

Violence Prevention Focused on Children and Youth: Early Childhood Home Visitation

Summary Evidence Table

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Violence by Child						
Achenbach 1993 ¹ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	Burlington, Vermont Recruitment in 1980–1981 Average age of mothers: 25–29 years; ethnicity not reported; only low-birthweight infants (birth weight : <2250g)	Four visits: at 3, 14, 30, and 90 days after discharge; initiated post-birth Neonatal nurse	Seven 1-hour sessions by neonatal nurse in maternity hospital, before discharge	All eligible Randomized into low-birthweight intervention and low-birthweight control groups I: n = 24 C: n = 31	Externalizing scale of Child Behavior Checklist (at 9 years of age) No significant difference between low-birthweight intervention and low-birthweight control groups	No significant difference
Lally 1988 ² Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Syracuse, New York Recruitment in 1969–1971 “Majority black” families; Mean age of mothers: 18 years; Income below \$5000 per year; 85% unmarried	Visits: 1/wk; initiated in the 3rd trimester of pregnancy, continued until the child’s 5th birthday Paraprofessional	Free child care 50 weeks/year, for 5 years (including transportation) Parent support groups	Probably convenience (not described) Matched controls recruited when intervention group children were 3 years old I: n = 65 C: n = 54	Number of subjects processed as probation cases by the county probation department, assessed when children were 13–16 years of age (proportion of the sample) Intervention group: 4 (6%) Control group: 12 (22%) (p = 0.01)	–72.3 % (p = 0.01)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Olds 1998 ³ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	Elmira, New York Recruitment 1978–1980 88% white; 11% black; 62% unmarried; 59% low SES; 48% <19 years of age	Visits: 1/wk, then less frequently; initiated before 29th wk of gestation; through child's 2nd birthday Nurses	Both intervention and control groups received free transportation to prenatal and well-child care and developmental screening	All eligible Randomized I: n = 97 C: n = 148	(All outcomes assessed when children were 15 years old) Major delinquent acts per subject (self-report) Intervention group: 3.57 Control group: 3.02 (NS) Incidence of arrests (self-report) Intervention group: 0.17 Control group: 0.36 (p <0.01) Incidence of convictions and probation violations (self-report) Intervention group: 0.10 Control group: 0.27 (p <0.01) Incidence of arrests (mother report) Intervention group: 0.08 Control group: 0.12 (p <0.01)	Major delinquent acts: +18.2 (NS) Arrests (self-report): -52.8% (p <0.01) Convictions (self-report): -63.0% (p <0.01) Arrests (mother report): -33.3%
St. Pierre 1999 ⁴ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	USA, 21 sites Probably 1992–1995 35% of mothers <20 years; 43% black, 26% Hispanic, 26% white, 3% Native American, 1% Asian; 83% with income <\$10,000 per year	2–4 visits/month; 5 yrs Paraprofessionals		Probably convenience (not described) Not random I: n = 1507 C: n = 1544	Externalizing scale of Child Behavior Checklist (at 5 years of age) No significant difference between low-birthweight intervention and low-birthweight control groups	No significant difference

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Child Maltreatment						
Barth 1991 ⁵ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	California Probably 1984–1988 45% white, 31% Hispanic, 17% black, 7% other; 40% received AFDC; 70% income <\$10,000; Mean age: 23.5 yrs; Screened as “at risk” for child abuse	About 1 every 2 wks, for 6 mo; mean: 11 visits (5–20), initiated post-birth Paraprofessionals		Convenience (referrals) Randomized I: n = 97 C: n = 94	Substantiated child abuse reports, before and after the program (at program completion) Intervention group: 5 (before) and 15 (after) Control group: 1 (before) and 14 (after)	–23.1% (NS)
Brayden 1993 ⁶ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Tennessee Probably 1984–1989 Mean age: ~22 yrs; ~70% white; All below 200% of poverty level; Screened as “at risk” for child abuse	Frequency not reported; 0–2 yrs, initiated post-birth Probably paraprofessionals (not clearly stated)	Pediatric care Psychological support counseling	All eligible Randomized I: n = 141 C: n = 122	Substantiated physical abuse reports as proportion of the sample (at program completion) Intervention group: 9.2% Control group: 6.6%	+39.5% (NS)
Brooten 1986 ⁷ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	Pennsylvania 1982–1986 ~80% black, 20% white; ~2/3 income >\$10,000; Only very-low-birthweight infants	5 visits from birth to 18 mo, initiated post- birth Nurses	On-call nurse availability	All eligible Randomized I: n = 39 C: n = 40	Reported cases of child abuse (at 18 mo) Intervention group: 2 Control group: 4	–48.7% (NS)
Caruso Whitney 1997 ⁸ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Florida Probably 1977–1986 Over 80% black, 6–7% white; 7–12% Hispanic; low SES; 75% unmarried	First year: 1/wk, 2nd year: 1 every 2 wks, 3rd year: usually 1/mo; initiated in the 3rd trimester of pregnancy, continued until 3 years of age Mental health workers	Parent support groups, child activity groups	Presumably all eligible Nonrandom I: n = 171 C: n = 91	Reports of abuse or neglect resulting in removal from home (at 12–18 months), proportion of the sample Intervention group: 0.53% Control group: 7.79%	–93.2% (NS)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Dawson 1989 ⁹ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Colorado 1977–1979 74% white, 25% Hispanic; low SES	Median number of completed home visits: 30, initiated at 30th wk of pregnancy, continued until 14 months old Paraprofessionals (community mothers)	Pediatric care Parent support groups once in 2 weeks (only for half the intervention group)	Convenience Randomized I: n = 67 C: n = 44	Reports of potential child abuse or neglect Intervention group: 5 Control group: 1	+228.4% (NS)
Duggan 1999 ¹⁰ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Hawaii 1994–1998 20% native Hawaiian, 13% Pacific Islander, 19% Filipino, 12% Caucasian, 7–10% Asian, rest multiracial or unknown; 2/3 below poverty level; screened as “at risk” for child abuse	Starts at 1/wk, then less frequently; (mean number of visits: 13) from birth to 2 years of age Paraprofessionals		Convenience Randomized I: n = 329 C: n = 238	Confirmed child abuse and neglect reports to Hawaii Child Protective Services (at 2 years), proportion of the sample Intervention group: 2% Control group: 3%	–33.3% (NS)
Flynn 1999 ¹¹ Lowest: post- intervention measure with no comparison (compared with national rate only) Fair	New Jersey 1995–1997 All mothers <19 yrs old, mean 16.9 yr; 71% black, 27% Hispanic; screened as “at risk” for child abuse	Starts at 1/wk, then 1 every 2 wks, 1/mo, 1 every 3 mos; duration not specified, apparently about 2 years, initiation at birth or prenatally Paraprofessionals		Convenience No control I: n = 137	Confirmed cases of child abuse and neglect Intervention group: 4 cases (rate 2.9%) (Compares with national rate by adolescent mothers of 11%)	–73.6 (NS)
Gray 1979 ¹² Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Colorado Probably 1971–1975 No information on race, economic status, or age; screened as “at risk” for child abuse	Visits 1/wk; initiated after birth, duration unclear (evaluated at 17 mo) Nurses	Pediatric care	Random sample from all eligible Randomized I: n = 50 C: n = 50	Injury suspicious for abuse/neglect (at 17 mo) Intervention group: 0 Control group: 5	–100% (p <0.01)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Hardy 1989 ¹³ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Baltimore, Maryland Probably 1983–1987 All black, urban; 78% of mothers single	Visits every 2–3 months; from birth until 2 years, about 8–10 total Paraprofessionals		Presumably all eligible Randomized (odd-even) I: n = 131 C: n = 132	Suspected or confirmed cases of child abuse and neglect (proportion of the sample), follow-up at least 10 months (average about 22–24 months) Intervention group: 2 (1.5%) Control group: 13 (9.8%)	–84.7 (NS)
Honig 2001 ¹⁴ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Syracuse, NY Study period not reported Mean age 17.5 yrs (range 13–21); 95% receiving public assistance; race not reported; screened as “at risk” for child abuse	Visits 1/wk; duration 18–27 months; initiated prenatally (Arm A) or postnatally (Arm B) Presumably paraprofessionals		Convenience Not random (control groups formed from program dropouts) Arm A: I: n = 52 C: n = 13 Arm B: I: n = 25 C: n = 24	Child abuse reports, proportion of the sample (apparently at exit, 18–27 mo) Arm A (pre-birth): Intervention group: 13.5% Control group: 15.4% Arm B (post-birth): Intervention group: 20% Control group: 54.2%	Arm A: –12.3% (NS) Arm B: –63.1% (p < 0.05)
Huxley 1993 ¹⁵ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Boulder, Colorado Probably 1987–1990 Mean age: 21 (I), 19 (C); ethnicity not reported; screened as “at risk” for child abuse	Frequency and duration not reported, evaluation at 12 mo Paraprofessionals, also public health nurses and mental health professionals		Convenience All eligible controls included, matched to cases I: n = 20 C: n = 20	Confirmed reports of child abuse (at 12 mo) Intervention group: 1 Control group: 5	–75.0% (p = 0.07)
Katzev 1999 ¹⁶ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Oregon 1996–1997 Mean age: 20.7 years, 29% ≤17 yrs; 74% white, 22% Hispanic screened as “at risk” for child abuse	Visits 1/wk, then less frequently; presumably from birth to 2 years Paraprofessionals	Parent support groups	Convenience Comparison with those who refused to participate I: n = 1332 C: n = 1372	Child abuse reports, proportion of the sample Intervention group: 3.4% Control group: 2.6%	+30.8% (NS)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Kitzman 1997 ¹⁷ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	Memphis, Tennessee 1990–1993 92% black; 85% below poverty; mean age: 18 years	Visits 1/wk, then less frequently; initiated prenatally, 29 wks: gestation to 2 years, mean: 7 prenatal and 26 postnatal visits Nurses	Both intervention and control groups received free transportation to pediatric appointments and developmental screening	All eligible Randomized I: n = 228 C: n = 515	Incidence of emergency department visits for injury or ingestion (through age 2 years) Intervention group: 0.33 Control group: 0.34	−2.9% (NS)
Larson 1980 ¹⁸ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Montreal, Canada Study period not reported White; “working class income;” age: 18–35 yrs	Visits 1 every 2 wks, then less frequently; duration 15 months, initiated prenatally (Arm A) or 6 weeks postnatally (Arm B), both groups received 10 visits total Child psychologists		Convenience Randomized (both Arm A and Arm B compared with the same control group) I: (Arm A) n = 26 I: (Arm B) n = 27 C: n = 37	Accident rate per child (at 18 months) Arm A (pre-birth) Intervention group: 0.86 Arm B (post-birth) Intervention group: 1.26 Control group: 1.55	Arm A: −44.5% (p < 0.01) Arm B: −18.7% (NS)
Marcenko 1996 ¹⁹ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Pennsylvania Study period not reported 93–95% black; mean age ~24 yrs; mean income \$450–480 per month; screened as “at risk” for out-of-home placement of a child	Visits 1 every 2 wks; initiated in 3rd–6th month of pregnancy, ended when child was 1 year old Paraprofessionals		Presumably all eligible Randomized I: n = 113 C: n = 84	Out-of home placement (either in foster care or with relatives/friends) (measured at 16 months), proportion of the sample Intervention group: 26% Control group: 23%	+13.0% (NS)
Mulsow 1996 ²⁰ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Georgia 1993–1995 All black, teenage (13–20 yrs), urban; 89% received some form of government support; screened as “at risk” for stressful conditions of parenting	Duration and frequency of visits not reported; initiated after birth Presumably paraprofessionals		Presumably all eligible Not random I: n = 15 C: n = 36	Reports of child abuse and neglect (both substantiated and non-substantiated) (at 2 years) Intervention group: 5 (33%) Control group: 6 (17%)	+94.1% (p = 0.18)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Olds 1997 ²¹ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	Elmira, New York 1978–1982 88% white, 11% black; 62% unmarried; 59% low SES; 48% <19 years of age	Visits 1/wk, then less frequently; initiated before 29 wk of gestation, through child's 2nd birthday Nurses	Both intervention and control groups received free transportation to prenatal and well-child care and developmental screening	All eligible Randomized I: n = 97 C: n = 148	Substantiated reports of child abuse and neglect, incidence (birth to 15 years) (reports per 15 year followup period) Intervention group: 1.95 Control group: 3.47	−46.3% (p <0.01)
Siegel 1980 ²² Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Greensboro, North Carolina 1976–1978 About 25% white, race of the remainder not reported; 65% single; mean age: 20–21 years	9 visits during the first 3 months of life Paraprofessionals	Arm A: Uncomplicated delivery, early mother-child contact (at least 45 min. during first 3 hours after delivery), and home visitation Arm B: Uncomplicated delivery and home visitation (no early mother-child contact) Arm C: Complicated delivery (infants placed in observation nursery after birth) and home visitation	Presumably all eligible Randomized (Arms A and B compared with uncomplicated delivery controls; Arm C compared with complicated delivery controls) Uncomplicated delivery: I (Arm A): n = 47 I (Arm B): n = 53 C: n = 52 Complicated delivery: I (Arm C): n = 60 C: n = 59	Reports of abuse and neglect, through child's first birthday Uncomplicated delivery: Arm A: 4 Arm B: 7 Control group: 3 Complicated delivery: Arm C: 3 Control group: 3	Arm A: +47.5% (NS) Arm B: +128.9% (NS) Arm C: −1.7% (NS)
Velasquez 1984 ²³ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	Minnesota Study period not reported Age: 16–25 years; ethnicity not reported; majority unmarried; screened as “at risk” for child abuse	Visits 1/wk; duration at least 18 months, initiated after birth Nurses, social workers	Intensive health care services	Convenience sample Not random I: n = 23 C: n = 32	Number of infants that experienced one or more occurrences of abuse, neglect, or out-of-home placement, through 18 months (proportion of the sample) Intervention group: 2 (9%) Control group: 13 (41%)	−78.0% (p <0.01)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Wagner 1999 ²⁴ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	California Probably 1991–1994 All teenagers <19 years; about 1/3 receiving AFDC; >50% Hispanic	Visits 1/month; duration 2 years, initiated before birth or after birth in the first 6 months of life Paraprofessionals	Arm A: Home visitation and parent support group Arm B: Home visitation, case management, and parent support group	Convenience Randomized (both arms compared with the same controls [no treatment]) I (Arm A): n = 149 I (Arm B): n = 138 C: n = 163	Cases of abuse and neglect (at 2 years), proportion of the sample Arm A: 1.3% Arm B: 0% Control: 2.4%	Arm A: –45.% (NS) Arm B: –100% (p <0.05)
Wagner 1999 ²⁴ Highest: prospective with comparison Fair	California 1992–1996 >75% Hispanic: about 1 in 5 receiving AFDC	Visits 1/month; duration 3 years, initiated after birth in the first 6 months of life Paraprofessionals	Parent support group available	Convenience Randomized I: n = 210 C: n = 153	Treated for injury during past year (assessed at age 3), proportion of the sample Intervention group: 8.1% Control group: 11.9%	–31.9 (NS)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Violence by Parents						
Olds 1997 ²¹ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	Elmira, New York Recruitment 1978–1980 88% white; 11% black; 62% unmarried; 59% low SES; 48% <19 years of age	Visits 1/wk, then less frequently; initiated before 29th wk of gestation through child's 2nd birthday Nurses	Both intervention and control groups received free transportation to prenatal and well- child care and developmental screening	All eligible Randomized Total sample: I: n = 97 C: n = 148 Subsample including only unmarried, low- SES mothers: I: n = 38 C: n = 62	(All outcomes relate to children's mothers, assessed 15 years after intervention started) Incidence of arrests (state records) Total sample: Intervention group: 0.12 Control group: 0.38 (NS) Low-SES unmarried: Intervention group: 0.16 Control group: 0.90 (p<0.01) Incidence of arrests (self-report) Total sample: Intervention group: 0.09 Control group: 0.22 (NS) Low-SES unmarried: Intervention group: 0.18 Control group: 0.58 (p <0.01) Incidence of convictions (state records) Total sample: Intervention group: 0.12 Control group: 0.27 (NS) Low-SES unmarried: Intervention group: 0.13 Control group: 0.69 (p <0.01) Incidence of convictions (self-report) Total sample: Intervention group: 0.03 Control group: 0.13 (NS) Low-SES unmarried: Intervention group: 0.06 Control group: 0.28 (p <0.01)	Arrests (State records) Total sample: –68.4% (NS) Low SES, unmarried: –82.2% (p <0.01) Arrests (self- report) Total sample: –59.1% (NS) Low SES, unmarried: –69.0% (p <0.01) Convictions (State records) Total sample: –55.6% (NS) Low SES, unmarried: –81.8% (p <0.01) Convictions (self- report) Total sample: –76.9% (NS) Low SES, unmarried: –78.4% (p <0.01)

Author & year Design suitability: design Quality of execution	Location Study period Population	Intervention		Sample selection Assignment to treatment conditions Sample size (at assessment)	Effect measure Effect reported in the study	Value used in summary, relative pct. change (significance level)
		Frequency and duration Visitor type	Other components (study arms, if any)			
Intimate Partner Violence						
Eckenrode 2000 ²⁵ Highest: prospective with comparison Good	Elmira, New York Recruitment 1978–1980 88% white, 11% black; 62% unmarried; 59% low SES; 48% <19 years of age	Visits 1/wk, then less frequently; initiated before 29th wk of gestation, through child's 2nd birthday Nurses	Both intervention and control groups received free transportation to prenatal and well-child care and developmental screening	All eligible Randomized Total sample: I: n = 97 C: n = 148	Incidence of domestic violence over the 15-year follow-up period No significant difference between intervention and control groups	No significant difference, no value specified.

AFDC, Aid to Families with Dependent Children; C, comparison; I, intervention; mo, month(s); n, sample size; NS, not significant; SES, socioeconomic status; wk, week; yr, year

References

1. Achenbach TM, Howell CT, Aoki MF, Rauh VA. Nine-year outcome of the Vermont intervention program for low birth weight infants. *Pediatrics* 1993;91:45–55.
2. Lally JR, Mangione PL, Honig AS. The Syracuse University Family Development Research Program: long-range impact of an early intervention with low-income children and their families. In: Powell DR, Sigel IE, eds. *Parent education as early childhood intervention: emerging directions in theory, research and practice*. Norwood, NJ: Alex Publishing Corporation, 1988.
3. Olds DL, Henderson Jr. CR, Cole R, et al. Long-term effects of nurse home visitation on children's criminal and antisocial behavior: 15-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 1998;280(14):1238–44.
4. St. Pierre RG, Layzer JI. Using home visits for multiple purposes: Comprehensive Child Development Program. *The Future of Children* 1999;9(1):134–51.
5. Barth RP. An experimental evaluation of in-home child abuse prevention services. *Child Abuse and Neglect* 1991;15:363–75.
6. Brayden R, Altemeier W, Dietrich M, et al. A prospective study of secondary prevention of child maltreatment. *Journal of Pediatrics* 1993;122:511–6.
7. Broton D, Kumar S, Brown LP, et al. A randomized clinical trial of early hospital discharge and home follow-up of very-low-birth-weight infants. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1986;315(15):934–9.
8. Caruso Whitney GA. Early intervention for high-risk families: Reflecting on a 20-year-old model. In: Albee GW, Gullotta TP, eds. *Primary prevention works*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 1997:68–86.

9. Dawson P, Van Doornick WJ, Robinson JL. Effects of home-based, informal social support on child health. *Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics* 1989;10(2):63–7.
10. Duggan AK, McFarlane EC, Windham AM, et al. Evaluation of Hawaii's Healthy Start program. *Future of Children* 1999;9(1):66–90.
11. Flynn L. The adolescent parenting program: improving outcomes through mentorship. *Public Health Nursing* 1999;16(3):182–9.
12. Gray JD, Cutler CA, Dean JG, Kempe CH. Prediction and prevention of child abuse and neglect. *Journal of Social Issues* 1979;35:127–39.
13. Hardy JB, Street R. Family support and parenting education in the home: an effective extension of clinic-based preventive health care services for poor children. *Journal of Pediatrics* 1989;115(6):927–31.
14. Honig AS, Morin C. When should programs for teen parents and babies begin? Longitudinal evaluation of a teen parents and babies program. *Journal of Primary Prevention* 2001;21(4):447–54.
15. Huxley P, Warner R. Primary prevention of parenting dysfunction in high risk cases. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 1993;63(4):582–8.
16. Katzev A, Pratt C, Henderson T, McGuigan W. Oregon's Healthy Start effort: 1997–98 status report. Corvallis, OR: Oregon State University Family Policy Program, 1999.
17. Kitzman H, Olds DL, Henderson Jr. CR, et al. Effect of prenatal and infancy home visitation by nurses on pregnancy outcomes, childhood injuries, and repeated childbearing: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 1997;278(8):644–52.
18. Larson CP. Efficacy of prenatal and postnatal home visits on child health and development. *Pediatrics* 1980;66:191–7.
19. Marcenko MO, Spence M, Samost L. Outcomes of a home visitation trial for pregnant and postpartum women at-risk for child placement. *Children and Youth Services Review* 1996;18:243–59.
20. Mulsow MH, Murry VM. Parenting on edge: economically stressed, single, African American adolescent mothers. *Journal of Family Issues* 1996;17(5):704–21.
21. Olds DL, Eckenrode J, Henderson Jr. CR, et al. Long-term effects of home visitation on maternal life course and child abuse and neglect: fifteen-year follow-up of a randomized trial. *JAMA* 1997;278(8):637–43.
22. Siegel E, Bauman KE, Schaefer ES, Saunders MM, Ingram DD. Hospital and home support during infancy: Impact on maternal attachment, child abuse and neglect, and health care utilization. *Pediatrics* 1980;66(2):183–90.
23. Velasquez J, Christensen M, Schommer B. Intensive services help prevent child abuse. *American Journal of Maternal Child Nursing* 1984;9:113–7.
24. Wagner MM, Clayton SL. The Parents as Teachers program: Results from two demonstrations. *Future of Children* 1999;9(1):91–115.
25. Eckenrode J, Ganzel B, Henderson Jr. CR, et al. Preventing child abuse and neglect with a program of nurse home visitation: the limiting effects of domestic violence. *JAMA* 2000;284(11):1385–91.