

APPENDIX A. TARGETED LITERATURE REVIEW STRATEGY AND CRITERIA

As part of the *Learn* phase, the SARHM team conducted a knowledge assessment to set the stage for the development of co-regulation strategies tailored to the context of youth-serving HMRE programs. One part of that assessment was a review of literature for key characteristics to consider when developing a set of co-regulation strategies. In this appendix, we present additional details about our literature search terms and screening results, along with the rationale for our approach.

The primary goal for the targeted literature review was to identify practical evidence-based co-regulation strategies that mapped to one or more self- or co-regulation domains and could be adapted for use with 14- to 24-year-olds in the context of HMRE programs. We also reviewed literature to support the development and testing of training approaches for staff, such as articles about best practices for instructional design, self-regulation measures, and practitioner resources.

Using the theoretical models from OPRE’s Self-Regulation and Toxic Stress series as the framework for our approach, we indexed published peer-reviewed articles with search terms corresponding to our review goals. We produced four lists of search terms for the review: (1) intervention-related terms; (2) terms relevant to self-regulation across cognitive, emotional, and behavioral domains and a few program-specific terms relevant to self-regulation in adolescents and young adults; (3) terms related to the three domains of co-regulation; and (4) terms relevant to adolescents and young adults ages 14 to 24. These terms are reflected in Table A.1, rows 1–4.

Table A.1: Search terms for targeted literature review

Search	Domain	Terms
1, 2	Interventions	intervention OR program* OR curricul* OR prevention OR training
AND		
1, 2	Self-regulation	self-regulat* OR "executive funct*" OR "effortful control" OR "cognitive flexibility" OR "problem solv*" OR "perspective taking" OR "cognitive reframing" OR dialectics OR "goal-setting" OR "feelings identification" OR "soc* emot*" OR "labeling feelings" OR "emotion regulat*" OR "inhibitory control" OR "delay* gratif*" OR impulsivity OR "impulse control" OR "self-control" OR aggression OR "risk behavior" OR "stress reactivity" OR "trauma informed" OR resilience OR "distress tolerance" OR "tolerat* distress" OR "healthy coping" OR mindfulness OR "life skills" OR "soft skills" OR empathy OR "relationship skills" OR environment OR attention (in article title only) OR grit OR "cognitive regulat*"

Search	Domain	Terms
AND		
1, 2	Co-regulation	co-regulat* OR warm OR responsive OR coach* OR monitor* OR support OR model OR scaffold* OR "structur* the environment" OR "structur* the classroom" OR "creat* safe environment" OR "classroom climate" OR buffer OR "nurtur* peer relationship**"
AND		
1, 2	Adolescents and young adults	teen* OR youth* OR adolescen* OR "young adult*" OR "young people" OR "young person*" OR "young woman" OR "young man" OR "young women" OR "young men" OR "high school" OR "secondary school"
AND		
2	Adults who support self-regulation	teacher OR parent OR mentor OR coach OR caregiver

We conducted our initial search in PsycINFO, a comprehensive library of peer-reviewed journals in the behavioral and social sciences fields. When the initial search yielded more than 7,000 publications, we applied major subject headings to narrow results. Major subject headings are standardized terms applied by an indexer in some literature databases to categorize articles covering similar topics. In the first search, we applied the major subject heading “self-regulation.”

This search in PsycINFO returned 121 publications, but only a handful were relevant. Accordingly, we broadened our search criteria and conducted the search again in PsycINFO, adding a set of search terms related to adults who support self-regulation (Row 5, Table A.1). For this second search, we applied two major subject headings: “self-regulation” and “emotion regulation” and searched a second database, the Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). ERIC is a federally sponsored online library of literature related to education research. We did not apply subject headings in ERIC because the database does not have this functionality. This second search returned 150 publications, including some of the articles identified in the first search (Table A.2).

As we screened the titles of the second search, we determined the results of both searches to be limited enough that the following additional searches were added to accomplish our project goals.

- We asked our expert panel to nominate relevant articles;
- We used a technique known as “citation harvesting” to identify relevant articles that had cited either highly relevant articles or key reports from our foundational literature;
- We used snowballing to identify relevant publications from the reference lists of particularly useful articles;
- We searched the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration’s (SAMHSA) National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices for practices

related to self-regulation and emotion regulation. This step was added to include any new approaches or interventions that may be used by HMRE practitioners, but that may not have been included in Murray’s review.

Table A.2 lists the search order, source, and number of results for each search in our process. Some publications appeared in more than one search.

Table A.2. Literature review searches

Search	Source	Results (before removing duplicates)
1	PsycINFO	121
2	PsycINFO, ERIC	150
3	Expert recommendations, citation harvesting, and snowballing	307
4	NREPP	3

We combined all the results—more than 500 citations—into a single table and removed duplicates. Next, we screened titles for relevance and excluded citations if they were not written in English, if study participants had been diagnosed with developmental delays or autism spectrum disorder, or if the intervention required a clinical degree to deliver. Citations were also excluded if the setting, context, population, or strategy described was not relevant for SARHM (for example, a study evaluating the impact of a computerized nutrition education intervention on adults). After removing duplicates and screening for relevance, we were left with 202 citations.

Next, we screened the abstracts of the 202 citations using questions to systematically group the articles into relevant topics and identify articles for full-text review (Table A.3). To identify articles that inform the development of contextually appropriate co-regulation strategies (Group A), as well as those that shed light on capacity building approaches for the pilot such as training content, organization of material for staff, and measures, we created screening questions to apply to each of the 202 citations. The screening questions allowed us to limit the articles that would receive a full text review to those most likely to discuss content relevant to strategy development. Some articles contained information relevant to more than one synthesis goal. Table A.3 lists the group to which the article was assigned, the screening questions, the number of articles in each group, and the action taken by reviewers. Groups were not mutually exclusive; articles were assigned to more than one group if the response to more than one screening question was affirmative. Articles that did not meet the screening questions for any group were discarded.

We conducted full-text reviews of all 71 articles in Group A. We conducted full-text reviews for citations in groups B, C, and D only if the abstract indicated that the article was relevant to the project aims. Information from these articles was used to validate findings and inform training

content, design, and strategy development. Articles in Group E were included in a separate measures review (see Appendix C).

Table A.3: Screening questions for full-text review

Group	Screening question	Total citations	Action
A	Does the abstract refer to at least one of the domains of co-regulation—in concept, if not in name (warm, responsive relationship; collaborative structuring of the environment; coaching, modeling, reinforcing skills)?	71	Review full text
B	Does the abstract indicate the article will expand our understanding of how 14- to 24-year-olds develop self-regulation?	45	Review full text if relevant to project aims
C	Is this work important to incorporate as we consider training approach development for HMRE staff? Note: These are not self- or co-regulation approaches as in questions 1 or 2 above, but rather information from other literature that informs our training approaches (e.g., evidence-based kernels, best practices in implementation science or instructional design, etc.).	49	Review full text if relevant to project aims
D	Is this work a relevant evidence-based or promising curriculum or resource for practitioners?	2	Review full text if relevant to project aims
E	Does this work provide information or content about self- and co-regulation measures?	12	Use for measures scan (Appendix C)

Note: Groups are not mutually exclusive.