention study. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*. 2017. p. 997-1002.
33. Benjamin L, Newton C, Ebbels S. Investigating the effectiveness of idiom intervention for 9-16-year-olds with developmental language disorder. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2019.
34. Bickford-Smith A, Wijayatilake L, Woods G. Evaluating the Effectiveness of an Early Years Language Intervention. *Educational Psychology in Practice*. 2005. 21(3): 161-73.
35. Biggs Elizabeth E, Carter Erik W, Gustafson J. Efficacy of Peer Support Arrangements to Increase Peer Interaction and AAC Use: *AJMR*. *American Journal on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*. 2017. p. 25-48, 93(5).
36. Binger C, Kent-Walsh J, Ewing C, Taylor S. Teaching Educational Assistants to Facilitate the Multisymbol Message Productions of Young Students Who Require Augmentative and Alternative Communication. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2010. p. 108-20.
37. Binger C, Maguire-Marshall M, Kent-Walsh J. Using Aided AAC Models, Recasts, and Contrastive Targets to Teach Grammatical Morphemes to Children Who Use AAC. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2011. p. 160-76.
38. Bjornson K, Kobayashi A, Zhou C, Walker W. Relationship of therapy to postsecondary education and employment in young adults with physical disabilities. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*. 2011. p. 179-86.
39. Blackwell Angela L, Yeager Danielle C, Mische-Lawson L, Bird Ryan J, Cook Donna M. Teaching Children Self-Regulation Skills within the Early Childhood Education Environment: A Feasibility Study. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2014. p. 204-24.
40. Blischak DM, Shah SD, Lombardino LJ, Chiarella K. Effects of phonemic awareness instruction on the encoding skills of children with severe speech impairment. *Disability & Rehabilitation*. 2004. p. 1295-304.
41. Boisvert M, Hall N, Andrianopoulos M, Chaclas J. The Multi-faceted Implementation of Telepractice to Service Individuals with Autism. *International Journal of Telerehabilitation*. 2012. p. 4(2): 11-23.
42. Boisvert Michelle K. An Investigation of the Efficacy of Speech and Language Interventions with Students with ASD Using Telepractice. 2012.
43. Borgestig M, Falkmer Tr, Hemmingsson H. Improving computer usage for students with physical disabilities through a collaborative approach: A pilot study. *Scandinavian*

Journal of Occupational Therapy. 2013. p. 463-70.

44. Borgestig M, Sandqvist J, Ahlsten G, Falkmer T, Hemmingsson H. Gaze-based assistive technology in daily activities in children with severe physical impairments - An intervention study. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation*. 2017. p. 129-41.
45. Borgestig M, Sandqvist J, Parsons R, Falkmer Tr, Hemmingsson H. Eye gaze performance for children with severe physical impairments using gaze-based assistive technology - A longitudinal study. *Assistive Technology*. 2016. p. 93-102.
46. Botting N, Gaynor M, Tucker K, Orchard-Lisle G. The importance of natural change in planning school-based intervention for children with Developmental Language Impairment (DLI). *Child Language Teaching & Therapy*. 2016. p. 159-77.
47. Boyer Valerie E, Mundschenk Nancy A. Using Animal-Assisted Therapy to Facilitate Social Communication: A Pilot Study. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology & Audiology*. 2014. p. 26-38.
48. Boyle JM, McCartney E, O'Hare A, Forbes J. Direct versus indirect and individual versus group modes of language therapy for children with primary language impairment: principal outcomes from a randomized controlled trial and economic evaluation. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2009. p. 826-46.
49. Breit-Smith A, Olszewski A, Swoboda C, Ying G, Prendeville J-A. Sequence text structure intervention during interactive book reading of expository picture books with preschool children with language impairment. *Child Language Teaching & Therapy*. 2017. p. 287-304.
50. Brosky Joseph A, Jr, Wiegand Mark R, Bartlett A, Idlewine T. Developing a K-12 Rural School System Wellness Policy through Community Engagement. *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship*. 2010. p. 31-40.
51. Bruce L, Lynde S, Weinhold J, Peter B. A Team Approach to Response to Intervention for Speech Sound Errors in the School Setting. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*. 2018. p. 110-9.
52. Bruce SM, Trief E, Cascella PW. Teachers' and speech-language pathologists' perceptions about a tangible symbols intervention: efficacy, generalization, and recommendations. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication* 2011. p. 172-82.
53. Bryant E, Cowan D, Walker• Bone K. The introduction of Petra running bikes (race runners) to non-ambulant children with cerebral palsy: a pilot study. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2015.
54. Bryant E, Pountney T, Williams H, Edelman N. Can a six-week exercise intervention improve gross motor function for non-ambulant children with cerebral palsy? A pilot randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation*. 2013. 27(2):150-1592013.
55. Buckle F, Franzsen D, Bester J. The effect of the wearing of weighted vests on the sensory behaviour of learners diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder within a school context. *South African Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2011. p. 36-42.
56. Busch Chersonia W, Kebritchi M. Effects of Co-teaching Instruction between a Speech Pathologist and First Grade Teachers. 2014.
57. Campbell Joseph E, Morgan M, Barnett V, Spreat S. Handheld Devices and Video Modeling to Enhance the Learning of Self-Help Skills in Adolescents With Autism Spectrum Disorder. *OTJR: Occupation, Participation & Health*. 2015. p. 95-100.

58. Canney C, Byrne A. Evaluating Circle Time as a Support to Social Skills Development--Reflections on a Journey in School-Based Research. *British Journal of Special Education*. 2006. p. 19-24.
59. Carlson B, McLaughlin Thomas F, Blecher J. Teaching preschool children with autism and developmental delays to write. 2009.
60. Carpe A, Harder K, Tam C, Reid D. Perceptions of writing and communication aid use among children with a physical disability. *Assistive Technology*. 2010. p. 87-98.
61. Carre AJM, Le Grice B, Blampied NM, Walker D. Picture Exchange Communication (PECS) training for young children: Does training transfer at school and to home? *Behaviour Change*. 2009. p. 54-65.
62. Case-Smith J, Holland T, Bishop B. Effectiveness of an Integrated Handwriting Program for First-Grade Students: A Pilot Study. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2011. p. 670-8.
63. Case-Smith J, Holland T, White S. Effectiveness of a Co-Taught Handwriting Program For First Grade Students. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2014. p. 30-43.
64. Case-Smith J, Weaver L, Holland T. Effects of a Classroom-Embedded Occupational Therapist - Teacher Handwriting Program for First-Grade Students. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2014. p. 690-8.
65. Casey AF, Pickard V, Ullrich C, MacNeil Z. An adapted walking intervention for a child with Pitt Hopkins syndrome. *Disability & Rehabilitation Assistive Technology*. 2018. p. 25-30.
66. Chang S-H, Yu N-Y. The effect of computer-assisted therapeutic practice for children with handwriting deficit: A comparison with the effect of the traditional sensorimotor approach. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2014. p. 1648-57.
67. Chang YJ, Chen SF, Huang JD. A Kinect-based system for physical rehabilitation: A pilot study for young adults with motor disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2011. p. 2566-70.
68. Chiang YH, Liu CH, Lee SJ, Shih YN. Effect of assistive reading software on high school students with learning disabilities: A pilot study. *Work*. 2012. 42(4): 473-80.
69. Chrysagis N, Skordilis EK, Stavrou N, Grammatopoulou E, Koutsouki D. The effect of treadmill training on gross motor function and walking speed in ambulatory adolescents with cerebral palsy: a randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation*. 2012. p. 747-60.
70. Chu S. Supporting children with special educational needs (SEN): An introduction to a 3-tiered school-based occupational therapy model of service delivery in the United Kingdom. *WFOT Bulletin*. 2017. p. 107-16.
71. Chu S, Reynolds F. Occupational therapy for children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), part 2: a multicentre evaluation of an assessment and treatment package. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2007. p. 439-48.
72. Ciccone N, Hennessey N, Stokes SF. Community-based early intervention for language delay: a preliminary investigation. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2012. p. 467-70.
73. Cleary SL, Taylor NF, Dodd KJ, Shields N. An aerobic exercise program for young

people with cerebral palsy in specialist schools: a phase I randomized controlled trial. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation*. 2017. 20(6):331-3382017.

74. Cleary Stacey L, Taylor Nicholas F, Dodd Karen J, Shields N. A qualitative evaluation of an aerobic exercise program for young people with cerebral palsy in specialist schools. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation*. 2017. p. 339-46.
75. Clegg J. Curriculum vocabulary learning intervention for children with social, emotional and behavioural difficulties (SEBD): findings from a case study series. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties*. 2014. p. 106-27.
76. Clendon S, Gillon G, Yoder D. Initial insights into phoneme awareness intervention for children with complex communication needs. *International Journal of Disability, Development and Education*. 2005. p. 7-31.
77. Colebourn Jennifer A, Golub-Victor Ann C, Paez A. Developing Overhand Throwing Skills for a Child With Autism With a Collaborative Approach in School-Based Therapy. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*. 2017. p. 262-9.
78. Collins A, Dworkin Rosalind J. Pilot Study of the Effectiveness of Weighted Vests. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2011. p. 688-94.
79. Connell A. A controlled trial of a classroom based intervention on motor development of 6-8 year old children. *Physiotherapy*. 2011. p. eS231.
80. Cosby E, McLaughlin TF, Derby KM. Using tracing and modeling with a handwriting without tears worksheet to increase handwriting legibility for a preschool student with autism. *The Open Social Science Journal*. 2009.
81. Coste-Zeitoun D, Pinton F, Barondiot C, Ducot B, Warszawski J, Billard C, et al. Specific remedial therapy in a specialist unit: Evaluation of 31 children with severe, specific language or reading disorders over one academic year. *Revue Neurologique*. 2005. p. 299-310.
82. Costigan FA, Light J. Effect of seated position on upper-extremity access to augmentative communication for children with cerebral palsy: Preliminary investigation. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2010. p. 596-604.
83. Cox AL, Gast DL, Luscre D, Ayres KM. The effects of weighted vests on appropriate in-seat behaviors of elementary-age students with autism and severe to profound intellectual disabilities. *Focus on Autism & Other Developmental Disabilities*. 2009. p. 17-26.
84. Crowley JP, Arnold SH, McEwen IR, James S. Treadmill training in a child with cerebral palsy: A case report. *Physical and Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2009. p. 60-70.
85. Cuevas Miranda CA, del Carmen Lopez F, Valenzuela Pelo MJI, Cares Gonzalez JE, Quintanilla Villar TA. Application experience of a language stimulation program implemented on inclusive kindergarten classrooms. *Revista de Logopedia, Foniatria y Audiologia*. 2019. p. 129-40.
86. Curran M, Van H, A O. Use of Recast Intervention to Teach Causal Adverbials to Young Children With Developmental Language Disorder Within a Science Curriculum: A Single Case Design Study. *American Journal of Speech Language Pathology*. 2019. 28(2): 430-47.
87. Dada S, Alant E. The Effect of Aided Language Stimulation on Vocabulary Acquisition in Children With Little or No Functional Speech. *American Journal of Speech-*

Language Pathology. 2009. p. 50-64.

88. Dalton Elizabeth M, McKenzie Judith A, Kahonde C. The implementation of inclusive education in South Africa: Reflections arising from a workshop for teachers and therapists to introduce Universal Design for Learning. 2012.
89. Davies P, Shanks B, Davies K. Improving narrative skills in young children with delayed language development. *Educational Review*. 2004. p. 271-86.
90. De K, Hendriks C, Bosma L. Getting children with ABI back on track at school. *Brain Injury*. 2014. p. 733.
91. Dessoye J, Converse-Korhonen C, McLaughlin L, McSweeney S, Steinhoff C. The Effectiveness of iPad Handwriting Applications in Improving Visual--Motor and Handwriting Skills in Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2017.
92. Devlin S, Leader G, Healy O. Comparison of behavioral intervention and sensory-integration therapy in the treatment of self-injurious behavior. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*. 2009. p. 223-31.
93. Dickson K, Marshall M, Boyle James M, McCartney E, O'Hare A, Forbes J, et al. Cost analysis of direct versus indirect and individual versus group modes of manual-based speech-and-language therapy for primary school-age children with primary language impairment. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*. 2009. p. 369-81.
94. DiMeo Sarah E, Baxter Mary F. Matching students to augmentative and alternative communication: A survey of trends and a case study. 2015.
95. Dockrell J, Lindsay G, Roulstone S, Law J. Supporting children with speech, language and communication needs: an overview of the results of the Better Communication Research Programme. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2014. p. 543-57.
96. Dodd Janet L, Hagge Darla K. AAC Camp as an Alternative School-Based Service Delivery Model: A Retrospective Survey. *Communication Disorders Quarterly: Communication Disorders Quarterly*. 2014. p. 123-32.
97. Donica Denise K. Handwriting Without Tears: General Education Effectiveness Through a Consultative Approach. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2015. p1-p8.
98. Donica Denise K, Giroux P, Faust A. Keyboarding Instruction: Comparison of Techniques for Improved Keyboarding Skills in Elementary Students. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools & Early Intervention*. 2018. p. 396-410.
99. Dunbar S, Carr-Hertel J, Lieberman H, Perez B, Ricks K. A Pilot Study Comparison of Sensory Integration Treatment and Integrated Preschool Activities for Children with Autism. *The Internet Journal of Allied Health Sciences and Practice*. 2012. 10(3): 1-8.
100. Dykstra JR, Boyd BA, Watson LR, Crais ER, Baranek GT. The impact of the Advancing Social-communication and Play (ASAP) intervention on preschoolers with autism spectrum disorder. *Autism*. 2012. 16(1): 27-44.
101. Ebbels Susan H, MariÄ‡ Na, Murphy A, Turner G. Improving comprehension in adolescents with severe receptive language impairments: a randomized control trial of intervention for coordinating conjunctions. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2014. p. 30-48.

102. Ebbels Susan H, Wright L, Brockbank S, Godfrey C, Harris C, Leniston H, et al. Effectiveness of 1:1 speech and language therapy for older children with (developmental) language disorder. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2017. p. 528-39.
103. Eckberg Z, Sheryl, Pfeiffer B. Effectiveness of a Handwriting Intervention With At-Risk Kindergarteners. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2016. p. p1-p8.
104. Eliasson AC, Shaw K, Berg E, Krumlinde-Sundholm L. An ecological approach of Constraint Induced Movement Therapy for 2-3-year-old children: a randomized control trial. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2011. p. 2820-8.
105. Fairweather Glenn C, Lincoln Michelle A, Ramsden R. Speech-language pathology teletherapy in rural and remote educational settings: Decreasing service inequities. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2016. p. 592-602.
106. Falzarano M, Petrocelli T, Kruger M. Efficacy of the "Connect Experience Write" (CEW) Music and Movement Handwriting Program for Nonwriters. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2016.
107. Farquharson K, Tambyraja Sherine R, Logan J, Justice Laura M, Schmitt Mary B. Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling to Examine How Individual SLPs Differentially Contribute to Children's Language and Literacy Gains in Public Schools. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2015. p. 504-16.
108. Fedewa A, Davis MAC, Ahn S. Effects of stability balls on children's on-task behavior, academic achievement, and discipline referrals: a randomized controlled trial. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2015.
109. Fedewa AL, Erwin HE. Stability balls and students with attention and hyperactivity concerns: Implications for on-task and in-seat behavior. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2011. p. 393-9.
110. Ferguson GD, Jelsma D, Jelsma J, Smits-Engelsman BCM. The efficacy of two task-orientated interventions for children with Developmental Coordination Disorder: Neuromotor Task Training and Nintendo Wii Fit training. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2013. p. 2449-61.
111. Ferguson Gillian D, Naidoo N, Smits-Engelsman Bouwien CM. Health Promotion in a Low-income Primary School: Children with and Without DCD Benefit, but Differently. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2015. p. 147-62.
112. Foster E. Physiotherapy interventions for children with cerebral palsy in a school setting: a systematic review. 2020.
113. Francis T. Differences in Reading Achievement When Using Occupational-therapy Based Strategies Versus Standard Classroom-based Reading Intervention for Elementary School Children-a Pilot Study. 2019.
114. Fricke S, Burgoyne K, Bowyer• Crane C, Kyriacou M, Zosimidou A, Maxwell L, et al. The efficacy of early language intervention in mainstream school settings: a randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2017. 58(10): 1141-51.
115. Fujiki M, Brinton B, McCleave CP, Anderson VW, Chamberlain JP. A social communication intervention to increase validating comments by children with language impairment. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*. 2013. 44(1): 3-19.
116. Gabel R, Grogan-Johnson S, Alvares R, Bechstein L, Taylor J. A field study of

telepractice for school intervention using the ASHA NOMS K-12 database. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*. 2013. p. 44-53.

117. Gallagher AL, Chiat S. Evaluation of speech and language therapy interventions for pre-school children with specific language impairment: a comparison of outcomes following specialist intensive, nursery-based and no intervention. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2009. p. 616-38.

118. Ganapathy Sankar U, Monisha R, Doss CAV, Palanivel RM. Evaluating the immediate effects of deep pressure on children developmental coordination disorder: Demonstrating individual differences. *Asian Journal of Pharmaceutical and Clinical Research*. 2020. p. 61-3.

119. Garg S. The effectiveness of the get ready to learn program in improving executive functions in children with disabilities. 2017.

120. Gelkop N, Burshtein Dikla G, Lahav A, Brezner A, Al-Oraibi S, Ferre Claudio L, et al. Efficacy of Constraint-Induced Movement Therapy and Bimanual Training in Children with Hemiplegic Cerebral Palsy in an Educational Setting. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2015. p. 24-39.

121. Gibbard D, Smith C. A transagency approach to enabling access to parent-based intervention for language delay in areas of social disadvantage: A service evaluation. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*. 2016. p. 19-33.

122. Gillam SL, Gillam RB, Reece K. Language Outcomes of Contextualized and Decontextualized Language Intervention: Results of an Early Efficacy Study. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*. 2012. 43(3): 276-91.

123. Gillam SL, Olszewski A, Squires K, Wolfe K, Slocum T, Gillam RB. Improving Narrative Production in Children With Language Disorders: An Early-Stage Efficacy Study of a Narrative Intervention Program. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*. 2018. p. 197-212.

124. Gilmore N, Ross K, Kiran S. The Intensive Cognitive-Communication Rehabilitation Program for Young Adults With Acquired Brain Injury. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2019. p. 341-58.

125. Glisson L, Leitao S, Claessen M. Evaluating the efficacy of a small-group oral narrative intervention programme for pre-primary children with narrative difficulties in a mainstream school setting. *Australian Journal of Learning Difficulties*. 2019. 24(1).

126. Golos A, Sarid M, Weill M, Weintraub N. Efficacy of an early intervention program for at-risk preschool boys: A two-group control study. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2011. p. 400-8.

127. Goodwin J, Lecouturier J, Basu A, Colver A, Crombie S, Smith J, et al. Standing frames for children with cerebral palsy: a mixed-methods feasibility study. *Health Technology Assessment*. 2018. p. 1-232.

128. Gordon K, Pasco G, McElduff F, Wade A, Howlin P, Charman T. A communication-based intervention for nonverbal children with autism: what changes? Who benefits? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 2011. p. 447-57.

129. Grajo Lenin C, Candler C. The Occupation and Participation Approach to Reading Intervention (OPARI): A community of practice study. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2017. p. 90-9.

130. Grogan-Johnson S, Alvares R, Rowan L, Creaghead N. A pilot study comparing the effectiveness of speech language therapy provided by telemedicine with conventional on-site therapy. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 2010. p. 134-9.
131. Grogan-Johnson S, Gabel RM, Taylor J, Rowan LE, Alvares R, Schenker J. A Pilot Exploration of Speech Sound Disorder Intervention Delivered by Telehealth to School-Age Children. *International Journal of Telerehabilitation*. 2011. p. 3(1): 31-41.
132. Gurian Manzini M, Simões, Martinez CM, Ferreira Lourenço G, de Brito Oliveira B. Alternative communication training of interlocutors for children with cerebral palsy. *Brazilian Journal of Occupational Therapy / Cadernos Brasileiros de Terapia Ocupacional*. 2017. p. 553-64.
133. Gutman SA, Raphael EI, Ceder LM, Khan A, Timp KM, Salvant S. The effect of a motor-based, social skills intervention for adolescents with high-functioning autism: two single-subject design cases. *Occupational Therapy International*. 2010. p. 188-97.
134. Haight Derek G. Will the use of therapy dogs provide greater motivation for multiply disabled children. 2012.
135. Haines D, Harland D, Swarbrick C. The impact of sensory integration groups on the occupational participation of children and young people with learning disabilities. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2017.
136. Hammond J, Jones V, Hill EL, Green D, Male I. An investigation of the impact of regular use of the Wii Fit to improve motor and psychosocial outcomes in children with movement difficulties: a pilot study. *Child: care, health and development*. 2014. p. 165-75.
137. Hand A. A controlled clinical evaluation of the Parents Plus Children's Programme for parents of children aged 6-12 with mild intellectual disability in a school setting. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2013. p. S276.
138. Hannah L. Self-regulation strategies of Singapore mainstream children with emotional disturbances. *Annals of the Academy of Medicine Singapore*. 2012. p. S203.
139. Hape K, Flood N, McArthur K, Sidara C, Stephens C, Welsh K. A Pilot Study of the Effectiveness of the Handwriting Without Tears Curriculum in First Grade. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2014. p. 284-93.
140. Harding C, Halai V. Providing dysphagia training for carers of children who have profound and multiple learning disabilities. *British Journal of Developmental Disabilities*. 2009. p. 33-47.
141. Harpster K, Burkett K, Walton K, Case-Smith J. Evaluating the Effects of the Engagement-Communication-Exploration (ECE) Snack Time Intervention for Preschool Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2015. p. 503-6.
142. Hatfield M, Murray N, Ciccarelli M, Falkmer Tr, Falkmer M. Pilot of the BOOST-A: An online transition planning program for adolescents with autism. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 2017. p. 448-56.
143. Heneker S. Speech and language therapy support for pupils with behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD): a pilot project. *British Journal of Special Education*. 2005. p. 86-91.
144. Herd CL, Hudson M. Training graduate student clinicians to use preschool peer interaction strategies. *Perspectives on Administration & Supervision*. 2009. p. 13-8.

145. Hernandez Stephen J. Evaluation of Push-In/Integrated Therapy in a Collaborative Preschool for Children with Special Needs. *Journal of the American Academy of Special Education Professionals*. 2012. p. 47-77.
146. Hesketh A, Dima E, Nelson V. Teaching phoneme awareness to pre-literate children with speech disorder: a randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2007. p. 251-71.
147. Hettiarachchi S. 'Katha petti' (Talk-boxes) approach: Working through teachers to encourage language-learning. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2019. p. 65.
148. Hodgetts S, Magill-Evans J, Misiaszek J. Effects of weighted vests on classroom behavior for children with autism and cognitive impairments. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*. 2011. p. 495-505.
149. Hodgetts S, Magill-Evans J, Misiaszek John E. Weighted Vests, Stereotyped Behaviors and Arousal in Children with Autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2011. p. 805-14.
150. Hotham S, Hamilton-West KE, Hutton E, King A, Abbott N. A study into the effectiveness of a postural care training programme aimed at improving knowledge, understanding and confidence in parents and school staff. *Child: Care, Health & Development*. 2017. p. 743-51.
151. Howe T-H, Roston Karen L, Sheu C-F, Hinojosa J. Assessing Handwriting Intervention Effectiveness in Elementary School Students: A Two-Group Controlled Study. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2013. p. 19-26.
152. Howlin P, Gordon RK, Pasco G, Wade A, Charman T. The effectiveness of Picture Exchange Communication System (PECS) training for teachers of children with autism: a pragmatic, group randomised controlled trial. *Journal of Child Psychology & Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines*. 2007. 48(5): 473-81.
153. Hrastelj L, Knight RA. Ingressive speech errors: a service evaluation of speech-sound therapy in a child aged 4;6. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2017. p. 479-88.
154. Hui C, Snider L, Couture MI. Self-regulation workshop and Occupational Performance Coaching with teachers: A pilot study. *The Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2016. p. 115-25.
155. Jelsma J, Pronk M, Ferguson G, Jelsma-Smit D. The effect of the Nintendo Wii Fit on balance control and gross motor function of children with spastic hemiplegic cerebral palsy. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation*. 2013. p. 27-37.
156. Joffe VL, Rixon L, Hulme C. Improving storytelling and vocabulary in secondary school students with language disorder: a randomized controlled trial. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*. 2019. 54(4): 656-72.
157. Jonathan G, Catherine A, Tony C, Ann Le C, Richard AE, Victoria G, et al. Paediatric Autism Communication Therapy-Generalised (PACT-G) against treatment as usual for reducing symptom severity in young children with autism spectrum disorder: study protocol for a randomised controlled trial. *Trials*. 2018.
158. Joseph C. Rapid Review of Occupational Therapy Interventions in Early Childhood Education Settings. 2020.
159. Justice Laura M, Schmitt Mary B, Murphy Kimberly A, Pratt A, Biancone T. The

'robustness' of vocabulary intervention in the public schools: targets and techniques employed in speech-language therapy. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2014. p. 288-303.

160. Kaiser M-L, Albaret J-M, Doudin P-A. Efficacy of an Explicit Handwriting Program. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*. 2011. p. 610-8.

161. Kamps D, Mason R, Thiemann-Bourque K, Feldmiller S, Turcotte A, Miller T. The Use of Peer Networks to Increase Communicative Acts of Students With Autism Spectrum Disorders. *Focus on Autism & Other Developmental Disabilities*. 2014. p. 230-45.

162. Kanna BSS, Balabaskar K. A Study on Efficacy of Respiratory Exercises Coupled with Neurodevelopmental Treatment on Pulmonary Function of Children with Spastic Quadriplegic Cerebral Palsy. *Biomedical and Pharmacology Journal*. 2019. p. 1519-24.

163. Karanth P, Shaista S, Srikanth N. Efficacy of communication DEALL-An indigenous early intervention program for children with autism spectrum disorders. *Indian Journal of Pediatrics*. 2010. p. 957-62.

164. Karlsson P, Johnston C, Barker K. Stakeholders' views of the introduction of assistive technology in the classroom: How family-centred is Australian practice for students with cerebral palsy? *Child: Care, Health & Development*. 2017. p. 598-607.

165. Katz E, Girolametto L. Peer-Mediated Intervention for Preschoolers with ASD Implemented in Early Childhood Education Settings. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education*. 2013. p. 133-43.

166. Katz E, Girolametto L. Peer-mediated intervention for pre-schoolers with ASD: Effects on responses and initiations. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2015. p. 565-76.

167. Kavlak E, Tekin F, Ergin A, Kavlak HA, Tekin S. Impact of physiotherapy and diet program on obesity in children with intellectual disabilities. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2018. p. 43.

168. Keane L, Rogers L. Using what you have: training teacher assistants as speech-language assistants. *Perspectives on School-Based Issues*. 2009. p. 19-22.

169. Kelly C, Leitao S, Smith-Lock K, Heritage B. The effectiveness of a classroom-based phonological awareness program for 4-5-year-olds. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2019. 21(1): 101-13.

170. Kennedy-Behr A, Rodger S, Graham F, Mickan S. Creating Enabling Environments at Preschool for Children with Developmental Coordination Disorder. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2013. p. 301-13.

171. King AM, Hengst JA, DeThorne LS. Severe speech sound disorders: An integrated multimodal intervention. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*. 2013. p. 195-210.

172. Kocak FA, Kocak Y, Sas S, Kurt EE, Erdem HR, Tuncay F. The evaluation of opinions of the parents of children with cerebral palsy on exercise therapy applied in Special Education and Rehabilitation Centers in rural areas. *Turkish Journal of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2018. p. 369-70.

173. Krasny-Pacini A, Limond J, Evans J, Hiebel J, Bendjelida K, Chevignard M. Context-Sensitive Goal Management Training for Everyday Executive Dysfunction in Children After Severe Traumatic Brain Injury. *The Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation*. 2014. p. e49-64.

174. Kreider C, Medina S. Development of an Organization-Level Model of Intervention for College Students With Learning Disabilities. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2018.
175. Kumban W, Amatachaya S, Emasithi A, Siritaratiwat W. Effects of task-specific training on functional ability in children with mild to moderate cerebral palsy. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation*. 2013. p. 410-7.
176. Laing SP, Espeland W. Low intensity phonological awareness training in a preschool classroom for children with communication impairments. *Journal of Communication Disorders*. 2005. p. 65-82.
177. Lauruschkus K, Tornberg A. Non-ambulatory children with cerebral palsy; effects on passive range of motion and spasticity in the hip after four month of static compared to dynamic standing exercise. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2019. p. 215-6.
178. Law J, Dockrell JE, Castelnovo E, Williams K, Seeff B, Normand C. Early Years Centres for pre-school children with primary language difficulties: What do they cost, and are they cost-effective? *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*. 2006. p. 67-81.
179. Law MC, Darrah J, Pollock N, Wilson B, Russell DJ, Walter SD, et al. Focus on function: a cluster, randomized controlled trial comparing child- versus context-focused intervention for young children with cerebral palsy. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*. 2011. p. 621-9.
180. Lee T, Norton A, Hayes S, Adamson K, Schwellnus H, Evans C. Exploring Parents' Perceptions and How Physiotherapy Supports Transition from Rehabilitation to School for Youth with an ABI. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2017. p. 444-55.
181. Leong HM, Stephenson J, Carter M. The use of sensory integration therapy in Malaysia and Singapore by special education teachers in early intervention settings. *Journal of Intellectual & Developmental Disability*. 2014. p. 10-23.
182. Lewis K, Nolan C. Examination Accommodations for Students with Sensory Defensiveness. *Journal of Postsecondary Education and Disability*. 2013. p. 163-82.
183. Lifshitz N, Har-Zvi S. A Comparison Between Students Who Receive and Who Do Not Receive a Writing Readiness Interventions on Handwriting Quality, Speed and Positive Reactions. *Early Childhood Education Journal*. 2015. p. 47-55.
184. Lim J, McCabe P, Purcell A. 'Another tool in my toolbox': Training school teaching assistants to use dynamic temporal and tactile cueing with children with childhood apraxia of speech. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*. 2019. 35(3): 241-56.
185. Lindsay G, Dockrell J, Desforges M, Law J, Peacey N. Meeting the needs of children and young people with speech, language and communication difficulties. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2010. p. 448-60.
186. Lowe H, Henry L, Joffe VL. The Effectiveness of Classroom Vocabulary Intervention for Adolescents With Language Disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2019. 62(8): 2829-46.
187. Lowe H, Joffe V. Exploring the feasibility of a classroom-based vocabulary intervention for mainstream secondary school students with language disorder. *Support for Learning*. 2017. 32(2): 110-28.
188. Luna-Oliva L, Ortiz-Gutiérrez Rosa Ma, Cano-de la C, Roberto, Piñero Rosa

Mn, Alguacil-Diego Isabel M, et al. Kinect Xbox 360 as a therapeutic modality for children with cerebral palsy in a school environment: A preliminary study. *NeuroRehabilitation*. 2013. p. 513-21.

189. Lund E, Young A, Yarbrough R. The Effects of Co-Treatment on Concept Development in Children With Down Syndrome. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*. 2020. p. 176-87.

190. Lund Shelley K, Troha Jeanette M. Teaching Young People who are Blind and have Autism to Make Requests Using a Variation on the Picture Exchange Communication System with Tactile Symbols: A Preliminary Investigation. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2008. p. 719-30.

191. Lundblom Erin Elizabeth G. Collaborative Service Delivery: From Instruction to Implementation. 2012.

192. Lust Carol A, Donica Denise K. Effectiveness of a Handwriting Readiness Program in Head Start: A Two-Group Controlled Trial. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2011. p. 560-8.

193. Muller E, Cannon Lynn R, Kornblum C, Clark J, Powers M. Description and Preliminary Evaluation of a Curriculum for Teaching Conversational Skills to Children With High-Functioning Autism and Other Social Cognition Challenges. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools*. 2016. p. 191-208.

194. Maher CA, Evans KA, Sprod JA, Bostock SM. Factors influencing postural management for children with cerebral palsy in the special school setting. *Disability & Rehabilitation*. 2011. p. 146-58.

195. Mander D, Moore Nicole D. Speech-language service delivery model in low socio-economic status preschools: An exploratory evaluation. *Canadian Journal of Speech-Language Pathology and Audiology*. 2015. p. 214-36.

196. Marchant J, McAuliffe Megan J, Huckabee M-L. Treatment of articulatory impairment in a child with spastic dysarthria associated with cerebral palsy. *Developmental Neurorehabilitation*. 2008. p. 81-90.

197. Marshall D, Wright B, Allgar V, Adamson J, Williams C, Ainsworth H, et al. Social Stories in mainstream schools for children with autism spectrum disorder: a feasibility randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*. 2016.

198. Martin Maureen K, Wright Lindsay E, Perry S, Cornett D, Schraeder M, Johnson James T. Children with Developmental Verbal Dyspraxia: Changes in articulation and perceived resilience with intensive multimodal intervention. *Child Language Teaching & Therapy*. 2016. p. 261-75.

199. Mason R, Kamps D, Turcotte A, Cox S, Feldmiller S, Miller T. Peer mediation to increase communication and interaction at recess for students with autism spectrum disorders. *Research in Autism Spectrum Disorders*. 2014. p. 8(3): 334-44.

200. McCartney E, Boyle J, Ellis S, Bannatyne S, Turnbull M. Indirect language therapy for children with persistent language impairment in mainstream primary schools: outcomes from a cohort intervention. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2011. p. 74-82.

201. McCormack J, Baker E, Masso S, Crowe K, McLeod S, Wren Y, et al. Implementation fidelity of a computer-assisted intervention for children with speech sound

- disorders. *International Journal of Speech Language Pathology*. 2017. p. 265-76.
202. McCoy Sarah W, Effgen Susan K, Chiarello Lisa A, Jeffries Lynn M, Villasante T, Alejandro G. School-based physical therapy services and student functional performance at school. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*. 2018. p. 1140-8.
203. McDonald R, Harris E, Price K, Jolleff N. Elation or frustration? Outcomes following the provision of equipment during the Communication aids project: Data from one CAP partner centre. *Child: Care, Health and Development*. 2008. p. 223-9.
204. McKean C. Language intervention in the early years - comparing the effectiveness of language intervention approaches for pre-school children with language difficulties. 2020.
205. McLean B, Girdler S, Taylor S, Valentine J, Carey L, Elliott C. Experience of Engagement in a Somatosensory Discrimination Intervention for Children with Hemiplegic Cerebral Palsy: a Qualitative Investigation. *Developmental neurorehabilitation*. 2019. p. 348-58.
206. McLean B, Taylor S, Blair E, Valentine J, Carey L, Elliott C. Somatosensory Discrimination Intervention Improves Body Position Sense and Motor Performance in Children With Hemiplegic Cerebral Palsy. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2017.
207. McLeod S, Baker E, McCormack J, Wren Y, Roulstone S, Crowe K, et al. Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial Evaluating the Effectiveness of Computer-Assisted Intervention Delivered by Educators for Children With Speech Sound Disorders. *Journal of Speech Language & Hearing Research*. 2017. p. 1891-910.
208. Mecrow C, Beckwith J, Klee T. An exploratory trial of the effectiveness of an enhanced consultative approach to delivering speech and language intervention in schools. *International Journal of Language and Communication Disorders*. 2010. 45(3): 354-67.
209. Miller N, Pennington L, Robson S, Roelant E, Steen N, Lombardo E. Changes in Voice Quality after Speech-Language Therapy Intervention in Older Children with Cerebral Palsy. *Folia Phoniatrica et Logopaedica*. 2013. p. 200-7.
210. Mills C, Chapparo C. Listening to teachers: Views on delivery of a classroom based sensory intervention for students with autism. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 2018. p. 15-24.
211. Mills C, Chapparo C, Hinitt J. The impact of an in-class sensory activity schedule on task performance of children with autism and intellectual disability: A pilot study. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2016. p. 530-9.
212. Mische L, Lisa A, Cox J, Blackwell Angela L. Yoga as a Classroom Intervention for Preschoolers. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2012. p. 126-37.
213. Missiuna C, Pollock N, Campbell W, DeCola C, Hecimovich C, Sahagian W, et al. Using an innovative model of service delivery to identify children who are struggling in school. *British Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2017. p. 145-54.
214. Missiuna C, Pollock N, Campbell WN, Bennett S, Hecimovich C, Gaines R, et al. Use of the Medical Research Council Framework to develop a complex intervention in pediatric occupational therapy: Assessing feasibility. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2012. p. 1443-52.
215. Mohammadzaheri F, Koegel LK, Rezaee M, Rafiee SM. A Randomized Clinical Trial Comparison Between Pivotal Response Treatment (PRT) and Structured Applied Behavior

- Analysis (ABA) Intervention for Children with Autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2014. 44(11): 2769-77.
216. Moonis A. A day through my eyes: Improving visual perceptual training for school staff members working with students with autism spectrum disorder. 2018.
217. Morgus K, Benson J, Brown Elena D, Smitsky D. Effects of Alternative Seating on Attention and In-Seat Behavior for Children With Autism. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2018.
218. Motsch H, Riehemann S. Effects of 'Context-Optimization' on the acquisition of grammatical case in children with specific language impairment: an experimental evaluation in the classroom. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2008. p. 683-98.
219. Murphy A, Franklin S, Breen A, Hanlon M, McNamara A, Bogue A, et al. A whole class teaching approach to improve the vocabulary skills of adolescents attending mainstream secondary school, in areas of socioeconomic disadvantage. *Child Language Teaching & Therapy*. 2017. p. 129-44.
220. Murphy S. Evaluating 'E-PLAYS' for children with social communication impairment. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies*. 2019.
221. Narimani A, Kalantari M, Dalvand H, Tabatabaee SM. Effect of mirror therapy on dexterity and hand grasp in children aged 9 to 14 years with hemiplegic cerebral palsy. *Iranian Journal of Child Neurology*. 2019. 13(4):135-1422019.
222. Nielsen Ann N. Effects of Systematic Proprioceptive-tactile Stimulation With Use of the Protac MyFit. 2019.
223. O'Connor C, Stagnitti K. Play, Behaviour, Language and Social Skills: The Comparison of a Play and a Non-Play Intervention within a Specialist School Setting. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2011. 32(3): 1205-11.
224. O'Connor KM, Hayes B. A real-world application of Social Stories as an intervention for children with communication and behaviour difficulties. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties*. 2019. 24(4): 323-38.
225. Ohl AM, Graze H, Weber K, Kenny S, Salvatore C, Wagreich S. Effectiveness of a 10-week tier-1 response to intervention program in improving fine motor and visual-motor skills in general education kindergarten students. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2013. 67(5):507-5142013.
226. Oriel Kathryn N, George Cheryl L, Peckus R, Semon A. The effects of aerobic exercise on academic engagement in young children with autism spectrum disorder. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*. 2011. p. 187-93.
227. O'Toole C, Kirkpatrick V. Building Collaboration between Professionals in Health and Education through Interdisciplinary Training. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*. 2007. p. 325-52.
228. Pahwa P. Efficacy of tele-rehabilitation for the management of physical impairments of the children with cerebral palsy in the inclusive educational settings: a protocol for a systematic review. 2019.
229. Palsbo Susan E, Hood-Szivek P. Effect of Robotic-Assisted Three-Dimensional Repetitive Motion to Improve Hand Motor Function and Control in Children With Handwriting Deficits: A Nonrandomized Phase 2 Device Trial. *American Journal of*

Occupational Therapy. 2012. p. 682-90.

230. Patten K, Kristie, Buckley-Reen A, Garg S. Efficacy of the Get Ready to Learn Yoga Program Among Children With Autism Spectrum Disorders: A Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2012. p. 538-46.

231. Patton S, Hutton E. Parents' perspectives on a collaborative approach to the application of the Handwriting Without Tears programme with children with Down syndrome. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 2016. p. 266-76.

232. Pennington L, Miller N, Robson S, Steen N. Intensive speech and language therapy for older children with cerebral palsy: a systems approach. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*. 2010. p. 337-44.

233. Pennington L, Roelant E, Thompson V, Robson S, Steen N, Miller N. Intensive dysarthria therapy for younger children with cerebral palsy. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2013. p. 464-71.

234. Pfeiffer B, Rai G, Murray T, Brusilovskiy E. Effectiveness of the Size Matters Handwriting Program. *OTJR : occupation, participation and health*. 2015. p.

235. Pfeiffer B, Slugg L, Erb Shelly R. Impact of Noise-Attenuating Headphones on Participation in the Home, Community, and School for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2019. p. 60-76.

236. Pierce D, Sakemiller L, Spence A, LoBianco T. Effectiveness of Transition Readiness Interventions by School-Based Occupational Therapy Personnel. *OTJR Occupation, Participation and Health*. 2020. p. 27-35.

237. Pingale V. The effects of sensory diets on children with sensory processing disorder. 2019.

238. Plante E, Mettler Heidi M, Tucci A, Vance R. Maximizing treatment efficiency in developmental language disorder: Positive effects in half the time. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2019. p. 1233-47.

239. Poon KW, Li-Tsang CWP, Weiss TPL, Rosenblum S. The effect of a computerized visual perception and visual-motor integration training program on improving Chinese handwriting of children with handwriting difficulties. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2010. p. 1552-60.

240. Popovici D-V, Ardeleanu D. RESULTS FROM INTEGRATING THE "LOGOPEDIX" SOFTWARE PROGRAM IN THE SPEECH-LANGUAGE THERAPY. *Elearning and Software for Education*. Bucharest: "Carol I" National Defence University; 2014. p. 78-85.

241. Pridham L, Hillier S, Esterman A. Four-year-old children with motor skill difficulties: How effective is a parent and teacher focused intervention? *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2010. p. 7-8.

242. Raghavendra P, Oaten R. Effects of speech and print feedback on spelling performance of a child with cerebral palsy using a speech generating device. *Disability and Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*. 2007. p. 299-308.

243. Ragonesi CB, Chen X, Agrawal S, Galloway JC. Power mobility and socialization in preschool: a case study of a child with cerebral palsy. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*. 2010. p. 322-9.

244. Ragonesi Christina B, Chen X, Agrawal S, Galloway James C. Power mobility and

socialization in preschool: follow-up case study of a child with cerebral palsy. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*. 2011. p. 399-406.

245. Ratzon NZ, Lahav O, Cohen-Hamsi S, Metzger Y, Efraim D, Bart O. Comparing different short-term service delivery methods of visual-motor treatment for first grade students in mainstream schools. *Research in developmental disabilities*. 2009. p. 1168-76.

246. Ratzon NZ, Zabaneh-Tannas K, Ben-Hamo L, Bart O. Efficiency of the home parental programme in visual-motor home activity among first-grade children. *Child: Care, Health and Development*. 2010. p. 249-54.

247. Reeder DL, Arnold SH, Jeffries LM, McEwen IR. The role of occupational therapists and physical therapists in elementary school system early intervening services and response to intervention: a case report. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2011. p. 44-57.

248. Reedman SE, Boyd RN, Trost SG, Elliott C, Sakzewski L. Efficacy of Participation-Focused Therapy on Performance of Physical Activity Participation Goals and Habitual Physical Activity in Children With Cerebral Palsy: a Randomized Controlled Trial. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation*. 2019.

249. Regev D, Reiter S. Occupational, speech and emotional therapy with students attending booster classes. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine & Health*. 2011. p. 245-50.

250. Reichow B, Barton EE, Good L, Wolery M. Brief report: Effects of pressure vest usage on engagement and problem behaviors of a young child with developmental delays. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2009. p. 1218-21.

251. Reichow B, Barton Erin E, Sewell Joanna N, Good L, Wolery M. Effects of Weighted Vests on the Engagement of Children With Developmental Delays and Autism. *Focus on Autism and Other Developmental Disabilities*. 2010. p. 3-11.

252. Riccelli-Sherman A. Using a Core Vocabulary Intervention to Improve Communication of Students Who Use Augmentative and Alternative Communication (AAC). 2017.

253. Roberts Gwenyth I, Derkach-Ferguson Alanna F, Siever Jodi E, Rose MS. An examination of the effectiveness of Handwriting Without Tears instruction. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2014. p. 102-13.

254. Rosie Juliet A, Ruhen S, Hing Wayne A, Lewis Gwyn N. Virtual rehabilitation in a school setting: is it feasible for children with cerebral palsy? *Disability & Rehabilitation: Assistive Technology*. 2015. p. 19-26.

255. Ross SM, Catena M, Twardzik E, Hospodar C, Cook E, Ayyagari A, et al. Feasibility of a Modified Ride-on Car Intervention on Play Behaviors during an Inclusive Playgroup. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2018. p. 493-509.

256. Rowe A. Investigating the acceptability of a school-based programme targeting working memory, attention and language skills in 4-5 year olds. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies*. 2019.

257. Rudd H, Grove N, Pring T. Teaching productive sign modifications to children with intellectual disabilities. *AAC: Augmentative & Alternative Communication*. 2007. p. 154-63.

258. Sadr Nader M, Haghgoo Hojjat A, Samadi Sayyed A, Rassafiani M, Bakhshi E, Hassanabadi H. The Impact of Dynamic Seating on Classroom Behavior of Students with Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Iranian Journal of Child Neurology*. 2017. p. 29-36.

259. Saleem Ghazala T, Gillen G. Mental practice combined with repetitive task practice to rehabilitate handwriting in children. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2019. p. 19-29.
260. Salem Y, Jaffee G, Coffin D, Godwin E. Effectiveness of a low-cost gaming system for children with developmental delay: A randomized single-blinded controlled trial. *Developmental Medicine and Child Neurology*. 2011.
261. Salls J, Benson Jeryl D, Hansen Mary A, Cole K, Pielielek A. A Comparison of the Handwriting without Tears Program and Peterson Directed Handwriting Program on Handwriting Performance in Typically Developing First Grade Students. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2013. p. 131-42.
262. Santos J, Vairinhos M, Jesus Luis MT. Treating Children With Speech Sound Disorders: Development of a Tangible Artefact Prototype. *JMIR Serious Games*. 2019. p. e13861.
263. Schindler V. An Occupational Therapy-based Supported Education Program for University Students with Various DSM-5 Diagnoses: Program Description and Academic Outcomes. *Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2019. p. 1-14.
264. Schmitt Mary B, Justice Laura M, Logan Jessica AR. Intensity of language treatment: contribution to children's language outcomes. *International Journal of Language & Communication Disorders*. 2017. p. 155-67.
265. Schneck C, Shasby S, Myers C, DePoy S, Michelle L. Handwriting Without Tears versus Teacher-Designed Handwriting Instruction in First Grade Classrooms. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2012. p. 31-42.
266. Scholtes Vanessa A, Becher Jules G, Comuth A, Dekkers H, Van D, Lieseke, et al. Effectiveness of functional progressive resistance exercise strength training on muscle strength and mobility in children with cerebral palsy: a randomized controlled trial. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*. 2010. p. e107-e13.
267. Scurlock D. Effect of occupation-based groups on self-concept of children aged 5-8: a pilot study. *Occupational Therapy in Health Care*. 2015. p. 63-76.
268. Selanikyo E, Weintraub N, Yalon-Chamovitz S. Effectiveness of the Co-PID for Students With Moderate Intellectual Disability. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2018. p. 1-10.
269. Selanikyo E, Yalon-Chamovitz S, Weintraub N. Enhancing classroom participation of students with intellectual and developmental disabilities. *Canadian Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2017. p. 76-86.
270. Shimel K, Candler C, Neville-Smith M. Comparison of Cursive Handwriting Instruction Programs Among Students Without Identified Problems. *Physical & Occupational Therapy in Pediatrics*. 2009. p. 170-81.
271. Shire SY, Chang Y-C, Shih W, Bracaglia S, Kodjoe M, Kasari C. Hybrid implementation model of community-partnered early intervention for toddlers with autism: a randomized trial. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. 2017.
272. Shire SY, Shih W, Chang YC, Bracaglia S, Kodjoe M, Kasari C. Sustained Community Implementation of JASPER Intervention with Toddlers with Autism. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2019. p. 1863-75.
273. Silverman F. Promoting Inclusion with Occupational Therapy: A Co-teaching Model.

Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention. 2011. p. 100-7.

274. Simon M. Toilet Training Interventions for Children with ASD: A Systematic Review. 2020.
275. Smith C, Goddard S, Fluck M. A Scheme to Promote Social Attention and Functional Language in Young Children with Communication Difficulties and Autistic Spectrum Disorder. *Educational Psychology in Practice*. 2004. p. 319-33.
276. Smith J, Hand L, Dowrick P. Video Feedforward for Rapid Learning of a Picture-Based Communication System. *Journal of Autism & Developmental Disorders*. 2014. p. 926-36.
277. Smith-Lock K, Leitao S, Lambert L, Prior P, Dunn A, Cronje J, et al. Daily or weekly? The role of treatment frequency in the effectiveness of grammar treatment for children with specific language impairment. *International Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2013. p. 255-67.
278. Smith-Lock Karen M, Leitão S, Prior P, Nickels L. The Effectiveness of Two Grammar Treatment Procedures for Children With SLI: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools*. 2015. p. 312-24.
279. Smith-Lock KM, Leitao S, Lambert L, Nickels L. Effective intervention for expressive grammar in children with specific language impairment. *International Journal of language & communication Disorders*. 2013. p. 265-82.
280. Solomon-Rice Patti L, Soto G, Robinson Nancy B. Project Building Bridges: Training Speech-Language Pathologists to Provide Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Augmentative and Alternative Communication Services to School-Age Children With Diverse Backgrounds. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*. 2018. p. 186-204.
281. Solomon-Rice PL, Soto G. Facilitating vocabulary in toddlers using AAC: A preliminary study comparing focused stimulation and augmented input. *Communication Disorders Quarterly*. 2014. p. 204-15.
282. Sorvoll M, Obstfelder A, Oberg GK. A participatory guidance approach: Teaching assistants how to enhance motor development in children with cerebral palsy. *Physiotherapy*. 2015. p. eS1425.
283. Soto G, Solomon-Rice P, Caputo M. Enhancing the personal narrative skills of elementary school-aged students who use AAC: the effectiveness of personal narrative intervention. *Journal of Communication Disorders*. 2009. p. 43-57.
284. Stagnitti K, O'Connor C, Sheppa L. Impact of the Learn to Play program on play, social competence and language for children aged 5-8 years who attend a specialist school. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 2012. p. 302-11.
285. Starling J, Munro N, Togher L, Arciuli J. Training Secondary School Teachers in Instructional Language Modification Techniques to Support Adolescents With Language Impairment: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools*. 2012. p. 474-95.
286. Sterman J, Villeneuve M, Spencer G, Wyver S, Beetham Kassia S, Naughton G, et al. Creating play opportunities on the school playground: Educator experiences of the Sydney playground project. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 2020. p. 62-73.
287. Stone G. A randomised controlled trial of the Helping Handwriting Shine programme. 2020.

288. Storkel HL, Komesidou R, Pezold MJ, Pitt AR, Fleming KK, Swinburne R. The Impact of Dose and Dose Frequency on Word Learning by Kindergarten Children With Developmental Language Disorder During Interactive Book Reading. *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools*. 2019. p. 50(4): 518-39.
289. Swanson LA, Fey ME, Mills CE, Hood LS. Use of Narrative-Based Language Intervention With Children Who Have Specific Language Impairment. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2005. p. 131-41.
290. Swe NN, Sendhilnathan S, van den B, Barr C. Over ground walking and body weight supported walking improve mobility equally in cerebral palsy: a randomised controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation*. 2015. 29(11):1108-11162015.
291. Tonsing Kerstin M. Supporting the Production of Graphic Symbol Combinations by Children with Limited Speech: A Comparison of Two AAC systems. *Journal of Developmental and Physical Disabilities*. 2016. p. 5-29.
292. Tonsing Kerstin M, Dada S, Alant E. Teaching Graphic Symbol Combinations to Children with Limited Speech During Shared Story Reading. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*. 2014. p. 279-97.
293. Taipalus Abbie C, Hixson Michael D, Kanouse Sandra K, Wyse Robert D, Fursa S. Effects of therapy balls on children diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. *Behavioral Interventions*. 2017. p. 418-26.
294. Tambyraja Sherine R, Schmitt Mary B, Justice Laura M. The Frequency and Nature of Communication Between School-Based Speech-Language Pathologists and Caregivers of Children With Language Impairment. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*. 2017. p. 1193-201.
295. Tanta KJ, Deitz JC, White O, Billingsley F. The effects of peer-play level on initiations and responses of preschool children with delayed play skills. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2005. p. 437-45.
296. Taras H, Brennan J, Gilbert A, Eck R, Helen. Effectiveness of Occupational Therapy Strategies for Teaching Handwriting Skills to Kindergarten Children. *Journal of Occupational Therapy, Schools, & Early Intervention*. 2011. p. 236-46.
297. Therrien MC, Light J. Using the iPad to facilitate interaction between preschool children who use AAC and their peers. *Augmentative and Alternative Communication*. 2016. p. 163-74.
298. Therrien MCS, Light JC. Promoting Peer Interaction for Preschool Children with Complex Communication Needs and Autism Spectrum Disorder. *American Journal of Speech Language Pathology*. 2018. 27(1): 207-21.
299. Thiemann-Bourque K, Brady N, McGuff S, Stump K, Naylor A. Picture Exchange Communication System and Pals: A Peer-Mediated Augmentative and Alternative Communication Intervention for Minimally Verbal Preschoolers With Autism. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2016. 59(5): 1133-45.
300. Thiemann-Bourque K, Feldmiller S, Hoffman L, Johner S. Incorporating a Peer-Mediated Approach Into Speech-Generating Device Intervention: Effects on Communication of Preschoolers With Autism Spectrum Disorder. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2018. 61(8): 2045-61.
301. Tobin LM, Ebbels SH. Effectiveness of intervention with visual templates targeting

- tense and plural agreement in copula and auxiliary structures in school-aged children with complex needs: a pilot study. *Clinical Linguistics and Phonetics*. 2019. 33(1-2): 175.
302. Tokolahi E, Vandal Alain C, Kersten P, Pearson J, Hocking C. Cluster randomised controlled trial of an occupational therapy intervention for children aged 11-13 years, designed to increase participation to prevent symptoms of mental illness. *Child & Adolescent Mental Health*. 2018. p. 313-27.
303. Trembath D, Balandin S, Togher L, Stancliffe RJ. Peer-mediated teaching and augmentative and alternative communication for preschool-aged children with autism. *Journal of Intellectual and Developmental Disability*. 2009. 34(2): 173-86.
304. Trief E, Cascella Paul W, Bruce Susan M. A Field Study of a Standardized Tangible Symbol System for Learners who are Visually Impaired and have Multiple Disabilities. *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*. 2013. p. 180-91.
305. Ukrainetz Teresa A. Sketch and Speak: An Expository Intervention Using Note-Taking and Oral Practice for Children With Language-Related Learning Disabilities. *Language, Speech & Hearing Services in Schools*. 2019. p. 53-70.
306. Ullrich D, Marten M. Aspects Concerning "Play" for the Promotion of Preschool Children with Severe Speech and Language Impairment. *Education Sciences*. 2016. p. 1-11.
307. Unger M, Faure M, Frieg A. Strength training in adolescent learners with cerebral palsy: a randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation*. 2006. 20(6):469-4772006.
308. van den H, R JF, Lexis MAS, de W, L P. Robot ZORA in rehabilitation and special education for children with severe physical disabilities: a pilot study. *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*. 2017. p. 353-9.
309. van der P, Vlaskamp C, Reynders K, Nakken H. Children with profound intellectual and multiple disabilities: the effects of functional movement activities. *Clinical Rehabilitation*. 2005. p. 613-20.
310. Van E, Van N, Sluijs L, Overvelde A, Smits-Engelsman B. Individually adapted task-oriented training for children with handwriting problems can successfully be applied in the classroom setting. *Physiotherapy*. 2011. p. eS1287.
311. van V, L F, de G, Rameckers EA, Becher JG, Dallmeijer AJ. Improved parent-reported mobility and achievement of individual goals on activity and participation level after functional power-training in young children with cerebral palsy: a double-baseline controlled trial. *European Journal of Physical & Rehabilitation Medicine*. 2018. p. 730-7.
312. Van W, Balemans AC, Becher JG, Dallmeijer AJ. The effectiveness of a physical activity stimulation programme for children with cerebral palsy on social participation, self-perception and quality of life: a randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation* 2014. p. 972-82.
313. Varanda C, Mendes EC, Campina N, Aulicino MDG, Nascimento RDCG, Grilo KR, et al. Early identification of language and behavioral deficits for psycho-educational intervention as a public policy. *European Psychiatry*. 2016. p. S438-S9.
314. Vella F, Dubus N, Gallard C, Malet C, Ades V, Vigouroux N. Observation of HandiMathKey appropriation phase by disabled students in a middle school. *Technology and Disability*. 2019. p. S157-S8.
315. Verschuren O, Ketelaar M, Gorter JW, Helders PJM, Uiterwaal C, Takken T. Exercise training program in children and adolescents with cerebral palsy: a randomized

controlled trial. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*. 2007. 161(11):1075-10812007.

316. Vidal Vn, Ernat C, DeThorne L. "I Think He Wants You to Play the Guitar:" Use of Behavioral Interpretation as a Strategy for Facilitating Peer Interaction Across Autistic and Nonautistic Peers. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*. 2018. p. 68-83.

317. Vincent R, Stewart H, Harrison J. South Australian school teachers' perceptions of occupational therapy reports. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 2008. p. 163-71.

318. Vivanti G, Dissanayake C, Duncan E, Feary J, Capes K, Upson S, et al. Outcomes of children receiving Group-Early Start Denver Model in an inclusive versus autism-specific setting: A pilot randomized controlled trial. *Autism*. 2019. p. 1165-75.

319. Vivanti G, Paynter J, Duncan E, Fothergill H, Dissanayake C, Rogers SJ. Effectiveness and Feasibility of the Early Start Denver Model Implemented in a Group-Based Community Childcare Setting. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2014. 44(12): 3140-53.

320. Vyas N, Raja K, Gupta S. Impact of school based physical education programme on children attending special school. *Physiotherapy*. 2015. p. eS1593.

321. Waddington Emma M, Reed P. Comparison of the effects of mainstream and special school on National Curriculum outcomes in children with autism spectrum disorder: an archive-based analysis. *Journal of Research in Special Educational Needs*. 2017. p. 132-42.

322. Wagner B, Fitzpatrick J, Symons M, Jirikowic T, Cross D, Latimer J. The development of a culturally appropriate school based intervention for Australian Aboriginal children living in remote communities: a formative evaluation of the Alert Program intervention. *Australian Occupational Therapy Journal*. 2017. p. 243-52.

323. Waldman-Levi A, Erez Asnat B-H. Will Environmental Interventions Affect the Level of Mastery Motivation among Children with Disabilities? A Preliminary Study. *Occupational Therapy International*. 2015. p. 19-27.

324. Wang CJ. Virtual reality as a therapeutic adjunct for children with cerebral palsy in a school setting: An exploratory study. *Annals of the Academy of Medicine Singapore*. 2010. p. S292.

325. Ward Emily J, Hillier S, Raynor A, Petkov J. A Range of Service Delivery Modes for Children With Developmental Coordination Disorder Are Effective: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Pediatric Physical Therapy*. 2017. p. 230-6.

326. Watson Anne H, Ito M, Smith Roger O, Andersen Lori T. Effect of Assistive Technology in a Public School Setting. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2010. p. 18-29.

327. Wellington W, Stackhouse J. Using Visual Support for Language and Learning in Children with SLCN: A Training Programme for Teachers and Teaching Assistants. *Child Language Teaching and Therapy*. 2011. p. 183-201.

328. White S, Spencer S. A school-commissioned model of speech and language therapy. *Child Language Teaching & Therapy*. 2018. p. 141-53.

329. Wiechmann J, Richardson M, Jones D. A Program Evaluation of the Language Lab: Response to Intervention Program for Teaching Grammar, Vocabulary, and Storytelling. *Journal of Instructional Pedagogies*. 2014.

330. Wilson G, Nash M, Earl G. Supporting students with language learning difficulties in

secondary schools through collaboration: the use of concept maps to investigate the impact on teachers' knowledge of vocabulary teaching. *Child Language Teaching & Therapy*. 2010. p. 163-79.

331. Wilson KP. Teaching social-communication skills to preschoolers with autism: efficacy of video versus in vivo modeling in the classroom. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2013. 43(8): 1819-31.

332. Wilson PH, Adams IL, Caeyenberghs K, Thomas P, Smits-Engelsman B, Steenbergen B. Motor imagery training enhances motor skill in children with DCD: a replication study. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2016. p. 54-62.

333. Wong LMS, Lam CSY. Enhancement of reading ability using self-controlled gaze interface in a digital medium for children with neuro-oculomotor challenges. 2017.

334. Wright B, Teige C, Watson J, Hodkinson R, Marshall D, Varley D, et al. Autism Spectrum Social Stories In Schools Trial 2 (ASSIST2): study protocol for a randomised controlled trial analysing clinical and cost-effectiveness of Social Stories in primary schools. *BMC Psychology*. 2020.

335. Yoder PJ, Camarata S, Woynaroski T. Treating Speech Comprehensibility in Students With Down Syndrome. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research*. 2016. p. 446-59.

336. Yu L, Zhu X. Effectiveness of a SCERTS Model-Based Intervention for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) in Hong Kong: A Pilot Study. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*. 2018. p. 3794-807.

337. Zwicker JG, Hadwin AF. Cognitive versus multisensory approaches to handwriting intervention: a randomized controlled trial. *OTJR occupation, participation and health*. 2009. p. 40-8.

Supplement 1c – Outcome categories and sub-categories across the included studies

(n=337) with verbatim examples and corresponding ICF items

Overall outcome categories (n studies included, %) ^a	Outcome sub-categories (n studies included, %) ^b	Verbatim examples of individual study outcomes within the sub-categories	Corresponding items within the ICF
Social Communication, Interaction and Behaviour (102/337, 30.3%)	Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) (42/102, 41.2%)	Shared attention Joint attention Engagement state Social skills Social interactions Social communication Pragmatic language skills Pragmatic skills Social conversation Idiom skills Emotional vocabulary Communication during routines Appropriate physical interactions	Sharing attention (b1403) Focusing attention (d160) Communicating – receiving (d310-329) Communicating – producing (d330-349) Conversation (d350) Social cues in relationships (d7104) Physical contact in relationships (d7105) Regulating behaviours within interactions (d7202) Interacting according to social rules (d7203) Maintaining social space (d7204)
	On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom (36/102, 35.3%)	Attention to task Concentration Engagement Appropriate in-seat behaviour On-task behaviour Following directions Classroom participation Classroom behaviours Reduction in disruptive behaviours	Sustaining attention (b1400) Listening (d115) Focusing attention (d160) Undertaking a single task (d210) Undertaking multiple tasks (d220) Regulating behaviours within interactions (d7202)
	Social interaction specifically with peers (27/102, 26.3%)	Peer interactions Socialisation with peers Validating comments Conversational skills Initiations and responses	Conversation (d350) Social cues in relationships (d7104) Interacting according to social rules (d7203) Informal relationships with peers (d7504)
	Self-regulation, emotions, mental health, and ‘challenging behaviour’ (24/102, 23.5%)	Self-regulation Social and emotional health Emotional regulation Identifying and expressing basic emotions Emotional and behavioural problems Challenging behaviour Mental health Mood Anxiety Psychosocial impacts	Emotional functions (b152) Handling stress (d2401) Regulating behaviours within interactions (d7202)
Support Within the Educational Environment (96/337, 28.5%)	Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills (40/96, 41.7%)	Knowledge Understanding Awareness Perceptions Confidence	Support and relationships – People in positions of authority (e330)

Overall outcome categories (n studies included, %) ^a	Outcome sub-categories (n studies included, %) ^b	Verbatim examples of individual study outcomes within the sub-categories	Corresponding items within the ICF
		Self-efficacy Skills Capacity Expectations of children's capabilities Use of strategies Implementation of interventions	Support and relationships – Personal care providers and personal assistants (e340) Individual attitudes of people in positions of authority (e430) Individual attitudes of personal care providers and personal assistants (e440)
	Health professional knowledge and skills (22/96, 22.9%)	Knowledge Understanding Perceptions Attitudes Skills Competence Comfort level Confidence Helpfulness of health professionals Expectations of children's capabilities Use of strategies Implementation of interventions	Support and relationships – Health professionals (e355) Individual attitudes of health professionals (e450)
	Support from peers (including peer-mediated interventions) (16/96, 16.7%)	Mentoring strategies used by adult users of speech-generating devices Peer support Peer communicative behaviour Peer social interaction Peer skills Peer use of strategies	Support and relationships – Acquaintances, peers, colleagues, neighbours, and community members (e325)
	Access to allied health services (13/96, 13.5%)	Attendance, engagement with treatment, and language outcomes in areas of social disadvantage Earlier identification of DCD, capacity of educators and parents to manage DCD, and children's participation in school and at home	Health services, systems, and policies (e580) Education and training services, systems, and policies (e585) Support and relationships – People in positions of authority (e330) Support and relationships – Health professionals (e355)
	Parent knowledge, skills, and actions in supporting their child (12/96, 12.5%)	Changes in parent and child interactions following attendance at parent-focused early intervention Parent stress Knowledge Understanding Confidence Skills Family empowerment	Support and relationships – Immediate family (e310) Individual attitudes of immediate family members (e410)
	Cost-effectiveness of allied health services (12/96, 12.5%)	Efficiency and effectiveness of different arrangements for organising and providing	Health services, systems, and policies (e580)

Overall outcome categories (n studies included, %)^a	Outcome sub-categories (n studies included, %)^b	Verbatim examples of individual study outcomes within the sub-categories	Corresponding items within the ICF
		speech and language therapy services Short-run resource consequences of direct versus indirect and individual versus group modes of speech and language therapy	Education and training services, systems, and policies (e585)
	Access to allied health services through tele-practice (7/96, 7.3%)	Efficacy of a speech-language pathology teletherapy program for improving speech and language skills	Health services, systems, and policies (e580) Education and training services, systems, and policies (e585)
	School and local authority policy (5/96, 5.2%)	Implementation of and compliance with a wellness policy for a rural school system Efficacy of the provision of low distraction examination venues for supporting participation in examinations	Health services, systems, and policies (e580) Education and training services, systems, and policies (e585)
Voice, Speech, Language and Communication (92/337, 27.3%)	Expressive language and communication (57/92, 62%)	Expressive language Oral language ability Expressive grammar and vocabulary Spoken language production Speech Written expression	Mental functions of language (b167) Acquiring language (d132) Speaking (d330) Writing (d170)
	Receptive language and communication (52/92, 56.5%)	Receptive language Language skills Understanding of grammar and vocabulary Listening comprehension Spoken language comprehension Lexical-semantic skills	Mental functions of language (b167) Acquiring language (d132) Communicating with – receiving – spoken messages (d310)
	Voice functions and speech sounds (23/92, 25%)	Voice quality Intelligibility Articulation Speech sound production Speech	Voice and speech functions (b3) Speaking (d330)
	Narrative skills (19/92, 20.7%)	Narrative abilities Script acquisition Narrative microstructure Narrative macrostructure Story productivity and complexity	Speaking (d3300) Writing (d170)
	Phonological skills (15/92, 16.3%)	Phonological awareness Phonological processing Phonological error patterns Encoding abilities Phonological and semantic complexity of utterances	Mental functions of language (b167) Speaking (d330)

Overall outcome categories (n studies included, %)^a	Outcome sub-categories (n studies included, %)^b	Verbatim examples of individual study outcomes within the sub-categories	Corresponding items within the ICF
Engaging in School and Education (86/337, 25.5%)	Writing and learning to write (39/86, 45.3%)	Handwriting readiness Pre-writing Positive reactions to writing Handwriting performance Handwriting skills Handwriting legibility Handwriting speed Writing fluency Spelling performance Written composition Expository reporting	Learning to write (a145) Writing (d170)
	Reading, learning to read, and literacy (23/86, 26.7%)	Reading Early word reading Emergent literacy Alphabet knowledge Reading engagement Reading achievement Reading comprehension skills	Learning to read (d140) Reading (d166)
	Self-care skills (e.g. eating & drinking at mealtimes, dressing, toileting, hygiene) (18/86, 20.9%)	Self-care Adaptive behaviour (including daily living skills) Activities of daily living Functional tasks Participation in and enjoyment of the school cafeteria Food exploration and eating Toilet training Bathing Dressing	Eating (d550) Drinking (d560) Toileting (d530) Dressing (d540) Washing oneself (d510) Caring for body parts (d520) Pre-school education (d815) School education (d820)
	Making academic progress (10/86, 11.6%)	Academic achievement National curriculum results Grade point average Science topic knowledge	School education (d820) Higher education (d830) Applying knowledge (d160-d179)
	Transition between settings and stages (6/86, 7%)	Feasibility of online transition planning to prepare for leaving school Participation and physical function during youth's transition from rehabilitation to school following an ABI Functional readiness for transition to adult life	Education, other specified (d838)
	Participation across the school day (e.g. classroom activities, assemblies, playground) (6/86, 7%)	Participation in pre-school activities Functional performance Communicating, choosing, and initiating in the classroom	Pre-school education (d815) School education (d820)
	Enrolling in settings and attending (4/86, 4.7%)	Classroom attendance Retention rate Graduation rate Enrolment in post-secondary education	School education (d820) Higher education (d830)
	Doing homework (1/86, 1.2%)	Doing homework	Undertaking a single task (d210)

Overall outcome categories (n studies included, %) ^a	Outcome sub-categories (n studies included, %) ^b	Verbatim examples of individual study outcomes within the sub-categories	Corresponding items within the ICF
			School education (d820)
Mobility, Movement and Motor Skills (66/337, 19.6%)	Gross motor skills (40/66, 60.6%)	Gross motor skills Gross motor function Fundamental movement skills Motor performance Functional ability Psychomotor status Balance control Mobility Walking speed Walking ability	Involuntary movement reaction functions (b755) Control of voluntary movement functions (b760) Changing and maintaining body position (d410-429) Moving objects with lower extremities (d435) Walking and moving (d450-d469)
	Fine motor skills (36/66, 54.5%)	Fine motor skills Dexterity Upper limb function Overhand throwing skills Motor performance Bimanual hand skill and movement patterns Visual-motor skills	Control of voluntary movement functions (b760) Lifting and carrying objects (d430) Fine hand use (d440) Hand and arm use (d445)
	Developing strength (11/66, 16.7%)	Strength Isometric strength Functional strength Grip strength	Muscle power functions (b730) Muscle endurance functions (b740)
	Protecting joints and muscles and preventing pain (9/66, 13.6%)	Bone health Joint range of motion Spasticity Bodily discomfort	Functions of the joints and bones (b710-729) Muscle tone functions (b735) Sensation of pain (b280) Maintaining a body position (d415)
	Physical activity (3/66, 4.5%)	Physical activity Leisure-time physical activity Habitual physical activity	Mobility (d4)
	Using Assistive Technology (60/337, 17.8%)	Using speech-generating devices (SGDs) (28/60, 46.7%)	Multistep requesting skills using an iPad Producing multi-symbol messages on SGDs Eye-gaze performance Spelling performance using SGDs Personal narrative skills of children using AAC Communicative interactions of girls with Rett Syndrome (including via SGDs) Frequency of communicative turns expressed in interactions with peers (using an iPad with an AAC app)
Using symbols, signs, and visual support (24/60, 40%)		Communication effectiveness of students using AAC Expressive vocabulary of beginner AAC users Production of graphic symbol combinations Use of tangible symbols	Assistive products and technology for communication (e1251) Assistive products and technology for education (e1301)

Overall outcome categories (n studies included, %) ^a	Outcome sub-categories (n studies included, %) ^b	Verbatim examples of individual study outcomes within the sub-categories	Corresponding items within the ICF
		Use of modified signs Use of visual support strategies in the classroom Use of PECS Experiences of using a total communication system	
	Using assistive technology for literacy or numeracy (15/60, 25%)	Perceptions of writing aid use Computer usage Keyboarding skills Use of a mathematical keyboard software Student ability on assistive technology-relevant goals Reading ability (using eye-gaze technology)	Assistive products and technology for education (e1301)
	Using assistive technology for mobility and movement (6/60, 10%)	Physical activity (using a mobility device) Mobility (using a mobility device) Independence in performing movement skills (including via mobility devices)	Assistive products and technology for personal indoor and outdoor mobility and transportation (e1201) Moving around using equipment (d465)
	Using assistive technology for play, leisure, and physical activity (5/60, 8.3%)	Ability to use a running bike Play and games (using eye-gaze technology) Parallel play/awareness (using a mobility device)	Assistive products and technology for culture, recreation, and sport (e1401)
	Using assistive technology for self-care (2/60, 3.3%)	Experience of using assistive devices Independent hand-washing skills (using video modelling)	Assistive products and technology for personal use in daily living (e1151)
Other Outcomes (52/337, 15.4%)	Quality of life and subjective wellbeing (15/52, 28.8%)	Quality of life Health-related quality of life Well-being	None
	Confidence, self-efficacy, and self-perception (15/52, 28.8%)	Self-esteem Self-image Self-concept Self-perceived ability Self-confidence Mastery motivation Resilience behaviours Perceptions of body image	Confidence (b1266) Body image (b1801)
	Sensory and perceptual functions (14/52, 26.9%)	Sensory processing Sensory modulation Upper limb somatosensory discrimination Visual perception Spatial awareness	Visual perception (b1561) Visuospatial perception (b1565) Proprioceptive function (b260)
	Fitness (7/52, 13.5%)	Fitness Stamina Cardiovascular performance Cardiorespiratory fitness Aerobic and anaerobic capacity	Exercise tolerance functions (b455)

Overall outcome categories (n studies included, %)^a	Outcome sub-categories (n studies included, %)^b	Verbatim examples of individual study outcomes within the sub-categories	Corresponding items within the ICF
	Memory functions (6/52, 11.5%)	Memory Working memory Prospective memory Auditory memory	Memory functions (b144)
	Executive functions (4/52, 7.7%)	Executive functions	Higher level cognitive functions (b164)
	Weight maintenance (3/52, 5.8%)	Weight status Obesity Body mass index	Weight maintenance functions (b530)
	Respiratory functions (1/52, 1.9%)	Pulmonary function	Respiration functions (b440)
Play, Recreation and Leisure (27/337, 8%)	Play (22/27, 81.5%)	Participation in play Play skills Play behaviours Play with toys Playfulness Participation in group games with peers Playground choice, control, independence, and inclusion	Play (d9200)
	Recreation and leisure (7/27, 25.9%)	Leisure activities Recreational activities Leisure-time physical activity Sports Social participation in recreation and leisure	Recreation and leisure (d920)

^aTotal across the categories exceeds 337 because individual studies usually report multiple outcomes.

^bTotals exceed category total because individual studies may report multiple outcomes.

ICF – World Health Organization’s International Classification of Functioning, Disability, and Health

DCD – Developmental coordination disorder

ABI – Acquired brain injury

AAC – Alternative and augmentative communication

PECS – Picture Exchange Communication System

Supplement 1d – Randomised controlled trials (n=62) across the included studies (n=337)

First author (year)	Country	Study Purpose	Intervention Leadership	Sample Size	Educational Stages	Overall Outcome Categories	Outcome Sub-categories
Buckle (2011)	South Africa	Evaluation	OT	11-30	Primary	Social communication, interaction and behaviour	On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom
Gelkop (2015)	Israel	Evaluation	OT	11-30	Pre-school	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Fine motor skills
Narimani (2019)	Iran	Evaluation	OT	11-30	Primary Secondary	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Fine motor skills Developing strength
Axford (2018)	Australia	Evaluation	OT	31-100	Pre-school	Engaging in school and education Mobility, movement and motor skills	Writing and learning to write Self-care skills Fine motor skills
Chang (2014)	Taiwan	Evaluation	OT	31-100	Primary	Engaging in school and education Using assistive technology	Writing and learning to write Using assistive technology for literacy or numeracy
Selanyiko (2017)	Israel	Evaluation	OT	31-100	Primary Secondary Post-secondary	Engaging in school and education	Participating across the school day (e.g. classroom activities, assemblies, playground)
Selanikyo (2018)	Israel	Evaluation	OT	31-100	Primary Secondary Post-secondary	Engaging in school and education	Participating across the school day (e.g. classroom activities, assemblies, playground)
Shimel (2009)	US	Evaluation	OT	31-100	Primary	Engaging in school and education	Writing and learning to write
Zwicker (2009)	Canada	Evaluation	OT	31-100	Primary	Engaging in school and education	Writing and learning to write
Fedewa (2015)	US	Evaluation	OT	>100	Primary	Engaging in school and education Social communication, interaction and behaviour	Reading, learning to read and literacy Making academic progress On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom
Nielsen (2019)	Denmark	Evaluation	OT	>100	Primary	Social communication, interaction and behaviour Other outcomes	On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom Confidence, self-efficacy and self-perception
Ohl (2013)	US	Evaluation	OT	>100	Pre-school	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Fine motor skills

First author (year)	Country	Study Purpose	Intervention Leadership	Sample Size	Educational Stages	Overall Outcome Categories	Outcome Sub-categories
Pfeiffer (2015)	US	Evaluation	OT	>100	Pre-school Primary	Engaging in school and education	Writing and learning to write
Tokolahi (2018)	New Zealand	Evaluation	OT	>100	Secondary	Social communication, interaction and behaviour Other outcomes	Self-regulation, emotions, mental health and 'challenging behaviour' Quality of life and subjective wellbeing Confidence, self-efficacy and self-perception
Chrysagis (2012)	Greece	Evaluation	PT	11-30	Secondary	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Gross motor skills Protecting joints and muscles and preventing pain
Kanna (2019)	India	Evaluation	PT	11-30	Primary Secondary	Other outcomes	Respiratory functions
Swe (2015)	Singapore	Evaluation	PT	11-30	Primary Secondary	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Gross motor skills
Atasavun (2012)	Turkey	Evaluation	PT	31-100	Primary Secondary	Engaging in school and education Social communication, interaction and behaviour Play, recreation and leisure Using assistive technology Other outcomes	Reading, learning to read and literacy Writing and learning to write Doing homework Self-care skills Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) Play Recreation and leisure Using assistive technology for literacy or numeracy Sensory and perceptual functions
Bar-Haim (2010)	Israel, Jordan, Palestine	Evaluation	PT	31-100	Primary Secondary	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Gross motor skills
Pridham (2010)	Australia	Evaluation	PT	31-100	Pre-school	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Gross motor skills Fine motor skills
Reedman (2019)	Australia	Evaluation	PT	31-100	Primary Secondary	Play, recreation and leisure Mobility, movement and motor skills Other outcomes	Recreation and leisure Physical activity Quality of life and subjective wellbeing

First author (year)	Country	Study Purpose	Intervention Leadership	Sample Size	Educational Stages	Overall Outcome Categories	Outcome Sub-categories
Scholtes (2010)	Netherlands	Evaluation	PT	31-100	Primary Secondary	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Gross motor skills Fine motor skills Developing strength Protecting joints and muscles and preventing pain
Unger (2006)	South Africa	Evaluation	PT	31-100	Secondary	Mobility, movement and motor skills Other outcomes	Gross motor skills Developing strength Confidence, self-efficacy and self-perception
Van Wely (2014)	Netherlands	Evaluation	PT	31-100	Primary Secondary	Play, recreation and leisure Mobility, movement and motor skills Other outcomes	Recreation and leisure Gross motor skills Quality of life and subjective wellbeing Confidence, self-efficacy and self-perception
Verschuren (2007)	Netherlands	Evaluation	PT	31-100	Primary Secondary	Play, recreation and leisure Mobility, movement and motor skills Other outcomes	Recreation and leisure Gross motor skills Developing strength Quality of life and subjective wellbeing Confidence, self-efficacy and self-perception Fitness
Adams (2012)	UK	Evaluation	SLT	31-100	Primary	Social communication, interaction and behaviour Voice, speech, language and communication	Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication Narrative skills
Allen (2013)	US	Evaluation	SLT	31-100	Pre-school	Voice, speech, language and communication	Voice functions and speech sounds
Hesketh (2007)	UK	Evaluation	SLT	31-100	Pre-school	Voice, speech, language and communication	Phonological skills
Smith-Lock (2015)	Australia	Evaluation	SLT	31-100	Primary	Voice, speech, language and communication	Expressive language and communication

First author (year)	Country	Study Purpose	Intervention Leadership	Sample Size	Educational Stages	Overall Outcome Categories	Outcome Sub-categories
Storkel (2019)	US	Evaluation	SLT	31-100	Pre-school	Voice, speech, language and communication	Receptive language and communication
Ukrainetz (2019)	US	Evaluation	SLT	31-100	Primary	Engaging in school and education	Writing and learning to write Making academic progress
Yoder (2016)	US	Evaluation	SLT	31-100	Primary Secondary	Voice, speech, language and communication	Voice functions and speech sounds
Green (2018)	UK	Evaluation	SLT	>100	Pre-school Primary	Social communication, interaction and behaviour Support within the educational environment Other outcomes	Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) Self-regulation, emotions, mental health and 'challenging behaviour' Parent knowledge, skills and actions in supporting their child Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills Quality of life and subjective wellbeing
Joffe (2019)	UK	Evaluation	SLT	>100	Secondary	Voice, speech, language and communication	Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication Narrative skills
Kelly (2019)	Australia	Evaluation	SLT	>100	Pre-school	Engaging in school and education Voice, speech, language and communication	Reading, learning to read and literacy Phonological skills
McKean (2020)	UK	Evaluation	SLT	>100	Pre-school	Voice, speech, language and communication	Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication
Murphy (2017)	Ireland	Evaluation	SLT	>100	Secondary	Voice, speech, language and communication	Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication
Eliasson (2011)	Sweden	Evaluation	MDT	11-30	Pre-school	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Fine motor skills
Mohammad-zaheri (2014)	Iran	Evaluation	MDT	11-30	Primary	Social communication, interaction and behaviour	Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills)
Golos (2011)	Israel	Evaluation	MDT	31-100	Pre-school	Engaging in school and education	Self-care skills Participating across the school day (e.g. classroom activities, assemblies, playground)

First author (year)	Country	Study Purpose	Intervention Leadership	Sample Size	Educational Stages	Overall Outcome Categories	Outcome Sub-categories
						Mobility, movement and motor skills	Gross motor skills Fine motor skills
Wilson (2016)	Australia	Evaluation	MDT	31-100	Primary	Support within the educational environment Mobility, movement and motor skills	Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills Gross motor skills Fine motor skills
Bellows (2013)	US	Evaluation	MDT	>100	Pre-school	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Physical activity Gross motor skills
Fricke (2017)	UK	Evaluation	MDT	>100	Pre-school Primary	Other outcomes Engaging in school and education	Weight maintenance Reading, learning to read and literacy
Law (2011)	Canada	Evaluation	MDT	>100	Pre-school	Voice, speech, language and communication Engaging in school and education Play, recreation and leisure	Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication Self-care skills Play Recreation and leisure
Shire (2017)	US	Evaluation	MDT	>100	Pre-school	Mobility, movement and motor skills Support within the educational environment Social communication, interaction and behaviour	Gross motor skills Protecting joints and muscles and preventing pain Parent knowledge, skills and actions in supporting their child Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom
Stone (2020)	UK	Evaluation	MDT	>100	Primary	Play, recreation and leisure Support within the educational environment	Play Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills
Wright (2020)	UK	Evaluation	MDT	>100	Primary	Engaging in school and education Social communication, interaction and behaviour	Writing and learning to write Enrolling in settings and attending Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) Self-regulation, emotions, mental health and 'challenging behaviour'

First author (year)	Country	Study Purpose	Intervention Leadership	Sample Size	Educational Stages	Overall Outcome Categories	Outcome Sub-categories
						Support within the educational environment	Parent knowledge, skills and actions in supporting their child
						Other outcomes	Cost-effectiveness of allied health services Quality of life and subjective wellbeing
Ratzon (2012)	Israel	Implementation	OT	31-100	Primary	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Fine motor skills
Ward (2017)	Australia	Implementation	PT	31-100	Primary	Mobility, movement and motor skills	Gross motor skills Fine motor skills
						Other outcomes	Confidence, self-efficacy and self-perception
Gallagher (2009)	UK	Implementation	SLT	11-30	Pre-school	Social communication, interaction and behaviour	On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom
						Play, recreation and leisure	Play
						Voice, speech, language and communication	Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication
Grogan-Johnson (2010)	US	Implementation	SLT	31-100	Pre-school Primary	Voice, speech, language and communication	Expressive language and communication Voice functions and speech sounds
						Support within the educational environment	Access to allied health services through telepractice
Starling (2012)	Australia	Implementation	SLT	31-100	Secondary	Engaging in school and education	Writing and learning to write
						Voice, speech, language and communication	Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication
						Support within the educational environment	Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills
Boyle (2009)	UK	Implementation	SLT	>100	Primary	Voice, speech, language and communication	Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication Narrative skills
						Support within the educational environment	Cost-effectiveness of allied health services
Dickson (2009)	UK	Implementation	SLT	>100	Primary	Voice, speech, language and communication	Receptive language and communication Expressive language and communication Narrative skills
						Support within the educational environment	Cost-effectiveness of allied health services

First author (year)	Country	Study Purpose	Intervention Leadership	Sample Size	Educational Stages	Overall Outcome Categories	Outcome Sub-categories
McLeod (2017)	Australia	Implementation	SLT	>100	Pre-school	Engaging in school and education Voice, speech, language and communication Other outcomes	Reading, learning to read and literacy Phonological skills Voice functions and speech sounds Quality of life and subjective wellbeing
Thiemann-Bourque (2018)	US	Implementation	SLT	>100	Pre-school	Social communication, interaction and behaviour Using assistive technology Support within the educational environment	Social interactions specifically with peers Using speech-generating devices Support from peers (including peer-mediated interventions)
Gordon (2011)	UK	Implementation	MDT	31-100	Primary	Using assistive technology Support within the educational environment	Using signs, symbols and visual support Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills
Howlin (2007)	UK	Implementation	MDT	31-100	Primary	Using assistive technology Support within the educational environment	Using signs, symbols and visual support Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills
Vivanti (2019)	Australia	Implementation	MDT	31-100	Pre-school	Social communication, interaction and behaviour Mobility, movement and motor skills Support within the educational environment	Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) Fine motor skills Parent knowledge, skills and actions in supporting their child
Shire (2019)	US	Implementation	MDT	>100	Pre-school	Social communication, interaction and behaviour Play, recreation and leisure Support within the educational environment	Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills) On-task behaviour and engagement in the classroom Play Teacher and teaching assistant knowledge and skills
Yu (2018)	China	Implementation	MDT	>100	Pre-school	Social communication, interaction and behaviour	Broad social communication and interaction (e.g. social skills, shared attention, pragmatic language skills)

First author (year)	Country	Study Purpose	Intervention Leadership	Sample Size	Educational Stages	Overall Outcome Categories	Outcome Sub-categories
							- Self-regulation, emotions, mental health and 'challenging behaviour'

