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ABSTRACT

This article provides a quantitative and conceptual review of emotion regulation difficulties in trauma-exposed young people, and informs future directions in the field. Despite long-standing interest in the influence of emotion regulation difficulties on different internalizing and externalizing psychiatric disorders in childhood, several questions remain unresolved with respect to children and adolescents with PTSD (Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder). Meta-analytic data from adult victims suggest that emotion regulation problems are associated with PTSD, but this has never been studied in children and young people. We therefore provide a conceptual review of features related to the phenomenology, assessment, severity and treatment of emotion regulation difficulties in trauma-exposed children and young people. We combine this with a meta-analysis of published literature. We searched studies in Medline, PsychINFO, and Embase databases based on pre-selected criteria. Eight hundred and eighty-six papers were identified and 41 were included. We found that children and adolescents with a diagnosis of PTSD reported more emotion regulation difficulties than those who did not develop PTSD, and that the overall association between the two symptom dimensions was moderately strong. We identify a number of research priorities: the development of instruments to assess emotion regulation difficulties in children, the design of studies that describe its prevalence in young epidemiological traumatized samples, its predictive role on the onset, severity and persistence of posttraumatic symptoms, and its relevance as a moderator, outcome or treatment target for young survivors.
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INTRODUCTION

Potentially traumatic events are fairly common in the lives of children and adolescents. More than two thirds of community youth have been exposed to at least one potentially traumatic event in their lifetime. The lifetime prevalence of Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in community samples of youth is around 5% [1,2]. In the aftermath of a traumatic experience, young people can experience intense emotional responses. Difficulties in emotion regulation can be a factor underlying the development, severity and persistence of post-traumatic stress symptoms over time in adult survivors [3-6], but data on young people are lacking. In young populations, emotion dysregulation has been consistently associated with a wide range of internalizing and externalizing disorders [7] and with maltreatment [8], but its association with PTSD has not yet been studied. This is surprising as developmental theories frame the acquisition of regulation capacities within the close relational context of the child, which would be disrupted when children experience traumatic relationships with core adult figures. Thus, traumatic experiences in young people can elicit both, post-traumatic symptoms and disrupt the acquisition of emotional regulation processes. Also, whether or not emotionally dysregulated patients who are receiving treatment would benefit from an emotion-stabilisation work prior to trauma-focused treatment has recently been reviewed in adult samples [9]. However, clinicians who treat young traumatized patients with prominent emotion regulation problems face a lack of guidance in these regards.

We review issues associated with the phenomenology, assessment, severity and treatment of emotion regulation difficulties in child and adolescent survivors of traumatic experiences. We also provide a metanalysis of the association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms, and give suggestions for future research and clinical practice.

I. Definition of emotion regulation difficulties

Emotion regulation difficulties in the form of anger or other intense negative emotional reactions are common in children and adolescents [7,10]. Researchers and clinicians use the term emotion regulation difficulties interchangeably with affect dysregulation, mood swings, affective and mood instability or lability. The boundaries of these key concepts are not firmly grounded in empirical data [11], showing considerable overlap and being defined by largely similar attributes. It is also of note that no overall ‘gold standard’ for measuring emotion regulation exists so far. After a systematic assessment of the tools used in adult clinical samples, no single instrument was found to comprehensively cover most of the core components of emotion
regulation difficulties. Indeed, around 25 distinct definitions and measures for general emotional regulation or its specific facets (e.g., oscillation, intensity, ability to regulate) were found [12]. Surprisingly, no systematic study has been conducted to refine those definitions or constrain their parameters [13]. It is however recognized that in pre-school years, regulation skills are consolidated, resulting in typically brief and contextualized misbehaviours such as angry outbursts, noncompliance and temper tantrums [8]. Whilst these behaviours are typical of development, if they become persistent, frequent and qualitatively distinct from normative misbehaviours they can acquire clinical significance. Similarly, during the transition from middle childhood into adolescence, there appears to be a developmental increase in stress responsivity which may be linked with the emergence of psychological disorders in vulnerable youth [14]. Thus, the lack of developmental sensitivity and specificity in the definition of emotion regulation is a considerable limitation in the field, probably reflecting the complexity of the construct and the pending need to bind together its measurement and understanding.

As a working definition we conceptualize emotion regulation difficulties broadly, including oscillations in affect, mood or emotion that are noteworthy because of their rapidity, intensity, frequency or difficulty in being controlled. This definition focuses on negative valences, while periods of elevated or expansive mood that typically qualify for manic states are not considered here. This definition would enable much of the lexicon in this field to be absorbed into a dimensional single term, while not being reliant on a specific theoretical framework. It should also be noted that we do not consider emotion regulation difficulties to be specific to PTSD. Indeed, it is clear that emotion regulation problems are present across psychopathology [15,16]. Whether emotion regulation across disorders represents a shared liability or a disease-specific phenomenon is currently debated [15], yet substantial evidence has accumulated linking the emotion regulation difficulties with impairment over and above that of each specific disorder [7,15]. Moreover, as indicated below, some authorities view the presence of emotion regulation difficulties in PTSD as meriting a distinct nosological description in the form of Complex PTSD.

II. Emotion regulation difficulties and conceptualization of PTSD

Reactions to traumatic events can vary widely, and how to best conceptualize PTSD has proven to be challenging since the earliest observations of post-traumatic reactions. As early as World War I, physicians highlighted the relevance of emotion regulation difficulties in the clinical profile of war survivors (e.g., "In a word, these disturbances are characterized by instability and exaggeration of emotion" [17]). However, how
emotion regulation difficulties should be considered in relation to PTSD is still an unresolved issue in current diagnostic classifications [18,19]. The DSM (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) and the ICD (International Classification of Diseases) have taken different approaches when conceptualizing the broad array of negative emotions that survivors can present alongside PTSD. The threatening nature of many traumatic events typically elicits trauma-specific negative emotions such as intense fear and anxiety, which are intrinsically related to the re-experiencing, avoidance and hyper-arousal post-traumatic stress symptoms. Alongside trauma-related fear, other emotions such as sadness, hopelessness, disgust or anger, may also be present [20].

The recognition of broader PTSD emotional profiles was modest in the first DSM definitions, where only irritability was listed within the hyper-arousal symptoms, and was always seen as a concomitant of fear reactions. However, the new DSM-5 defines PTSD more widely, not requiring a fear response at the time of the exposure to the traumatic event (Criteria A), and including trauma-related negative mood and cognitions which comprise a new symptom cluster (e.g., shame, horror, guilt). However, more general difficulties in regulating emotions, which might not be directly tied to trauma-triggers, are still defined as associated features and not as core PTSD symptoms.

A different approach has been taken by the ICD Working Group. Stemming from WHO’s (World Health Organization) emphasis on clinical usefulness, the new ICD-11 [21] directs clinicians’ attention to a simplified PTSD diagnosis, refocusing on the three fear-based elements tied to trauma-triggers (e.g., re-experiencing, avoidance and physiological over-arousal). This definition removes symptoms that are less specific, which may overlap with comorbidities or persist beyond specific trauma triggers, such as irritability. Alongside this narrow definition of PTSD proposed for the ICD-11 and consistent with the WHO’s approach, the ISTSS Expert Consensus Complex Trauma Task Force (2012) also recommends that more extensive post-traumatic reactions should be classified in a new diagnostic category named Complex PTSD (CPTSD).

This subgroup of severely traumatized patients would typically be exposed to early repeated interpersonal trauma and present persistent and debilitating problems in emotion regulation, self-perception and interpersonal relationships, in addition to core PTSD symptoms [22-24]. It has been suggested that this construct has its origin before adulthood, and that it might be associated with more impairment and psychiatric comorbidities in both adults and adolescents [25,26].

This debate has significant implications for clinicians who encounter trauma-exposed young people with difficulties in emotion regulation in their daily practice. The separation of two distinct constructs (e.g., PTSD
and CPTSD) could imply taking into consideration different risk factors when assessing cases, expecting a different symptom course, prognosis and, ultimately, planning different treatment approaches accordingly.

III. Association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms

Regardless of where emotion regulation difficulties might sit within the PTSD nosologic structure, meta-analytic data in traumatized adults show that post-traumatic stress symptoms are largely correlated with general emotion regulation difficulties [27] as well as with more concrete aspects of it, such as irritability [28,29]. The high co-occurrence of emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic symptoms does not seem to be artificially inflated by the fact that anger is one of the symptoms of PTSD [30,31]. Instead, several aspects such as the victim's age, gender, the type of traumatic experience (e.g., interpersonal vs non interpersonal) and sample type (clinical vs community), seem to influence the relationship between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms. However, in a metanalysis conducted in adults, the type of trauma and sample did not moderate the relationship between general emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms [27]. There is no such metanalysis available for trauma-exposed children and adolescents, despite the finding that emotion regulation difficulties occur in up to 60% of community youth exposed to interpersonal trauma [25].

Thus, the first question that needs to be answered is whether trauma-exposed young people frequently report difficulties in emotion regulation, and how strongly these are associated with their post-traumatic stress symptoms. In order to address this gap in the literature, we first aimed to find any epidemiological or clinical research that described the rates of emotion regulation difficulties in children or adolescents with PTSD. Secondly, we wanted to determine whether emotion regulation problems were associated with post-traumatic stress symptoms among trauma-exposed youth, both dimensionally and when meeting threshold for a PTSD diagnosis. Finally, we aimed to explore which individual or trauma factors could affect the co-occurrence of the two symptom dimensions.

We hypothesized that levels of emotion regulation difficulties would be high in survivors who presented with a PTSD diagnosis, and that there would be a significant positive correlation between emotion regulation difficulties and PTSD symptoms. We set the following questions: 1) What are the rates of emotion regulation difficulties in children and adolescents with PTSD? 2) What is the strength of association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms in children and adolescents? 3) Which are the main factors that affect the association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress
symptoms? Answering these questions systematically and employing a quantitative approach will serve as an empirical basis from which to set specific directions for future research.

IV. Emotion regulation difficulties and PTSD treatment

The treatment of emotion regulation difficulties across psychopathology can present a major clinical challenge [16]. Moreover, clinicians differ in the best way to approach these symptoms in children treated for PTSD. Some experts have argued that the efficacy of and engagement in trauma-focused treatment can be impaired in those adults with PTSD who also present emotion regulation difficulties (e.g., CPTSD). In this context, the consensus treatment guideline elaborated by the International Society for Traumatic Stress Studies Complex Trauma Task Force (ISTSS) supports the implementation of special emotion stabilization procedures prior to trauma-focused treatment when treating these patients. They suggest as the optimal strategy a phase-oriented or sequential treatment model [32], where emotion regulation skills would be strengthened before focusing on the trauma, ensuring that the patient can safely use the ability to regulate strong emotions before exposure [33]. A recent review argued that the evidence to support this approach is still lacking and that it risks delaying delivery of trauma-focused treatments from which patients might profit [9].

Recent reviews about the effectiveness of PTSD therapies for children and adolescents include research projects that did not usually take into account emotion regulation difficulties [34-36]. Despite some interventions incorporating emotion regulation skills in the therapies tested, the papers reviewed do not measure it as a treatment target or moderator [37-39]. Thus, it remains unclear whether an initial stabilization phase to improve emotion regulation difficulties is needed before applying trauma-focused interventions in youth that report high levels of these difficulties.

Whilst the state of the literature does not allow for a metanalysis of effects, we provide a narrative review of treatment studies that tackle the issue of emotion regulation problems in the context of trauma.

METHOD

In Online Resource 1 we describe in more detail the methods employed for the systematic review including search terms, inclusion criteria, study selection, data extraction and the analytic strategy of the metanalysis. Here we provide an overview of the main characteristics of the methodology used.

Systematic review
Two independent reviewers systematically searched in Medline, PsychINFO, and Embase databases. The search strategy was defined by any combination of terms representing emotion regulation difficulties, post-traumatic symptoms, and young age. We included studies that measured levels of emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms (e.g., mean scores, %) or the relationship between the two variables (e.g., r values, regression coefficients) in samples of children and adolescents below the age of 18 years. All study designs were accepted except for qualitative or non-original research. Both reviewers did the selection process independently (Figure 1), and all efforts to contact authors and librarians were made. Given the broad range of study designs, a standard and empirically grounded quality assessment tool was not available. Thus, both reviewers applied a 14-item checklist that provides an overall quality score covering the study internal validity and risk of bias [40]. There is not a validated threshold for the overall score to be selected for study inclusion, ranging from a relatively conservative cut-off point (e.g., 75%) to a more liberal one (e.g., 55%). Almost all (19/21) studies included in the meta-analysis received an overall score above 75%, only two were rated between 55% and 75%, and none below 55%, so no study was deemed to be excluded from analysis (Table 2).

**Meta-analysis**

In order to calculate the strength of association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms (Question 2), we selected from the systematic search all studies that reported mean scores for both symptom dimensions, and conducted a meta-analysis of the pooled correlation coefficients. A total of 21 effect sizes of the r-type were obtained. One study [41] provided data for two unique community samples and was therefore counted as two separate studies for the purposes of the analyses. All studies provided cross-sectional data except one [42], which provided longitudinal correlation coefficients (r) at 3 and 6 months after the trauma. Both r coefficients were of the same magnitude, and only one was included in the analyses. Fisher’s Z transformations were used in order to correct for the standard error formula of r-type effect sizes. Given that the studies varied in methodology and design, a random-effects model was estimated using Stata 13. Random effects models account for within-study and between-study error, resulting in broader confidence intervals and a more conservative estimate of the true effect, reducing the probability of making a Type I error [43]. To test for between-study heterogeneity we used the $I^2$ statistic, which is the percentage of variation attributable to heterogeneity. The values of $I^2$ lie between 0% and 100%, with larger values showing increasing heterogeneity. $I^2$ values between 25%-50% are considered low, between 50%-75% moderate, ≥75% high [44].
Another complementary way of testing the co-occurrence of emotion regulation and post-traumatic difficulties would be to use a categorical approach, in order to determine if trauma-exposed children and adolescents who develop PTSD report more emotion regulation difficulties than those who do not develop the disorder. This would be of clinical relevance, as it is common in clinical practice to use diagnostic thresholds when assessing patients and elaborating treatment plans. To do that, we metanalysed all case-control studies found (e.g., studies reporting emotion regulation levels in the case group (with PTSD) and in the control group (without PTSD)). We used a random-effects model, appropriate when analysing studies with different designs, to pool the standardized mean difference (SMD). This model reflects the difference between the distributions in the two groups even if they do not measure exactly the same outcome [45]. After the systematic search, we only found 4 case-control studies, and one of them did not provide complete data for analyses (Online Resource 2). It is of note that, unlike a fixed-effect model which can be used to perform a metanalysis with only two studies [46], the random-effects model may provide a false sense of assurance if the number of studies is very small, as the estimate of the between-studies variance will have poor precision.

**Descriptive analysis**

Given the small number of case-control studies available from the systematic search, we also decided to use a descriptive approach in order to observe if those trauma-exposed children and adolescents with higher difficulties in emotion regulation also endorsed a PTSD diagnosis more commonly. To do that, we needed to standardize the mean scores of emotion regulation difficulties reported in the studies, as we were to compare data collected with different measurement tools. The calculation was done based on the minimum and maximum possible scores of each study measure, representing all standardized means on a scale ranging from 0 to 100. For one study [47] the standardized mean score could not be calculated as the minimum and maximum tool scores were not available.

Finally, we also used a descriptive approach to do a general review of those studies that focused on treatment, which were not part of our systematic search strategy or metanalysis, but were of clear clinical relevance.

**RESULTS**

The systematic search returned a total of 866 articles and 41 studies met inclusion criteria for the review; 4 were case-control studies, 4 were cross-sectional studies of trauma exposed and non-exposed samples, 4 were longitudinal cohort studies and 1 a retrospective cohort of clinical records, 12 were treatment trials from which we selected pre-treatment data only, 15 were cross-sectional observational studies and 1 was a within-scale metanalysis (e.g., data collected only from studies that used the same questionnaire, which measured
post-traumatic and anger symptoms, disregarding other differentiated symptom checklists or structured interviews) [48]. In order to prevent duplicate data from being used, the metanalysis found was not included within any analytical strategy or in the interpretation of the review.

**Question 1: What are the rates of emotion regulation difficulties in trauma-exposed children and adolescents with PTSD?**

We first wanted to select all studies that reported the percentage of trauma-exposed children and adolescents with emotion regulation difficulties and with PTSD to answer this question. Out of the 41 studies included in the review, we could not find any epidemiological study providing this prevalence data in a representative community sample. Only 2 cohort studies reported both the PTSD percentage and the rates of emotion regulation difficulties in exposed youth [49,50]. However, none of them specified the percentage of youth reporting emotion regulation difficulties within those that presented PTSD. Thus, there were no primary studies that allowed us to do a metanalysis to determine the prevalence of emotion dysregulation in young people with PTSD.

Alternatively, other 35 studies provided mean score levels of emotion regulation difficulties in youth with varying levels of post-traumatic stress symptoms or PTSD diagnosis and were appropriate for descriptive analyses (Table 1).

**Question 2: What is the strength of association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms in children and adolescents?**

Most common psychiatric problems, including emotion dysregulation, seem to vary along a continuum and their underlying aetiology seems to conform to a dimensional model [51,52]. Thus, to answer our question, we used a dimensional approach, metanalysing the strength of the association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms.

Out of the 41 studies included in the review, we used the 21 studies (Table 2) that reported data on the association of both symptom dimensions to conduct a metanalysis of the pooled correlation coefficients (Figure 2). The studies comprised 5,818 unique participants. The overall effect size found between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms was large according to Cohen's Standards ($r = .372$; $k = 21$; 95% CI .244 - .501), with a high degree of heterogeneity ($I^2 = 95\%$). This high heterogeneity means
that the varied designs of the included studies could be affecting the validity of the results. This is not surprising given that a limitation in this research field is the lack of consistency in emotion regulation measures, and that we decided to use a wide working definition for this review. A total of 12 different self-reported tools were used in the 21 studies included in the metanalysis. Almost two thirds of the studies (k=13, 61.9%) used a definition which encompassed several dimensions on which emotion regulation difficulties can occur (e.g., lack of emotional awareness or clarity, difficulty engaging in goal-directed behaviours, limited access to emotion regulation strategies, non-acceptance of emotional responses), while the remaining 8 studies (38.1%) measured emotion regulation difficulties more narrowly focusing specifically on problems with anger.

In order to address this concern, we conducted the same analyses but limited to the studies that operationalized and measured emotion regulation with the same tool. The DERS (Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale) was the most commonly used (k=6, 28.6%). When pooling the data of these 6 studies we still found a large effect (r=.447; k=6; 95% CI .359 -.535) and the percentage of variation attributable to heterogeneity decreased to a 30.6%. We repeated the same strategy selecting the 6 studies that measured PTSD symptoms with the same tool (PTSD-RI: Posttraumatic Stress Disorder-Reaction Index) but in this case the heterogeneity was still very high (I² 97%; r=.368; k=6; 95% CI .078 -.657).

These results suggest that the overall cross-sectional association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms is strong in children and adolescents, and the consistency of these results increases when using the same measurement tool for emotion regulation.

Following a categorical approach, we wondered if beside the dimensional association with post-traumatic symptoms, emotion regulation was also more common in trauma-exposed youth who meet threshold for a PTSD diagnosis in contrast with those who do not develop the disorder. For this, we selected the 3 case-control studies that reported levels of emotion regulation difficulties in young survivors with and without a PTSD diagnosis. The pooled sample size of the 3 studies analysed was N= 157 for the PTSD group and N=162 for the non-PTSD group. Compared with young people without a PTSD diagnosis, those with PTSD did not present significantly higher mean scores of emotion regulation difficulties (pooled SMD= 0.316, 95%CI= -0.206 to 0.838. I² = 79.2%).

Given that the interpretation of this results could be limited by the small number of studies analysed, we took a descriptive approach in order to observe if those trauma-exposed young samples that report higher difficulties in emotion regulation, tend to present a PTSD diagnosis more often. We selected 19 studies out of
the 41 included in the review, which provided information on the proportion of the sample meeting PTSD threshold for diagnosis, with percentages ranging from 11.7% to 77.8% depending on the sample. In 4 of the studies PTSD rates were of 100% as survivors were only included if they presented a full-blown PTSD, and we did not include them in the description. The proportions of PTSD diagnosis as a function of emotion regulation difficulties mean scores are represented in Online Resource 2 (see studies included in Table 1 in bold). A positive association was observed, in that higher emotion regulation difficulties were associated with higher proportion of PTSD diagnosis in the samples. The strength of this correlation was of r=.61. These results support the association between PTSD diagnosis and emotion regulation difficulties also in children and adolescents.

**Question 3: Which are the main factors that modify the association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms in youth?**

Based on prior literature in adult samples, we hypothesized that the overall effect size of the association between emotion regulation difficulties and posttraumatic symptoms would vary depending on the young people’s age, gender, type of trauma experienced or whether they were survivors from the general population or youth who seek help from medical services. Out of the 21 studies that we meta-analysed, 7 (33.3%) were of non-interpersonal trauma survivors, 5 (23.8%) were of interpersonal trauma survivors, and 9 (42.9%) were of survivors exposed to a variety of trauma types. The mean survivors’ age was of 13.8(2.76). Two of the studies recruited only females and one study only males, and for the remaining studies the percentage of females ranged from 27.36% to 75%. We included gender, age, type of trauma and source of recruitment as predictors in a meta-regression to see if the inclusion of these covariates affected the pooled effect size between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms. The results were non-significant, F(4,15) = 1.08, p=.403, I²= 94.72%, indicating that the relationship between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms in traumatized youth does not seem to depend on the age, gender, type of trauma or source of recruitment of the survivors. However, the high heterogeneity of the pooled studies limits the interpretation of these results.

Finally, as we could only find 21 studies that reported an effect size appropriate for metanalysis, we tested for publication bias (e.g., significant findings are more likely to be published). We examined whether there was asymmetry in funnel plots and calculated the Egger’s coefficient, and we could not find evidence of publication bias (bias=.12, p=.904). A more detailed description of examination of publication bias and
funnel plots are provided in the Online Resource 1. Also, as most of the individual effect estimates of the metanalysis were above zero, any effect of publication bias would be to inflate the estimate rather than to lead to an incorrect conclusion about the existence of an effect. It is important to note that the results of these tests should be taken carefully, as publication bias is only one of many sources of asymmetry found in funnel plots [53,54].

**Emotion regulation difficulties and PTSD treatment**

We found 12 studies evaluating changes in emotion regulation in relation to different PTSD treatment modalities. Most studies (7 out of 12) were uncontrolled pre-post treatment trials. Some were based on trauma-focused CBT [55-57] while others applied sequenced-based therapies that also included enhancement of specific emotion regulation strategies [58-60]. Studies from both approaches demonstrated improvements in emotion regulation, and in PTSD symptoms, but the absence of a control group in the studies limits interpretation of their results and the comparison between the effect sizes of the interventions.

We only found 3 studies with more robust methodological designs, a randomized control trial [61], a single case across time and setting experimental design [62] and a randomized trial using enhanced treatment as usual as a control group [63]. The first two studies showed that anger and emotion regulation improved with treatments that were based on trauma-focused CBT. These interventions included some elements of anger and emotion regulation, but these were not the focus of the treatment and were not sequentially designed within an initial stabilization phase. However, Ford et al [63] did not find significant changes in emotion regulation in adolescents that were treated with a CBT intervention based on a sequential skill set designed to enhance emotion regulation without trauma memory processing (TARGET: Trauma Emotion regulation Guide for Education and Therapy).

Therefore whether improving emotion regulation skills in the early stages of PTSD therapy is necessary is still unclear, not only in adult patients but also in children and adolescents.

**DISCUSSION**

Given the wide variety of emotion regulation definitions and measurement tools found in our study of trauma-exposed youth, clinicians and researchers might firstly be interested in knowing how to measure emotion regulation difficulties to assess and track changes in patients’ symptom levels, and design their research projects. In view of the lack of a gold standard to assess emotion regulation problems, one relevant focus for future research would be to create developmentally adapted instruments and procedures that validly
and reliably assess emotion regulation broadly. This could be done by combining the scales that have shown the strongest psychometric properties using factor analyses, and validating the new tool against external criteria. This approach would still be limited by recall bias, which could be avoided by focusing research on measuring real-time experiences of affect change (e.g., Ecological Momentary Assessment). As childhood and adolescence are considered key developmental periods for emotion regulation, developing a gold standard measure developmentally adapted to young populations would be of paramount usefulness.

Once a reliable and valid measure to assess emotion regulation in young populations is available, an important initial step would be to describe the prevalence of emotion regulation difficulties in a representative community sample of traumatized children and adolescents. There are no epidemiological studies addressing this issue so far.

Our metanalysis showed a strong positive association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms in children and adolescents ($r=.447$; $k=6$; 95% CI .359 -.535). The effect size is in the medium range and slightly smaller than that found for children’s negative appraisals of trauma and post-traumatic symptoms ($r=.63$; 95% CI .58 -.68) [64]. Yet, when interpreting such effects, the size of the effect is only part of the consideration. The nature of the problem (e.g. in medicine effect sizes for death as an outcome as opposed to days off work) must also be taken into account [65]. Given that the consequences of emotion dysregulation can be dire [15,7,16] ranging from increased burden of illness to aggression towards self and others, it is important that its effect sizes are interpreted accordingly.

Our results also provided preliminary evidence that youth who develop PTSD are more likely to report emotion regulation difficulties than those trauma-exposed youth who do not develop the disorder. However, there is a paucity of studies with the appropriate case-control design to answer this question. Thus, future research projects should be designed as case-control studies comparing the rates of emotion regulation difficulties between trauma-exposed youth with and without PTSD. Answering this question would expand our results that suggested a large association between post-traumatic stress symptoms and emotion regulation difficulties. As emotion regulation difficulties are also known to be associated with a wide range of internalizing and externalizing disorders in youth, it would be interesting to control for the presence of comorbidity to clarify how much of this association would be specific to PTSD. Future studies will need to examine whether emotion dysregulation arises as a consequence of core traumatic symptoms (e.g. reliving of trauma) or whether it is a generalized feature.
What is still under debate is whether the co-occurrence of these symptom domains could help clinicians in classifying victims in different groups, either by their level of PTSD severity or as a function of PTSD and CPTSD diagnostic categories. Our review did not seek to directly address this question. Our finding that emotion dysregulation is relatively common in young people with (vs without) PTSD symptoms is in principle consistent with both a severity account (emotion dysregulation occurs in more severe forms of PTSD) and a categorical account (emotional dysregulation occurs in CPTSD). However, we did not find that trauma type modified the relationship between PTSD and emotional dysregulation, and many of our reviewed studies included young people who had been exposed to single-event trauma. This implies that emotion dysregulation does not occur only in CPTSD.

Direct tests of whether emotion regulation difficulties are a function of PTSD severity or part of a distinct nosological entity would require a different approach to study design and analysis. A recent review of such approaches with adults [66], concludes that there is general support for the distinction between PTSD and CPTSD, but also notes that data about children and young people are lacking. A recent latent class analysis among clinically referred children [67] found that PTSD and CPTSD were empirically distinguishable. Further work is needed.

Our results did not suggest that age, gender, type of trauma or source of recruitment were significantly changing the strength of the relationship between emotion regulation problems and post-traumatic symptoms. However, the high variability between studies did not allow us to draw robust conclusions. Given that these factors have shown to be of importance in studies with adult samples, future research projects should take them into account when studying emotion regulation difficulties in traumatized youth, in order to clarify which risk factors predict the development of emotion regulation difficulties in youth exposed to trauma.

With regard to the limitations of this study, even if our search strategy were broad, it did not include the PILOTS (Published International Literature on Traumatic Stress), potentially overlooking other relevant studies. Also, due to the lack of longitudinal primary studies, the analysis was correlational, limiting our ability to draw casual inferences.

Finally, beyond their cross-sectional association with PTSD symptoms, emotion regulation difficulties have been shown to be both a predisposing factor and a consequence of post-traumatic stress symptoms, increasing risk of symptom persistence over time [68]. They have also been found to be a factor associated with sexual revictimisation [69] and risky behaviours such as self-harm [70] or drug use [71]. These longitudinal studies have only been applied to adult clinical or university samples, and after our systematic search we could only
find one study in youth that measured emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic symptoms over time. Therefore, longitudinal studies in traumatized young clinical samples looking at how emotion regulation difficulties predict the onset, severity, persistence of posttraumatic symptoms and risky behaviours after a traumatic event are needed. The lack of such data limits causal inferences. In order to determine a causal relationship all variables should be collected before and after the traumatic event. Due to the unpredictability of traumatic events, one way to look at this would be to follow cohorts of children throughout their childhood and adolescence screening for emotion regulation difficulties and exposure to trauma in each follow-up time point. Few longitudinal cohort studies following young survivors after a traumatic event have been conducted, and they usually focus on the development of post-traumatic, anxiety or depressive symptoms [72,73] but not on emotion regulation. Shedding light on this, would allow us to get a better understanding on the possible role of emotion regulation difficulties as a predisposing factor for future revictimisation, as sequelae of trauma or both.

Finally, future research should focus on increasing the evidence on how to best treat children and adolescents that seek help in clinics for their post-traumatic stress symptoms, and also report significant difficulties in regulating their emotions. In order to guide clinicians towards the best treatments for their patients, and to effectively help children and adolescents, randomized controlled trials that include emotion regulation as study outcome are needed. It should also be studied if difficulties in emotion regulation are a moderator of PTSD improvement, as high baseline levels of anger or emotion dysregulation did not seem to modify the efficacy of conventional PTSD trauma-exposure treatments for youth, but this has not been tested in controlled studies [74,75]. Improving the evidence in all the above mentioned aspects would definitely have an impact on improving the quality and effectiveness of the services provided in clinics for such vulnerable young traumatized survivors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>Trauma type</th>
<th>Age (sd)</th>
<th>Sex (% females)</th>
<th>Emotion regulation difficulties</th>
<th>PTSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tool</td>
<td>Mean score (sd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>children in specialized anxiety clinic</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10.38 years (1.54)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>2.04** (0.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205</td>
<td>juvenile detention center</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>16.23 years (1.19)</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>92.41 (20.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>juvenile detention center</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>16.23 years (1.19)</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>104.1 (16.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>436</td>
<td>children war-affected zone</td>
<td>war (interpersonal)</td>
<td>17.8 years (2.3)</td>
<td>44.6</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>3.41 (0.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>adolescents in sexual assault specialized center</td>
<td>sexual abuse (interpersonal)</td>
<td>16 years (1.4)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>TSCC²</td>
<td>44* (7.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>children PTSD treatment center</td>
<td>neglect, domestic violence, physical or sexual abuse (interpersonal)</td>
<td>12.15 years (2.85)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>TSCC²</td>
<td>9.23 (7.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Age (Mean, SD)</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>TSCC</td>
<td>NMR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espil et al. 2016 [78]</td>
<td>50 adolescents acute psychiatric hospital (clinical) various clinics and community centers (community)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>15.1 years (1.4)</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>92.3 (27.5)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford et al. 2012 [63]</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>14.7 years (1.2)</td>
<td>TSCCb</td>
<td>8.8 (7.1)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford et al. 2012 [63]</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>14.7 years (1.2)</td>
<td>TSCCb</td>
<td>8.3 (6)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges et al. 2013 [79]</td>
<td>318 children in PTSD treatment center (clinical)</td>
<td>sexual or physical abuse, neglect (interpersonal)</td>
<td>9.8 years (1.5)</td>
<td>TSCCb</td>
<td>6.73 (5.23)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaczkurkin et al. 2016 [75]</td>
<td>31 adolescents sexual assault crisis center (clinical)</td>
<td>sexual abuse or assault (interpersonal)</td>
<td>15.3 years (1.52)</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td>93.36 (11.94)</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaczkurkin et al. 2016 [75]</td>
<td>30 adolescents sexual assault crisis center (clinical)</td>
<td>sexual abuse or assault (interpersonal)</td>
<td>15.3 years (1.52)</td>
<td>STAXI</td>
<td>47 (11.7)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kagan et al. 2013 [60]</td>
<td>26 family service programs (clinical)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TSCC</td>
<td>54.4* (-)</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerig et al. 2016 [80]</td>
<td>221 Youth from juvenile justice facilities (community)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>15.98 years (1.25)</td>
<td>ENRS</td>
<td>22.93 (7.34)</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Type of Sample</td>
<td>Age (Mean ± SD)</td>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>CPTSD-RI</td>
<td>CPTSD-RI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimonis et al. 2011 [81]</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>Juvenile detention center (community)</td>
<td>16.43 years (0.8)</td>
<td>NAS 89.25 (16.59)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>K-SADS-PL 3.24(4.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanktree et al. 2012 [82]</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Juvenile detention center (clinical)</td>
<td>11.43 years (2.69)</td>
<td>TSCC 8.96 (6.71)</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>TSCC 11.74(6.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laor et al. 2002 [47]</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Displaced homeless children (non-interpersonal)</td>
<td>8.2 years (1.3)</td>
<td>TDGS 1.88 (0.48)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>CPTSD-RI 30.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma et al. 2014 [83]</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>School (community)</td>
<td>12 years (1.5)</td>
<td>CEMS 12.28 (2.24)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>CRIES -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ma et al. 2014 [83]</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>School (community)</td>
<td>12.04 years (1.37)</td>
<td>CEMS 10.75 (2.48)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>CRIES -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March et al. 1998 [62]</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Elementary and high school students (community)</td>
<td>12 years (1.6)</td>
<td>STAXI 15.06 (8.67)</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>CAPS-CA 71.47 (19.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsee et al. 2008 [84]</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>High school students (non-interpersonal)</td>
<td>14.97 years (1.1)</td>
<td>ADI-ED 10.11 (7.17)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>RI 16.43(11.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinez et al. 2014 [48]</td>
<td>135*** (195)</td>
<td>US studies (international)</td>
<td>12.47 years (2.56) ***</td>
<td>TSCC 8.3*** (0.37)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>TSCC 9.2***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Description</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Mean Age (SD)</td>
<td>Mean (SD)</td>
<td>PSS-SR (Mean, SD)</td>
<td>PSS-SR (Range)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazloom et al. 2016 [85]</td>
<td>High school students (community) - earthquake (non-interpersonal)</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>15.81 years</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>92.36 (18.87)</td>
<td>16.03(11.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovaert et al. 1998 [86]</td>
<td>Juvenile offender center (community) - sexual, physical abuse (interpersonal)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15.4 years (1.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33.75 (10.47)</td>
<td>37.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovaert et al. 1998 [86]</td>
<td>Juvenile offender center (community) - various</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.4 years (1.1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40.47 (13.03)</td>
<td>44.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olafson et al. 2016 [58]</td>
<td>Youth from juvenile justice facilities (community) - various</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.5 years</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>54.4* (11.8)</td>
<td>56.1*(11.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Runyon et al. 2009 [87]</td>
<td>School-based PTSD clinic (clinical) - children in PTSD treatment center (clinical)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.8 years (1.72)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>57 (14.47)</td>
<td>8.1(4.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandler et al. 2015 [88]</td>
<td>Children in PTSD treatment center (clinical) - war (interpersonal)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.51 years (2.99)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>111.39 (7.35)</td>
<td>5.25(2.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandler et al. 2015 [88]</td>
<td>Children in PTSD treatment center (clinical) - war (interpersonal)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10.51 years (2.99)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100.79 (22.93)</td>
<td>7.18(2.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma-Patel et al. 2016 [74]</td>
<td>Youth in PTSD treatment center (clinical) - sexual abuse or assault, physical abuse, domestic violence (interpersonal)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>11.02 years</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58.56 (13.52)</td>
<td>17.21(10.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Setting</td>
<td>Diagnosis</td>
<td>Age Mean (SD)</td>
<td>STAXI (Mean, SD)</td>
<td>CPTSD-I (Mean, SD)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1 Review and selection of articles
Table 2 Characteristics of studies correlating post-traumatic and emotion regulation difficulties symptoms included in the metanalysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Sample type</th>
<th>Trauma type</th>
<th>Age years (sd)</th>
<th>Sex (% females)</th>
<th>PTSD symptoms tool</th>
<th>Emotion regulation difficulties tool</th>
<th>Effect size (r)</th>
<th>Quality score rater1-rater2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bender et al. 2015 [76]</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>children in specialized anxiety clinic (clinical)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>10.38 years (1.54)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>SCARED-R</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>70% - 86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett et al. 2014 [92]</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>juvenile-justice-involved adolescents (community)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>15.56 years (1.41)</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>PTSD-RI</td>
<td>MAYS1-2</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>91% - 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennett et al. 2015 [77]</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>juvenile detention center (community)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>16.23 years (1.19)</td>
<td>36.88</td>
<td>PTSD-RI</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>91% - 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ehlers et al. 2003 [42]</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>children in emergency department (clinical)</td>
<td>road traffic accident (non-interpersonal)</td>
<td>12.3 years (2.86)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>IES PTSD-RI</td>
<td>single question</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>95% - 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Espil et al. 2016 [78]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>adolescents in acute psychiatric hospital (clinical)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>15.1 years (1.4)</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>CPSS</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>91% - 82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodges et al. 2013 [79]</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>children in specialized trauma treatment centers (clinical)</td>
<td>sexual abuse, physical abuse, neglect (interpersonal)</td>
<td>9.8 years (1.5)</td>
<td>67.61</td>
<td>TSCC&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TSCYC&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>86% - 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaczkurkin et al. 2016 [75]</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>adolescents in a sexual assault crisis center for PTSD treatment (clinical)</td>
<td>sexual abuse or assault (interpersonal)</td>
<td>15.3 years (1.52)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>CPSS-I</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>92% - 92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kerig et al. 2016 [80]</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>juvenile detention center (community)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>15.98 years (1.25)</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>PTSD-RI</td>
<td>ENRS</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>95% - 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimonis et al. 2011 [81]</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>juvenile detention center (community)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>16.43 years (0.8)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>K-SADS</td>
<td>NAS</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>95% - 95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanktree et al. 2008 [93]</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>children in specialized trauma treatment centers (clinical)</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>9.7 years (1.5)</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>TSCC&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TSCYC&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>95% - 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Sample Size</td>
<td>Type of Trauma</td>
<td>Mean Age (SD)</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Predictor 1</td>
<td>Predictor 2</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laor et al. 2002 [47]</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>displaced homeless children (community)</td>
<td>8.2 years (1.3)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>PTSD-RI</td>
<td>TDGS</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>59% - 77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavi et al. 2005 [41]</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>high school adolescents (community)</td>
<td>13.52 years (0.73)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>TSCC&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TSCC &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>77% - 73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lavi et al. 2005 [41]</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>high school students (community)</td>
<td>14.75 years (0.42)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>TSCC&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>TSCC &lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>77% - 73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marsee et al. 2008 [84]</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>high school students (community)</td>
<td>14.97 years (1.1)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>ADI- ED</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>86% - 82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazloom et al. 2016 [85]</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>high school students (community)</td>
<td>15.81 years 54.1</td>
<td>PSS-SR</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>91% - 91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat-Horenczyk et al. 2014 [94]</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>431 mother–child dyads (community)</td>
<td>16.29 years (0.7)</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>PTSD-RI</td>
<td>CERQ-S</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>82% - 77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandler et al. 2015 [88]</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>children in specialized PTSD treatment center (clinical)</td>
<td>10.51 years (2.99)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>K-SADS</td>
<td>NMR</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>59% - 64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma-Patel et al. 2016 [74]</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>youth in PTSD treatment center (clinical)</td>
<td>11.02 years 75</td>
<td>CPSS</td>
<td>BASC-PRS</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>82% - 86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shenk et al. 2013 [95]</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>maltreated adolescents (unknown)</td>
<td>16.75 years (1.11)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>CTI</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>100 - 100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valdez et al. 2014 [96]</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>foster youth (community)</td>
<td>17 years (0.15)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>DIS-IV</td>
<td>IASC-AD</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>100% - 95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whalen et al. 2015 [90]</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>adolescents in a residential psychiatric treatment facility (clinical)</td>
<td>14.28 years (1.38)</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>CPSS</td>
<td>DERS</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>91% - 91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PTSD= Post-traumatic Stress Disorder; sd= standard deviation; PTSD-RI= Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Reaction Index; TDGS= Traumatic dissociation and grief scale; IES= impact of event scale; RI= Reaction Index exposure; ADI-ED= abbreviated dysregulation inventory- affective dysregulation subscale; PSS-SR= PTSD Symptom Scale -Self Report; DERS= Difficulties in Emotion Regulation Scale; TSCC= Trauma Symptom Checklist for Children (ptsd subscale); TSCC= Trauma Symptom Checklist for Children (anger subscale); K-SADS= Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia for School-Age Children; NMR= negative mood regulation scale; CTI= The Comprehensive Trauma Interview; CPSS-1= The Child PTSD Symptom Scale- Interview; CPSS= Child PTSD Symptoms Scale; BASC-PRS= Behaviour Assessment System for Children - Parent Report Scale; TSCYC= Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children (care-taker reported. ptsd subscale); DIS-IV= Diagnostic Interview Schedule-Version IV; IASC-AD: Inventory of Altered Self-Capacities- Affect Dysregulation subscale; ENRS= Emotional Numbing and Reactivity Scale (numbing of anger subscale); CERQ-S= Cognitive-Emotion Regulation Questionnaire (Short); SCARED-R= Screen for Child Anxiety Related Emotional Disorders-Revised (PTSD subscale); NAS= Novaco anger scale; TSCYC= Trauma Symptom Checklist for Young Children (care-taker reported. anger/aggression subscale); MAYSI-2= The Massachusetts Youth Screening Instrument–Second Version (anger-Irritability subscale).

Fig. 2 Forest Plot of the 21 studies included in the metanalysis of the association between emotion regulation difficulties and post-traumatic stress symptoms.
Conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

17. Smith (1918) Shell Shock and its lessons. Longmans, Green & co., University of Manchester
43. Field A (2013) Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics. Sage,


