An Evidence Review on Prevention, Screening, Assessment, & Intervention for Youth Experiencing Homelessness and Human Trafficking

Valerie R. Anderson[a]
Colleen Schlecht[b]
Shannon Kugley[c]
Destinee L. Starcher[a]
Matthew Morton[b]

September 2022

[a] University of Cincinnati
[b] Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
[c] RTI International

An Evidence Review on Prevention, Screening, Assessment, & Intervention for Youth Experiencing Homelessness and Human Trafficking

Valerie R. Anderson, Colleen Schlecht, Shannon Kugley, Destinee L. Starcher, & Matthew Morton

November 2022

Recommended Citation
Anderson, V., Schlecht, C., Kugley, S., Starcher, D. & Morton, M. (2022). *An Evidence Review on Prevention, Screening, Assessment, & Interventions for Youth Experiencing Homelessness and Human Trafficking*. RHYTTAC.

Disclaimer
The points of view, analyses, interpretations, and opinions expressed here are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the position of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children and Families, Family and Youth Services Bureau.

Contact
Colleen Schlecht
Senior Researcher
Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago
1313 East 60th St.
Chicago, IL 60637
cschlecht@chapinhall.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

An Evidence Review on Prevention, Screening, Assessment,
& Intervention for Youth Experiencing Homelessness and
Human Trafficking (2022)   Anderson, Schlecht, Kugley, Starcher & Morton | i

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

Youth experiencing homelessness are at a high risk of human trafficking victimization. The Chapin Hall team conducted a rapid evidence review to identify studies that evaluated the outcomes associated with interventions for preventing human trafficking, mitigating risk, or improving outcomes among youth experiencing homelessness. In addition, we sought screening or assessment tools for identifying sex trafficking experience or risk among youth experiencing homelessness.

We retrieved 1,082 records from among an existing youth homelessness evidence library maintained by Chapin Hall, bibliographic databases searches, and supplemental hand searches We included reports that examined an intervention or prevention program or provided detailed information about screening and assessment for human trafficking among youth experiencing homelessness. We identified four unique interventions evaluated across eight studies and publications that included youth-level outcomes for youth experiencing homelessness and trafficking. We identified 14 unique assessment or screening tools relevant to youth populations who may be experiencing trafficking and/or at-risk for trafficking.

An Evidence Review on Prevention, Screening, Assessment, & Intervention for Youth Experiencing Homelessness and Human Trafficking (2022)

Anderson, Schlecht, Kugley, Starcher & Morton | iii

INTRODUCTION

The Problem

Human trafficking is defined as the exploitation of a person through force, fraud, or coercion to obtain form of labor or for commercial sexual exploitation (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2022). Human trafficking among youth and young adults is an increasing concern in the United States and around the world, however, the exact number of youth who have been sex trafficked and/or labor trafficked is challenging to determine (Finkelhor et al., 2017; Franchino-Olsen et al., 2020). Since it is difficult to identify and track cases of human trafficking, most estimates of these crimes are likely undercounted and should be considered with caution (Franchino-Olsen et al., 2020). Youth homelessness also presents a significant national challenge. A national estimate completed by Chapin Hall in 2017 indicated that 1 in 10 youths ages 18-25 and at least 1 in 30 youths ages 13-17 "experience some form of homelessness unaccompanied by a parent or guardian over the course of a year" (Morton et al., 2017).

Youth experiencing homelessness are among the populations that are most vulnerable to trafficking and they commonly face unequal risks and difficulties, in addition to the hardship of homelessness itself. Evidence shows that youth experiencing homelessness are at a high risk of human trafficking victimization (Choi, 2015), exposure to sexual violence and reliance on survival sex (Heerde et al., 2014), a range of health problems (Medlow et al., 2014), high prevalence of mental health issues and psychiatric disorders (Hodgson et al., 2013), early pregnancy (Greene & Ringwalt, 1998), and substance use (Greene et al., 1997). Homeless and unstably housed youth, on average, have low educational attainment and high unemployment, compounding the challenges for them to escape poverty and contribute to the competitiveness of their economies (Gaetz & O'Grady, 2013).

Some distinctions are relevant to this discussion, specifically, differing federal definitions of sex trafficking for people over and under 18. According to the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, sex trafficking is defined as "the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act where such an act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age" (Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, 2000). Labor trafficking is the "recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for labor or services, through the use of force, fraud, or coercion for the purpose of subjection to involuntary servitude, peonage, debt bondage, or slavery" (Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, 2000). Within these federal definitions, it is important to note that when a person younger than 18 is used to engage in any commercial sex, it is a crime regardless off the use of force, fraud, or coercion. Many youth experiencing homelessness are at an increased risk for human trafficking due to many of the above-discussed risk factors, including low educational attainment, high unemployment rates, prior histories of abuse, mental health issues, and documented substance use disorders (Murphy, 2017). The lack of viable

economic and housing opportunities leaves youth experiencing homelessness particularly vulnerable to traffickers who exploit their need to work (Murphy). A Covenant House study interviewed nearly 1,000 young people experiencing homelessness in 13 cities across the U.S. and Canada and found nearly 1 in 5 (19.4%) were victims of human trafficking (Murphy; Wolfe et al., 2018).

Data also show that youth experiencing homelessness are not a homogeneous group. They have varying levels and types of needs and experience homelessness and housing instability dynamically across a continuum of severity and duration (Bucher, 2008; Milburn et al., 2006; Toro et al., 2011). Ongoing research also shows substantial interaction among homeless and unstably housed youth with child welfare, law enforcement, and justice systems (Morton et al., 2017). While homeless and unstably housed youth present significant service needs overall, certain populations are particularly vulnerable. Studies consistently show that youth experiencing homelessness who also identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, and/or transgender (LGBTQ+), for instance, face heightened levels of risk compared to their heterosexual counterparts (Cochran et al., 2002; Gangamma et al., 2008; Whitbeck et al., 2004). Further, researchers from the previously mentioned Covenant House study found that LGBTQ+ youth face a higher risk of sex trafficking (Murphy, 2017).

An early review (Choi, 2015) showed that childhood abuse and a history of running away from home were significant predictors of sex trafficking among minors. More recent reviews have summarized several potential risk factors (de Vries et al., 2020; Franchino-Olsen, 2021) and adverse health outcomes for minor sex trafficking victims (Le et al., 2018; Ottisova et al., 2016; Suwetty et al., 2019). According to a systematic review by Le and colleagues (2018), child survivors of sex trafficking are at increased risk for substance use and abuse, mental health disorders such as depression, PTSD, suicidal behaviors, and sexual and reproductive health issues including STIs, HIV, and pregnancy. Suwetty et al. (2019) reported similar adverse outcomes for young survivors of human trafficking, including anxiety, depression, isolation, disorientation, aggression, suicidal ideation, attention deficit, psychotic disorders, and PTSD. Laird and colleagues (2020) examined 52 demographic and psychosocial factors reported in 37 unique studies to identify those associated with child sexual exploitation. Adolescents who experienced child sexual exploitation were likely to have reported sexual risk taking, multiple sexual partners, posttraumatic stress disorder, exposure to child pornography, and childhood trauma (Laird et al., 2020).

Understanding the risk factors and adversities associated with sex trafficking is important for the effective development and use of screening, assessment, and intervention approaches. The complexity and array of difficulties faced by homeless and unstably housed youth who experience human trafficking elevate the need for a comprehensive synthesis of evidence on interventions, screening and assessment, and prevention efforts to address a range of outcomes that will impact youths' long term health, safety, and wellbeing.

While an earlier systematic review completed by Chapin Hall synthesized research evidence on programs and practices addressing youth homelessness (Morton et al., 2019), researchers have not yet completed a comprehensive review of interventions and prevention efforts, including screening and assessments, related to youth experiencing homelessness who have been identified as at risk for, or have experienced, human trafficking. To address this gap in the body of research, we undertook a comprehensive search of the literature to identify studies of interventions for preventing or addressing human trafficking among runaway or homeless youth. We supplemented this with a search of the research and resources addressing youth-specific human trafficking screening and assessment practices and tools.

METHOD

I.   Objective

The central objective of this review was to identify and summarize empirical evidence related to interventions for preventing or addressing human trafficking among youth experiencing homelessness. In addition, we searched for screening and assessment tools used to identify sex trafficking experience or risk that may be used with populations of youth experiencing homelessness. We included literature describing a screening and assessment tool, as well as existing published tools available in the public domain.

In this section, we will first discuss our eligibility criteria for records to be included in the evidence review of prevention and intervention programs as well as our separate criteria for including assessment and screening tools. We will then discuss search strategies, and then our selection and data extraction processes. The processes and review of the intervention programs and outcomes were separate and distinct from those for the screening and assessment tools, and where applicable we describe these separately in the subsections below.

II.   Eligibility for Study Inclusion

Prevention and Intervention Programs

Population

To be eligible for inclusion in the review of interventions and prevention, studies had to include youth or young adults up to the age of 25 who experienced or were at risk of experiencing homelessness and/or housing instability and/or who had run away from home and had experienced or were at risk of experiencing human trafficking based on the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000 definition[1] ("Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000,"). We defined youth experiencing homelessness as those who live on the street, in cars, in shelters or in transitional housing programs or places not meant for human habitation. We defined unstably housed youth are those who are doubled up, couch surfing, staying in hotels/motels, or involved in the sex trade (Morton et al., 2017).

When studies included a broader population than the population of interest, 75% of study participants had to be aged 25 years or younger, the mean age of the sample had to be aged 25 years or younger, or the information reported one youth aged 25 years or younger had to be separately from the overall population. Prevention and intervention programs typically involve (1) identification of potential participants, in this case YYAs under 25 who experienced or at risk of experiencing homelessness or housing instability or at risk of human trafficking; (2) inclusion and exclusion criteria, e.g., a set of characteristics or experiences for which a given program is an

---

[1] According to the Trafficking Victims Protection Act (TVPA) of 2000, sex trafficking is defined as "the recruitment, harboring, transportation, provision, or obtaining of a person for the purpose of a commercial sex act where such an act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform such act has not attained 18 years of age".

appropriate response or support; (3) a clearly defined set of services or supports that are logically connected to and intended to address the effects of their experiences; and (4) a desired set of outcomes that occur in response to prevention (e.g., avert negative experiences) and intervention (e.g., individuals experience improved well-being, symptom reduction, enhanced supports).

We included only studies that were conducted with participants located in an Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) member country.[2] We excluded non-OECD populations (primarily those in low- and middle-income countries) because we expect that the cultural, institutional, and resource differences between OECD countries and low- and middle-income countries are significant, and findings would not be applicable in these varied settings.

Interventions
We included studies that evaluated an intervention or prevention program or service for youth who experienced or were at risk of experiencing homelessness, housing instability or who had run away from home and had experienced or were at risk of experiencing human trafficking homeless.

Outcomes
We included studies that reported a youth-level outcome. Youth-level outcomes could include mental or physical health, substance use, criminal justice involvement, child welfare involvement, self-harm, victimization, running away, sex behaviors, and sex trafficking involvement, among others.

Study Designs
To capture the broadest range of evidence on interventions, we included experimental and quasi-experimental, with or without an independent comparison group. We included program evaluations or implementation studies if it also reported a youth-level outcome.

Screening and Assessment Tools
As noted above, screening and assessment tools are often used to identify individuals and populations who are at risk for or experiencing specific problems. Screening tools are typically brief in length and necessarily entail follow-up to explore initial impressions. They are a method for one to evaluate the possible presence of a certain problem. They typically produce scores or "answers" to indicate whether an individual is likely to have the problem that is the subject of the screening tool. Ideally, screening tools identify individuals early enough to provide treatment and avoid or reduce symptoms and other consequences, improving outcomes, with less human and financial toll. For example, a positive indicator on a depression screening tool likely means that, on deeper assessment, the individual would indeed be identified or diagnosed as

---

[2] Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries currently include Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherland, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, United Kingdom, and United States.

experiencing depression. A valid depression screening tool accurately distinguishes individuals who are depressed from those who are not most of the time. However, caution must be exercised in relying too heavily on the results of the screening tool alone. Screenings can produce "false positives" (screening indicates depression and later assessment does not confirm it) and "false negatives" (screening tool does not indicate depression but the individual is experiencing depression). Screening tools for human trafficking can have weighty consequences – an individual whose answers to the screening tool initially indicate a lack of victimization may be due to fear or lack of event-specific memory as a result of the trauma. Therefore, the extent to which they are reliable and valid (consistent and accurate) is critical in choosing a tool.

An assessment tool is typically a longer (more questions) tool that is used in a practice, field, or even research setting. Assessments are a process for defining the nature of a problem, determining a diagnosis, and at times developing specific treatment recommendations to address the problem/diagnosis. Assessment tools are more likely (but not always) administered within a practice or clinical encounter as part of a comprehensive appraisal process that produces important individual information that drives program placement, decision making, and the type and intensity of supports and services.

For the purposes of this work, we defined screening tools as brief and narrow instruments to identify youth at risk for trafficking. The tools do not screen for risk of homelessness or housing instability, however several have been used with these youth populations. We defined assessment tools as broad and in-depth tools to assess the occurrence of human trafficking (RTI International, 2021). Appendix C explains the reliability and validity measures we report for the assessment and screening tools in this review.

Key Definitions

Term	Definition
Population	Individuals under the age of 25 years who experienced or were at risk of experiencing homelessness, or housing instability or who had run away from home and experienced or were at risk for human trafficking based on the TVPA definition
Intervention	Any strategy, process, or program intended to impact one or more outcomes, including prevention, among the population of interest
Outcome	An observation of interest measured following exposure to an intervention
Screening & Assessment	Any formal tool or measure used to identify the presence of human trafficking among youth or assess the occurrence of human trafficking in a systematic and in-depth manner

III.   Search Sources and Strategies

Prevention and Intervention Programs

Our primary source of literature for this review was a collection of nearly 6,000 records maintained by Chapin Hall in EndNote™ (The Endnote Team, 2014). The records were retrieved

between 2017 and 2022 using sophisticated search strategies as part of the Chapin Hall Voices of Youth Count[3] evidence review project (see Morton et al., 2019) and an ongoing evidence update. Using trafficking related terms and variants[4] we identified 216 records. To supplement the retrieval from the existing youth homelessness evidence library, we developed search strategies specific to youth trafficking and executed searches in several bibliographic databases including PubMed, the Web of Science Core Collection and Scopus. The bibliographic database searches yielded 822 records[5]. Lastly, we scanned reference lists of relevant publications and used other hand searching techniques to identify 46 records, for a total search retrieval of 1,084 records.

Screening and Assessment Tools

We searched a subset of the of the records retrieved from the search for prevention and intervention programs and ran a search with the term assessment. We conducted additional hand searches and supplemented the search with knowledge of existing tools.

IV.   Selection and Screening Process

Prevention and Intervention Programs

We developed a set of inclusion criteria which were used to determine whether retrieved records were eligible for inclusion. Studies that met criteria 1-4 and either 5a or 5b were eligible for inclusion (see Table 1). Review authors formally screened the records from the initial library (n = 216), documenting inclusion and exclusion decisions in Rayyan, a web-based tool designed for screening and coding of documents for systematic reviews. The supplemental records (n = 866) were scanned for inclusion informally by one or more review authors.

Table 1. Screening Criteria for Intervention and Prevention Studies

1.   Have the study participants experienced homelessness or are they at-risk of experiencing homelessness?
2.   Have the study participants experienced sex trafficking or are they at-risk of experiencing sex trafficking?
3.   Are the study participants aged 25 years or younger?
4.   Was the study conducted in an OECD country?
5a. Does the study report on an intervention or program evaluation?
5b. Does the study include youth-level, sex trafficking, or process outcomes?

Screening and Assessment Tools

To be included in this review, screening or assessment tools had to have been used or clearly indicate use with youth to assess their risk for or experience of trafficking. In total, across all

---

[3] https://voicesofyouthcount.org/

[4] "exploit*", "commercial*", "traffick*", "prostitut*"
[5] PubMed - 10/18/2021 (n = 186); Scopus - 10/18/2021 (n = 504); Web of Science – 10/18/2021 (n = 132)

searches, 14 unique screening and assessment tools were identified in this review and met selection criteria.

V.   Data Extraction

Prevention and Intervention Programs

We created an excel spreadsheet to organize the information extracted from each eligible report. A copy of the data extraction form is available from the authors upon request.

We recorded publication and study information (e.g., full reference, research design, sampling strategy), information about the population including the trafficking type (sex, labor, or both), the comparison group (if included), the intervention, and outcome(s). Consistent with the four core outcome areas established as performance standards by the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act Final Rule (Runaway and Homeless Youth Program Final Rule, 2016), we coded outcomes as safe and stable housing, education or employment, permanent connections, and social and emotional wellbeing.

Screening and Assessment Tools

We created an Excel spreadsheet to organize the information from each assessment and screening tool extracted. In this sheet, we recorded details on the screening or assessment tool including context of use and whether the tool had been validated for use with the population of interest, among other characteristics and details.

FINDINGS

In this section, we briefly summarize the evidence from evaluations of an intervention, followed by a summary of the assessment and screening tools (14 unique instruments).

Prevention Intervention Programs

We included eight publications (Bani-Fatemi et al., 2020; Bounds et al., 2017; Bounds et al., 2019; Countryman-Roswurm & Bolin, 2014; Edinburgh & Saewyc, 2009; Gibbs et al., 2015; Kahan et al., 2020; Saewyc & Edinburgh, 2010; Slesnick et al., 2018) that evaluated four unique interventions (Lotus Psychoeducational Group, Runaway Intervention Program, Peer Education and Connection through Empowerment, Strengths-Based Outreach and Advocacy) for youth experiencing homelessness and trafficking or commercial sexual exploitation. Table 1 summarizes the outcomes reported for each of the interventions by publication. Many of the records that met our study population criteria did not report on an intervention or prevention program and/or did not include outcomes in their study (many were descriptive studies) and thus are into included in this review. Following the table, we describe the interventions and their evidence of effectiveness. Additional information on the participants (e.g., age, gender, race/ethnicity) of the included studies is included in Appendix B.

We organized outcomes across 12 categories: stable housing, sex exchange behavior, recurrent victimization, runaway status, child-welfare involvement, criminal justice system involvement, substance use, education and employment, mental health need, self-harm behavior, and social-emotional wellbeing. Outcomes that did not correspond to one of the existing categories were labeled as "other youth-level outcomes". The most frequently reported outcomes were mental health and education and/or employment. None of the included studies reported child welfare or criminal justice outcomes.

Table 2. Outcomes reported in studies of intervention and prevention programs for sex trafficking among youth

Intervention[a] / Prevention[b] Citation(s) *(sample size, study design)*	Outcome category										
	Stable Housing	Sex Exchange Behaviors	Recurrent Victimization	Runaway Status	Substance Use	Education/Employment	Mental Health	Other	Physical Health	Self-Harm Behaviors	Social-Emotional Well-being
Lotus Psychoeducational Group[a,b] A 10-session psychoeducational curriculum that fosters protective factors among youth experiencing homelessness who are victims of, or at risk of, domestic minor sex trafficking.											
Countryman-Roswurm and Bolin (2014) *(n=23; unmatched control pre/post)*		👍	👍								👍
Runaway Intervention Program (RIP)[a] A comprehensive, health care focused program for youth aged 12-17 who have run away and who experienced sexual violence.											
Edinburgh and Saewyc (2009) *(n=20; single-group repeated measures)*				👍	👍	👍			👍		
Saewyc and Edinburgh (2010) *(n=68; quasi-experimental study)*					👍*	👍*	👍*			👍*	👍*
Bounds et al. (2019) *(n=362; longitudinal repeated measures)*							👍*			👍*	
Bounds et al. (2017) *(n=361; single-group repeated measures)*							👍*				
Peer Education and Connection through Empowerment (PEACE)[a] A program for youth ages 16-24, peer-led support groups to develop and implement activities to support their mental, physical and social health.											
Kahan et al. (2020) *(n=19; qualitative interviews)*								👍[6]			
Bani-Fatemi et al. (2020) *(n=70; longitudinal observational study)*		👍*			✗		✗	✗[7]			👍*
Strengths-Based Outreach and Advocacy (SBOA)[b] A strengths-based outreach program designed to assist youth (ages 14-24) experiencing homelessness to access needed services.											

---

[6] Engagement and youth satisfaction

[7] Resiliency and mastery

	Outcome category										
Intervention[a] / Prevention[b] Citation(s) *(sample size, study design)*	Stable Housing	Sex Exchange Behaviors	Recurrent Victimization	Runaway Status	Substance Use	Education/Employment	Mental Health	Other	Physical Health	Self-Harm Behaviors	Social-Emotional Well-being
Slesnick et al. (2018) (n=79; longitudinal repeated measures)	👍	👍*8			👍	👍*	👍				

👍: improvement

✗: no change

*: statistically significant

Lotus Psychoeducational Group

Countryman-Roswurn and Bolin (2014) examined a 10-session psychoeducational curriculum to foster protective factors among runaway, homeless, and street youth subjugated to or at risk of domestic minor sex trafficking. Using a pre-post design, authors observed self-reported improvements among the 23 youth who participated in the psychoeducational curriculum including changes in relationship boundary setting (71%), increased knowledge about sex trafficking and abuse (88%), feeling less likely to be involved in an abusive relationship (82%), less likely to become involved in sex trafficking (71%), understanding what to do if in an abusive relationship or being sex trafficked (88%), and understanding how to help themselves or someone else who is being abused or sex trafficked (71%).

Runaway Intervention Program (RIP)

The Runaway Intervention Program (RIP) is a strengths-based approach to addressing the trauma and health needs of youth who have experienced sexual violence and have engaged in running away behaviors. Nurse Practitioners work collaboratively with runaway youth, their families, and school, justice, and social services to provide health care and reconnect youth to supportive relationships.

In a single-group repeated measures design youth (n = 20) reported reductions in risky behaviors and health issues (e.g., STIs) and improved knowledge about health practice one year after receiving RIP (Edinburgh & Saewyc, 2009). A longitudinal repeated measures design with youth at a hospital-based Child Advocacy Center and a comparison group drawn from a community-based sample of youth reported that youth who experienced the highest levels of emotional distress and the lowest levels of connectedness and self-esteem demonstrated the greatest gains from the RIP intervention (Saewyc & Edinburgh, 2010). Girls in the RIP program

---

8 Income from survival behaviors

saw "significant improvements" in protective factors, distress tolerance, and risky behavior at 6- and 12-month follow-up.

A 2017 evaluation reported trauma responses among sexually assaulted or exploited young runaway girls enrolled in RIP (Bounds et al., 2017). The mean trauma response scores decreased at 3 and 6 months and were maintained at 12 months (p<0.001). Analyses indicated that RN visits and empowerment groups were significant independent predictors of the observed improvement. Bounds et al. (2019) reported that RIP improved mental health outcomes for sexually assaulted or exploited young runaway girls, especially those experiencing PTSD and emotional distress related to their victimization. Overall, most of the sample (74%) had PTSD symptom scores that met the criteria for a diagnosis of PTSD. Mean values for emotional distress, suicidal ideation, suicide attempts, and self-injury decreased significantly from baseline to 3 and 6 months and these decreases were maintained at 12 months. Current trauma symptoms followed similar trends. The results also suggest preliminary effectiveness of RIP to reduce trauma responses with runaway youth who have experienced severe forms of sexual violence, including sexual exploitation. Follow up analyses suggest that some intervention effects may take as long as six months to manifest.

Peer Education and Connection through Empowerment (PEACE)
PEACE aims to support and empower survivors of gender-based violence, including human trafficking, by focusing on improved gender identity formation, healthy living, self-esteem and body image, women's physical health, mental health, sexual health, healthy relationships, and coping mechanisms. Kahan and colleagues (2020) used qualitative interviews with service providers and youth survivors of trafficking who were also experiencing homelessness to evaluate their experiences with the three-month PEACE group program. Youth reported satisfaction with the program and providers credited the program's the focus on survivors' needs, the quality and accessibility of the program, and cooperation between and across agencies with overall success. Bani-Fatemi et al. (2020) reported significant improvement in overall quality of life and a decrease in victimization at 12 months after enrollment among 70 females between the ages of 16 to 24 who experienced gender-based violence and homelessness.

Strengths-Based Outreach and Advocacy (SBOA)
The Strengths-Based Outreach and Advocacy (SBOA) program encourages youth to obtain needed services and helps individuals navigate services in the system. Additional features of the model include a dual focus on the youth and their environment, focus on individual strengths rather than deficits, and building agency of individuals in their receipt of the intervention. Slesnick et al. (2018) examined changes in income sources among 79 youth who received SBOA over six months. The researchers used a single group, repeated measures design to evaluate the effect of the intervention on employment and access to formal and informal supports. Retention rates were high with 87-91% of youth available for the 3-, 6-, and 9-month assessments. Changes in income trajectories (e.g., income from legal sources rather than survival behaviors) were positive and accessing formal (e.g., governmental assistance programs) and informal (e.g.,

from family and friends) support increased among youth who received the SBOA intervention (Slesnick et al., 2018).

Assessment and Screening Tools

While screening the literature for relevant publications on interventions or prevention, we also identified publications that described one or more screening or assessment tool to identify youth who had experienced or were at risk of experiencing trafficking. In addition, we conducted web searches and consulted websites and other non-peer reviewed sources for information on screening or assessment tools. This scan was thorough but not systematic. Our inclusion criteria did not require a tool to be validated. The only requirement for inclusion was that it had been used or was clearly indicated for use with youth to assess their risk for, or experience of, trafficking.

We reviewed human trafficking screening tools and assessments and synthesized the results based on applicability for homeless and runaway populations and/or designed for youth and young adults. Despite several available screening and assessment tools specifically for youth experiencing trafficking, there is currently very limited empirical evidence about the utility and validity of these tools. Macy and colleagues (2021) published the most comprehensive review to date of screening and assessment tools for trafficking survivors (adult and youth). In their review, they identified 22 unique screening tools, with a subset indicated for potential use with youth populations. We identified and included 14 screening and assessment tools that may be applicable for use by runaway and homeless youth (RHY) providers. Among these, six are validated to identify youth who have experienced human trafficking. We discuss the psychometric properties in the discussion section that follows. All included tools were designed for use specifically with youth or young adult populations. Among the 14 tools, six were developed to be used with youth experiencing homelessness, among other youth populations. All 14 tools screened or assessed for sex trafficking and seven of those also screened or assessed for labor trafficking.

Table 3 highlights the characteristics of the tools included in this review.

Table 3. Matrix of characteristics of reviewed assessment and screening tools (n=14)

Assessment or Screening Tool and references	Tool Characteristics						
	Validated	Sex Trafficking	Labor Trafficking	Developed for use with RHY	Questionnaire	Specific to Youth	Length
Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Identification Tool (CSE-IT) (Haley et al., 2017)	▲	▲				▲	46 items
Educators and Human Trafficking (Polaris Project, 2011b)		▲	▲			▲	37 items
Human Trafficking Interview and Assessment Measure (HTIAM-14) (Bigelson et al., 2013)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	50+ items
Human Trafficking of Children Indicator Tool (State of Florida Department of Children and Families, 2009)		▲	▲			▲	4 domains
Human Trafficking Screening Tool: Florida Departments of Children and Families (DCF) and Juvenile Justice (DJJ) (Florida Department of Children and Families)		▲	▲		▲	▲	40 items (plus background and parent items)
Human Trafficking Screening Tool (HTST): Urban Institute (Dank et al., 2017)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	19 items (~2-5 minutes)
InterCSECt Screening Tool (Salisbury et al., 2015)		▲			▲	▲	Main screening tool is 7 items
Minnesota Youth Trafficking and Exploitation Identification (MYTEI) Tool (Safe Harbor)		▲				▲	Not specified
Quick Youth Indicators of Trafficking (QYIT) (Chisolm-Straker et al., 2019)	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	▲	4 items
Safe Harbors Youth Intervention Project Screening Questions (Bortel et al., 2008)		▲		▲	▲	▲	10 items
Sexual Exploitation Risk Assessment Framework (SERAF) (South Gloucestershire Council, 2020)		▲			▲	▲	30 items

Assessment or Screening Tool and references	Tool Characteristics						
	Validated	Sex Trafficking	Labor Trafficking	Developed for use with RHY	Questionnaire	Specific to Youth	Length
Shared Hope International's Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking (DMST) Intake Tool (Leitch & Snow, 2010)		▲			▲	▲	Tier 1 (34 items) Tier 2 (48 items)
Short Screen for Child Sex Trafficking (SSCST) (Greenbaum et al., 2018)	▲	▲			▲	▲	6 items
Trafficking Victims Identification Tool (TVIT) (Simich et al., 2014)	▲	▲	▲		▲	▲	Long (34-42 items) Short (16-20 items)
Grand Total	6	14	7	4	10	14	

DISCUSSION

We conducted this review to summarize the state of the science on human trafficking prevention and intervention efforts, and existing trafficking screening and assessment tools for youth experiencing homelessness or housing instability, or who have runaway. We looked for published reports of intervention or prevention efforts that addressed sex trafficking among youth experiencing homelessness. We also compiled a collection of trafficking assessment and screening tools that would be helpful for service providers working with youth who have experienced or are at risk of experiencing sex trafficking.

Key Findings: Intervention and Prevention

We included eight publications that evaluated four unique interventions. The types of interventions included both prevention and intervention and protection programs. Broadly, the interventions and prevention efforts aimed to provide services such as cognitive-behavioral therapy, healthcare, housing, and other services to homeless, trafficked youth appear to reduce trauma responses and the risk of trafficking overall.

Three of the programs (RIP, PEACE and SBOA) showed statistically significant improvements in certain domains. Specifically, at least one program showed significant improvements in the following outcome categories: sex exchange behaviors, recurrent victimization, substance use, education and employment, mental health, self-harm behaviors, and social and emotional well-being.

The RIP program showed significant improvements across the most categories in this review. Three of the studies that evaluated RIP found significant improvements in participant's mental health and two showed improvements in self-harm behaviors. Other areas of significant improvement were in substance use, education and employment, and social and emotional well-being.

Gaps remain in the research. There is very limited research on intervention and prevention programs for youth experiencing homelessness and trafficking victims. Further, research designs for the majority of the studies were not rigorous, lack comparison groups, include small sample sizes, and outcomes were often self-reported.

Implications for Prevention and Intervention Efforts

There are several avenues for prevention and intervention efforts related to interventions designed and/or tailored for YEH and human trafficking. First, interventions need to assess multiple—or more diverse sets—of outcomes. Most of the studies included primarily focused on youth mental health needs (e.g., decreasing PTSD symptoms) and substance abuse as primary outcomes of interest. Only a few studies examined recurrent victimization, sex exchange behaviors, and future running away behavior—all of which are known indicators of human trafficking risk. None of the intervention or prevention studies included outcomes related to child welfare or criminal justice system involvement. As there has been movement toward using

specialty courts for trafficking survivors (see Kulig & Butler, 2019) there is a need to monitor these efforts to improve outcomes for YEH and trafficking and reduce chances for criminalization of YEH and trafficking through the justice system. Intervention timing and modality will also be critical to examine in future research and evaluation.

Despite several promising interventions for YEH and human trafficking, there are several limitations to these interventions as it relates to their scope and research design. In terms of research design, there is a need for more rigorous research designs to evaluate the effectiveness of these interventions including experimental, quasi-experimental, or prospective designs with comparison groups. While single group designs with smaller samples are useful to gather pilot data or establish intervention feasibility, future research on these interventions with trafficking survivors should implement more rigorous evaluations (e.g., experimental or quasi-experimental including a comparison or control group) with larger samples and clearly defined outcomes of interest. Larger samples would allow researchers and evaluators to disaggregate findings by subgroups (e.g., gender, age, race/ethnicity, nationality). Finally, in terms of intervention scope and target population, most of the studies included in this evidence review focused on YEH populations in the United States with samples of predominantly female-identifying youth experiencing sex trafficking. More research is needed on YEH and trafficking from diverse backgrounds and different types of trafficking (e.g., labor trafficking or both sex and labor trafficking).

Key Findings: Assessment and Screening

We examined the known/reported psychometric properties of the measures we located. Screening and assessment tools can play a very important role in practice, policy, and research; studies that include information on the quality of those instruments include information that helps users decide which is the best tool to use. Reliability and validity are the most important psychometric properties of these tools and each has different facets. Reliability is the extent to which the tool can produce consistent results across time and in differing circumstances. Validity is how well a tool measures what it aims or purports to measure (see Appendix C for more information). A measure cannot be valid if it is not reliable. To guide use of the trafficking tools, table x provides a summary of psychometric properties that are available for six of the 14 included tools.

Target Population and Trafficking Type

All 14 screening and assessment tools included youth as the main target population. As reviewed in Table 1, all of the instruments were specifically screening or assessing for sex trafficking victimization, and several were indicated for use to screen or assess both sex and labor trafficking (n = 7). Screening tools most frequently asked questions about living conditions and youth behaviors (e.g., experiences of homelessness, exchanging sex for shelter, running away from home). Youth-specific screening questions included questions about truancy, use or familiarity with online venues for sex exchange, and risky work conditions (Chisolm-Straker et al., 2019; Haley et al., 2017; Polaris Project, 2011a).

Psychometric Properties

Six (43%) of the 14 screening and assessment tools reported empirical data about the reliability and/or validity of the instrument for trafficking. Most reported on predictive validity psychometric properties. The TVIT also reported on internal consistency and demonstrated high ratings of validity and reliability for the tool as a whole, as well as the individual sections of the instrument that screen for sex trafficking and labor trafficking. The CSE-IT included detailed information about the face validity, content validity, and reliability measures. The study examining CSE-IT also used exploratory factor analysis to examine the structure of the assessment questions across empirical domains (Basson, 2017). In another example, Chisolm-Straker and colleagues (2019) created the QYIT, a four-item tool to screen for sex trafficking among homeless youth with nearly 90% sensitivity (true positive rate). The study examining the HTST analyzed its face and content validity, feasibility for implementation, factorial validity and internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, concurrent validity, and predictive validity. The study showed evidence of validity in both the full and short versions. However, the positive predictive value was only 61%, meaning for approximately 6 in 10 youth, HTST correctly predicted youth as trafficking victims "according to the administering practitioner's beliefs and observations" (Dank et al., 2017). Comparatively, the SSCT study tested a short (6-item) screening tool with youth appearing in healthcare settings and were identified as victims of commercial sexual exploitation of children/child sex trafficking (CSEC/CST) as well as patients with allegations of acute sexual abuse without evidence of CSEC/CST. The study found that youth with at least 2 positive answers to the 6-item questionnaire identified child sex trafficking victims 92% of the time. This tool performed better than the HTST to positively predict youth as trafficking victims, but not as well to correctly predict that a youth was not victimized. Missing victims in a screening tool can have dire consequences, but individual providers should take into account their youth populations and other considerations when weighing these validity results to decide which is best to meet their needs. Table 4 details the 6 instruments with reported psychometric properties.

Table 4. Reported psychometric properties of assessment and screening tools

Instrument	Reliability/Validity
Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Identification Tool (CSE-IT) (Basson, 2017; Haley et al., 2017)	Housing and Caregiving items: Cronbach's α: 0.857 (Good)
Human Trafficking Interview and Assessment Measure (HTIAM-14) (Bigelson et al., 2013)	Study identified 14.9% of the 185 individuals interviewed had experienced some form of human trafficking before their time at the shelter; effective in differentiating those who had and had not been trafficked, comparing tool to information in agency case files.

Human Trafficking Screening Tool (HTST): Urban Institute (Dank et al., 2017)	Reliability: Cronbach's α: 0.922 (Excellent) Validity: Sensitivity: 61%; Specificity: 85%
Quick Youth Indicators of Trafficking (QYIT) (Chisolm-Straker et al., 2019)	Sensitivity: 87.6% Specificity: 76.5%
Short Screen for Child Sex Trafficking (SSCST) (Greenbaum et al., 2018)	When individuals give positive response to 2 of 6 items: Sensitivity: 92% Specificity: 73%
Trafficking Victims Identification Tool (TVIT) (Simich et al., 2014)	ENTIRE TOOL Cronbach's α: 0.910 (Excellent) SEX TRAFFICKING Cronbach's α: 0.817 (Good) Sensitivity: 98.9% Specificity: 92.1% Correctly classified: 96.8% of individuals experiencing sex trafficking LABOR TRAFFICKING Cronbach's α: 0.753 (Acceptable) Sensitivity: 94.1% Specificity: 90.6% Correctly classified: 92.8% of individuals experiencing labor trafficking

Administration and/or Validation with YEH and Trafficking

Of the six tools in this report with empirical data, three - the Human Trafficking Interview and Assessment Measure (HTIAM-14) (Bigelson et al., 2013), the Quick Youth Indicators of Trafficking (QYIT) (Chisolm-Straker et al., 2019), and the Human Trafficking Screening Tool (HTST) (Dank et al., 2017; Mostajabian et al., 2017), were validated for use with YEH. The HTST was tested with 617 youth in RHY and CW settings, and found the full length and shorter version of the tool are effective in identifying youth who are trafficking victims. Further, practitioners in both the RHY and CW systems assessed the tool as easy to administer. The QYIT, developed and validated with participants at a service provider for homeless young adults, is very brief, highly sensitive, and does not require an expert in trafficking to administer (Chisolm-Straker et al., 2019). Developers compiled items from previous guidelines and existing tools, combined with additional questions to create the HTIAM-14 designed specifically to asses trafficking victimization among homeless youth population served at a RHY provider in New Jersey. Known victims of trafficking assisted with instrument development.

Implications for Assessment and Screening Practices

There is a need for more studies that explore the reliability and validity of screening tools for YEH and trafficking. There is a need for clarity around how well tools operate across populations (e.g., whether the assessment performs equally well by gender, race/ethnicity, etc.) and types of trafficking (e.g., sex trafficking or labor trafficking).

Screening and Assessment Tools Summary
The tools with **information about psychometric properties**:

1. Human Trafficking Interview and Assessment Measure (HTIAM-14)
2. Quick Youth Indicators of Trafficking (QYIT)
3. Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Identification Tool (CSE-IT)
4. Trafficking Victims Identification Tool (TVIT)
5. Short Screen for Child Sex Trafficking (SSCST)
6. Human Trafficking Screening Tool (HTST)

The tools that included **both psychometric properties and have been used with YEH and trafficking populations and/or in RHY settings** included:

1. Human Trafficking Interview and Assessment Measure (HTIAM-14)
2. Quick Youth Indicators of Trafficking (QYIT)
3. Trafficking Victims Identification Tool (TVIT)
4. Human Trafficking Screening Tool (HTST)

Of course, effectively administering a screening or assessment depends on administering it at the right time, in the right place, and with staff trained to do so. Many of the included tools have guides that accompany the instrument to help prepare for and provide best practices around implementation. Further, a provider's goal for the tool will determine which one to choose. As mentioned at the start, screening tools and assessment tools serve different purposes. If the needs of the provider are to understand the extent of the trafficking victimization in order to tailor services, an assessment tool may be prioritized. If providers are unsure of trafficking victimization with their youth population but are aware of more common risk factors that increase a young person's vulnerability to trafficking, then a screening tool may best meet their needs. And if trafficking victimization is suspected, a combination of a screening tool followed by an assessment tool may be the best option. In our recommendations below, we highlight a set of questions that may guide a practitioner's choice of the tool.

Recommendations

Based on this review, we present seven key research and policy recommendations for the field to consider. We first discuss our recommendations for future **research** related to human trafficking screening and assessment include:

1. Validate existing tools and disaggregate validation by subpopulations and types of trafficking. While validated scales are critical to this work, scale development and validation is a long, technical process and resource intensive process. Items must first be generated, and the validity of their content is assessed before the scale is constructed. Constructing the sale involves pre=testing, administration, and understanding how many domains the scale captures. Finally, dimensions and reliability are tested, and validity assessed (Boateng et al, 2018). Disaggregating validation by different populations prioritized by the scale and for the different types of trafficking will make the tool more practical for providers in different context.

2. Create culturally appropriate response protocols for service providers. Macy et al.'s (2021) scoping review notes that there are no specific response protocols associated with human trafficking screening and assessment tools. YEH and trafficking practitioners across a wide variety of settings (e.g., juvenile justice, child welfare, school-based service providers) should carefully review the assessment and screening information to consider the most appropriate tool for their setting and the relative strengths/weaknesses of the tool (e.g., that few of these have been validated and, even when they have been validated they may not be appropriate for the service providers setting). Protocols may include a set of questions to guide a provider's choice to select a tool, such as:

   1. Purpose: What are you looking to measure or learn about?

   2. When, where, and how will the tool be used (e.g., intake, screening, clinical; paper and pencil; aloud; etc.)? These considerations are important from the standpoint of the individual, that is, the setting and tone in which the tool is given can affect an individual's responses.

   3. Will the tool be used to guide decisions about eligibility? If so, explore how it has been used and how effective it seemed to be in identifying trafficking and other experiences that are relevant (e.g., validity).

   4. Examine the reliability and validity information on each tool that seems to suit your purpose.

   5. Once you have a few questionnaires or measures to consider, ask front line staff to review them for wording, sensitivity, and so on?

3. Share and disseminate findings about service providers use of trafficking screening tools broadly.

Our recommendations for future **policy and practice** as it pertains to human trafficking screening and assessment include:

1. Prioritize culturally responsive, trauma-informed approaches to administering HT screening/assessment in various YEH settings. Among other practices, these include:

   o Ensure confidentiality during/after interview;

- Ensure cultural and linguistic appropriateness of questions;

- Explain the interviewee's rights and establish rapport with interviewee, including ensuring their comfort and basic needs are met;

- Prioritize the interviewee's safety and needs; and

- Use trauma-informed and strengths-based approaches throughout the process (Macy et al., 2021).

2. Partner with research and evaluation teams to develop and validate screening tools for appropriate use in their settings.   For example, service providers working with young ppl who may be trafficked can work in partnership with university faculty or research center staff to carefully evaluate the tools that are best suited for their work as well as demonstrating reliability and validity. Research partnerships can enable the development, testing, and refinement of tools that are attuned to specific circumstances in the field. Collaborative work between assessment experts and practitioners can address an array of concerns and produce quality measures that operate well in the field. Sometimes providers note important limitations of existing tools and they can provide critical input and influence toward better measurement. Practitioners leverage ample field experience and may have lived expertise that can inform the development of items and questionnaires that are sensitive and reflect the experiences of individuals who experience trafficking.

3. We generally encourage the use of established measures due to the fact that their reliability and validity have been tested and programs can compare the characteristics and outcomes of the individuals they work with, enabling insights about the comparative severity of trafficking, its characteristics and impact, and how individuals respond to and manage the associated trauma across time.

Limitations of the Research

As described throughout, there were several notable limitations with this review and with respect to the available research on interventions relevant to YEH and human trafficking. Research designs for intervention studies were not rigorous (e.g., exploratory pre-post, single group), sample sizes were small, and outcomes were often self-reported. Given there were few evaluations to include in our pool, we deemed it important to be liberal with the inclusion of various types of evaluations, despite potential limitations with the design and/or sample.

To make stronger inferences, there is room for growth in the area of rigorous research designs and outcome evaluations (e.g., experimental or quasi-experimental designs using prospective and longitudinal measures). There were no intervention or prevention efforts targeted labor trafficking victimization—leaving room to broaden the scope and impact of interventions for YEH and trafficking. The screening and assessment literature was also limited on that front; there were only four tools with validity data that included questions or items about labor trafficking. Moreover, most of the instruments were developed (and 43% validated) specifically for domestic minor sex trafficking. Many tools were identified through agency or non-governmental reports

rather than through peer-reviewed research articles. These "home grown" measures likely reflect important priorities in the field.

In sum, there is a need for more research and rigorous evaluation across all aspects (prevention, intervention, screening, and assessment) of YEH and trafficking populations and RHY social service settings. This should include the development of guidelines across RHY social service settings (e.g., juvenile/criminal justice, child welfare, human service organizations) that target specific areas of need (e.g., legal services, housing needs, health care) with YEH and trafficking. It also includes establishing more evidence on practices related to screening and assessment. IF a validated tool is administered outside of a trauma-informed approach or without the requisite trusted, the information reported won't necessarily be reported. All areas of need should be linked to the development and implementation of prevention efforts, interventions, and screening/assessment tools for YEH and trafficking.

Limitations of this Review

We included a wide range of study designs, including those without a valid comparison group. Inclusion of these study designs was important to understand the evidence landscape for this population and identify critical gaps in the scholarly and evaluative evidence base. However, inclusion of less rigorous study designs in a review increases the risk of introducing bias into the conclusions. The evidence for the interventions is not supported by rigorous, large scale experimental studies. Given there are so few evaluations, we deemed it appropriate to adjust the threshold for inclusion to include as much information as possible. The summary of outcomes reported provides an overview of what is represented currently in the literature and is insufficient for recommending any specific intervention or prevention strategy.

Conclusion

The goal of this review was to summarize the evidence for human trafficking interventions and prevention among youth experiencing homelessness and to describe evidence about human trafficking assessment and screening practices that may be applicable for runaway and homeless youth populations and the service providers working with them. We identified just eight publications on four interventions that reported youth-level outcomes for youth experiencing homelessness and trafficking. We identified 14 unique assessment or screening tools relevant to youth populations who may be experiencing trafficking and/or at-risk for trafficking. Most of the screening and assessment tools had not been formally validated with YEH and trafficking. Nonetheless, there are several tools that show promise for this population—or could be adapted for use with YEH and trafficking—across a wide variety of settings. Despite some of the limitations described above, this review offers important evidence regarding the state of the literature about interventions and assessment practices with YEH and human trafficking.

REFERENCES

Bani-Fatemi, A., Malta, M., Noble, A., Wang, W., Rajakulendran, T., Kahan, D., & Stergiopoulos, V. (2020). Supporting Female Survivors of Gender-Based Violence Experiencing Homelessness: Outcomes of a Health Promotion Psychoeducation Group Intervention. *Front Psychiatry*, *11*, 601540. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2020.601540

Basson, D. (2017). *Validation of the Commercial Sexual Exploitation-Identification Tool* WestCoast Children's Clinic.

Bigelson, J., Vuotto, S., Addison, K., Trongone, S., & Tully, K. (2013). *Homelessness, survival sex, and Human Trafficking: As Experienced by the Youth of Covenant House.* New York: Covenant House.

Boateng GO, Neilands TB, Frongillo EA, Melgar-Quiñonez HR & Young SL. (2018). Best Practices for Developing and Validating Scales for Health, Social, and Behavioral Research: A Primer. *Frontiers in Public Health,* 6:149. https://doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149

Bortel, A., Ellingen, M., Ellison, R., Phillips, R., & Thomas, C. (2008). Sex trafficking needs assessment for the state of Minnesota. *Minneapolis: The Advocates for Human Rights*.

Bounds, D., Edinburgh, L., Fogg, L., & Saewyc, E. (2017). The Minnesota Runaway Intervention Program's Influence on Sexually Exploited Youth's Trauma Responses. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *60*(2), S22-S23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2016.10.063

Bounds, D. T., Edinburgh, L. D., Fogg, L. F., & Saeywc, E. M. (2019). A nurse practitioner-led intervention for runaway adolescents who have been sexually assaulted or sexually exploited: Effects on trauma symptoms, suicidality, and self-injury. *Child Abuse Negl*, *90*, 99-107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2019.01.023

Bucher, C. E. C. (2008). Toward a needs-based typology of homeless youth. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *42*(6), 549-554.

Chisolm-Straker, M., Sze, J., Einbond, J., White, J., & Stoklosa, H. (2019). Screening for human trafficking among homeless young adults [Article]. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *98*, 72-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2018.12.014

Choi, K. R. (2015). Risk Factors for Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking in the United States: A Literature Review. *Journal of Forensic Nursing*, *11*(2), 66-76. https://doi.org/10.1097/jfn.0000000000000072

Cochran, B. N., Stewart, A. J., Ginzler, J. A., & Cauce, A. M. (2002). Challenges Faced by Homeless Sexual Minorities: Comparison of Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender

Homeless Adolescents With Their Heterosexual Counterparts. *American Journal of Public Health*, *92*(5), 773-777. https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.92.5.773

Countryman-Roswurm, K., & Bolin, B. L. (2014). Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: Assessing and Reducing Risk [Article]. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, *31*(6), 521-538. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10560-014-0336-6

Dank, M. L., Yahner, J., Yu, L., Vasquez-Noriega, C., Gelatt, J., & Pergamit, M. R. (2017). *Pretesting a human trafficking screening tool in the child welfare and runaway and homeless youth systems* New York, NY: Urban Institute.

de Vries, I., Kafafian, M., Goggin, K., Bouchard, E., Goldfarb, S., & Farrell, A. (2020). Enhancing the Identification of Commercial Sexual Exploitation Among a Population of High-Risk Youths Using Predictive Regularization Models. *Child Maltreat*, *25*(3), 318-327. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077559519889178

Edinburgh, L. D., & Saewyc, E. M. (2009). A novel, intensive home-visiting intervention for runaway, sexually exploited girls. *J Spec Pediatr Nurs*, *14*(1), 41-48. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6155.2008.00174.x

Finkelhor, D., Vaquerano, J., & Stranski, M. (2017). Sex trafficking of minors: How many juveniles are being prostituted in the US? 2017 update.

Florida Department of Children and Families. *Human Trafficking Screening Tool Administration Guide (HTST) CF-FSP 5406.* Retrieved from https://www.flrules.org/Gateway/reference.asp?No=Ref-06228

Franchino-Olsen, H. (2021). Vulnerabilities Relevant for Commercial Sexual Exploitation of Children/Domestic Minor Sex Trafficking: A Systematic Review of Risk Factors. *Trauma Violence Abuse*, *22*(1), 99-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838018821956

Franchino-Olsen, H., Chesworth, B. R., Boyle, C., Rizo, C. F., Martin, S. L., Jordan, B., Macy, R. J., & Stevens, L. (2020). The Prevalence of Sex Trafficking of Children and Adolescents in the United States: A Scoping Review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *23*(1), 182-195. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838020933873

Gaetz, S., & O'Grady, B. (2013). Why Don't You Just Get a Job? Homeless Youth, Social Exclusion and Employment Training. *Youth homelessness in Canada: Implications for policy and practice*, 243-268.

Gangamma, R., Slesnick, N., Toviessi, P., & Serovich, J. (2008). Comparison of HIV risks among gay, lesbian, bisexual and heterosexual homeless youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *37*(4), 456-464.

Gibbs, D. A., Hardison Walters, J. L., Lutnick, A., Miller, S., & Kluckman, M. (2015). Services to domestic minor victims of sex trafficking: Opportunities for engagement and support

[Article]. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *54*, 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.04.003

Greenbaum, V. J., Dodd, M., & McCracken, C. (2018). A Short Screening Tool to Identify Victims of Child Sex Trafficking in the Health Care Setting. *Pediatr Emerg Care*, *34*(1), 33-37. https://doi.org/10.1097/pec.0000000000000602

Greene, J. M., Ennett, S. T., & Ringwalt, C. L. (1997). Substance use among runaway and homeless youth in three national samples. *Am J Public Health*, *87*(2), 229-235.

Greene, J. M., & Ringwalt, C. L. (1998). Pregnancy among three national samples of runaway and homeless youth. *J Adolesc Health*, *23*(6), 370-377.

Haley, H., Basson, D., & Langs, J. (2017). *Screening to identify commercially sexually exploited children.* Oakland, CA. Retrieved from https://www.westcoastcc.org/wpcontent/uploads/2017/09/WCC-CSE-IT-ImplementationGuide-FINAL.pdf

Heerde, J. A., Hemphill, S. A., & Scholes-Balog, K. E. (2014). 'Fighting' for survival: A systematic review of physically violent behavior perpetrated and experienced by homeless young people. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *19*(1), 50-66. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2013.12.002

Hodgson, K. J., Shelton, K. H., van den Bree, M. B., & Los, F. J. (2013). Psychopathology in young people experiencing homelessness: a systematic review. *Am J Public Health*, *103*(6), e24-37. https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.2013.301318

Kahan, D., Lamanna, D., Rajakulendran, T., Noble, A., & Stergiopoulos, V. (2020). Implementing a trauma-informed intervention for homeless female survivors of gender-based violence: Lessons learned in a large Canadian urban centre. *Health Soc Care Community*, *28*(3), 823-832. https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.12913

Kulig, T. C., & Butler, L. C. (2019). From "Whores" to "Victims": The Rise and Status of Sex Trafficking Courts. *Victims & Offenders*, *14*(3), 299-321. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2019.1595242

Laird, J. J., Klettke, B., Hall, K., Clancy, E., & Hallford, D. (2020). Demographic and Psychosocial Factors Associated With Child Sexual Exploitation: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis [Review]. *JAMA Netw Open*, *3*(9), e2017682. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.17682

Le, P. D., Ryan, N., Rosenstock, Y., & Goldmann, E. (2018). Health Issues Associated with Commercial Sexual Exploitation and Sex Trafficking of Children in the United States: A Systematic Review. *Behavioral Medicine*, *44*(3), 219-233. https://doi.org/10.1080/08964289.2018.1432554

Leitch, L., & Snow, M. A. (2010). *Intervene: Identifying and Responding to America's Prostituted Youth.* Arlington, VA: Shared Hope International. Retrieved from https://www.thresholdglobalworks.com/pdfs/sex-trafficking-guide.pdf

Macy, R. J., Klein, L. B., Shuck, C. A., Rizo, C. F., Van Deinse, T. B., Wretman, C. J., & Luo, J. (2021). A scoping review of human trafficking screening and response. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15248380211057273.

Medlow, S., Klineberg, E., & Steinbeck, K. (2014). The health diagnoses of homeless adolescents: a systematic review of the literature. *J Adolesc*, *37*(5), 531-542. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.04.003

Milburn, N. G., Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Rice, E., Mallet, S., & Rosenthal, D. (2006). Cross-National Variations in Behavioral Profiles Among Homeless Youth [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-005-9005-4]. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, *37*(1-2), 63. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1007/s10464-005-9005-4

Morton, M. H., Dworsky, A., & Samuels, G. M. (2017). Missed Opportunities: Youth Homelessness in America. National Estimates. *Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago*.

Morton, M. H., Kugley, S., Epstein, R. A., & Farrell, A. F. (2019). Missed Opportunities: Evidence on Interventions for Addressing Youth Homelessness. *Chapin Hall at the University of Chicago*.

Mostajabian, S., Bocchini, C., Wiemann, C. M., & Santa Maria, D. (2017). IF YOU ASK, THEY WILL TELL: IDENTIFYING RISK FOR HUMAN TRAFFICKING AMONG HOMELESS YOUTH. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *60*(2), S63-S64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2016.10.309

Murphy, L. (2017). Labor and sex trafficking among homeless youth: A Ten City Study (Executive Summary).

Ottisova, L., Hemmings, S., Howard, L. M., Zimmerman, C., & Oram, S. (2016). Prevalence and risk of violence and the mental, physical and sexual health problems associated with human trafficking: an updated systematic review. *Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences*, *25*(4), 317-341. https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045796016000135

Polaris Project. (2011a). *Comprehensive human trafficking assessment.* Washington, D.C., USA: Polaris Project. Retrieved from https://humantraffickinghotline.org/sites/default/files/Comprehensive%20Trafficking%20Assessment.pdf

Polaris Project. (2011b). *Educators and human trafficking: In depth review.* Washington, D.C., USA: Polaris Project. Retrieved from https://humantraffickinghotline.org/sites/default/files/In%20Depth%20Review%20for%20Educators.pdf

RTI International. (2021). *Improving outcomes for child and youth victims of human trafficking: Compendium of resources.* RTI International.

Saewyc, E. M., & Edinburgh, L. D. (2010). Restoring healthy developmental trajectories for sexually exploited young runaway girls: fostering protective factors and reducing risk behaviors. *J Adolesc Health*, *46*(2), 180-188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.06.010

Safe Harbor. *Minnesota Youth Trafficking and Exploitation Identification Tool and Guide.* Minnesota Department of Health. Retrieved from https://www.health.state.mn.us/communities/safeharbor/communities/mytei.html

Salisbury, E. J., Dabney, J. D., & Russell, K. (2015). Diverting victims of commercial sexual exploitation from juvenile detention: development of the InterCSECt screening protocol. *J Interpers Violence*, *30*(7), 1247-1276. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514539846

Simich, L., Goyen, L., Powell, A., & Mallozzi, K. (2014). *Improving human trafficking victim identification: Validation and dissemination of a screening tool.* Retrieved from https://www.ojp.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/246712.pdf

Slesnick, N., Zhang, J., & Yilmazer, T. (2018). Employment and Other Income Sources Among Homeless Youth. *J Prim Prev*, *39*(3), 247-262. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10935-018-0511-1

South Gloucestershire Council. (2020). *Sexual exploitation risk assessment framework (SERAF).* Bristol, UK: South Gloucestershire Council.

State of Florida Department of Children and Family. (2009). *Human Trafficking of Children Indicator Tool.* Retrieved from https://humantraffickinghotline.org/sites/default/files/HumanTraffickingOfChildrenIndicatoTool%20-%20FL%20DCF.pdf

Suwetty, A. M., Astari, A. M., & Wihastuti, T. A. (2019). Mental Health of Human trafficking; A Systematic Review. *Research Journal of Life Science; Vol 6, No 2 (2019)*. https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.rjls.2019.006.02.6

The Endnote Team. (2014). *EndNote*. In (Version EndNote X8) Clarivate.

Toro, P. A., Lesperance, T. M., & Braciszewski, J. M. (2011). The heterogeneity of homeless youth in America: Examining typologies. *National Alliance to End Homelessness: Washington, DC*.

Victims of Trafficking and Violence Protection Act of 2000, § Pub. L. 106–386, 114 Stat. 1464, codified as amended at 22 U.S.C. 7101-7110. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PLAW-106publ386/pdf/PLAW-106publ386.pdf

Whitbeck, L. B., Chen, X., Hoyt, D. R., Tyler, K. A., & Johnson, K. D. (2004). Mental disorder, subsistence strategies, and victimization among gay, lesbian, and bisexual homeless and runaway adolescents. *J Sex Res*, *41*(4), 329-342. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224490409552240

Wolfe, D. S., Greeson, J. K. P., Wasch, S., & Treglia, D. (2018). Human trafficking prevalence and child welfare risk factors among homeless youth a Multi-City study.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Data Extraction Form

General Information

Study authors
Full reference citation
Name of person extracting data
Date form completed (dd/mm/year)
Notes:

Study Characteristics

Study objective (summary of study's focus)
Study design (e.g., qualitative, descriptive quantitative, process evaluation, experimental, or quasi-experimental evaluation design)
Comparison group (if eligible experimental or quasi-experimental evaluation design)
Sample (e.g., random, stratified, systematic)
Participant characteristics (e.g., age, sex, race/ethnicity)
Recruitment method (e.g., phone, mail, online)
Notes:

Intervention Characteristics

Type of intervention (e.g., prevention, protection, or prosecution of traffickers)
Description of intervention
Notes:

Outcomes

Youth-level outcome(s) description (e.g., mental and physical health needs, drug use, criminal justice involvement, child welfare involvement, and self-harm behaviors) and results
Housing outcome(s) description (e.g., stable housing, runaway status, education, employment, and social-emotional wellbeing) and results
Trafficking outcome(s) description (e.g., recurrent victimization, sex exchange behaviors, age of first sexual experience, total number of sexual partners, family/peer involvement in sex trafficking, protective factors and risk factors) and results
Notes:

Appendix B. Intervention studies and descriptions

This appendix provides more details on the sample characteristics of the study (Table B-1)

Table B-1. Sample Characteristics of the Intervention Studies (eight publications reporting on four unique interventions)

Citation	Intervention	Sample Size	Sample Characteristics
Bani-Fatemi et al. (2020)	PEACE	n= 70	Age: 16-24; Race/ethnicity: Black (37.2%), White (22.8%), Other (40%); Gender: Transgender (2.8%), Both female and male (n = 1); Did not disclose (n =1)
Bounds et al. (2017)	RIP	n = 361	Age: 11-17; Gender: 96% female
Bounds et al. (2019)	RIP	n = 362	Age: 11-18; Gender: 96% female
Countryman-Roswurm and Bolin (2014)	LOTUS	n = 23	Age: 14-21; Gender: Female (56%), male (35%), other (9%); Race/Ethnicity: Caucasian (39%), African American (22%), Hispanics (9%), Native American (13%), Bi-racial (17%)
Edinburgh and Saewyc (2009)	RIP	n = 20	Age: 10-14; Gender: all female youth; Race/Ethnicity: Hmong (90%), Native American (5%), Latina (5%)
Kahan et al. (2020)	PEACE	n = 19 stakeholders (service users, providers, peers, administrators)	Age: 19-24; Gender: bi-gender (1) female-identified (11); Race/Ethnicity: Caucasian, Black, South Asian and mixed
Saewyc and Edinburgh (2010)	RIP	n = 68	Age, mean: 13.75 ±1.13; Race/Ethnicity: White (12.3%), Black (12.3%), Hmong/Asian (55.4%), Hispanic (3.1%), American Indian (3.1%), Multi-ethnic (12.3)
Slesnick et al. (2018)	SBOA	n = 79	Age: 18-24 (20.84 ± 2.1); Gender: female (46.8%), male (53.2%); Race/Ethnicity: white not of Hispanic origin (57.0%), Other (43.0%)

Appendix C. Reliability and validity measures

Table C-1. Reliability and validity measures reported in assessment and screening tools

Test	What it is	Measure	Acceptable ranges
Validity: *How accurately the instrument actually measures the outcome of interest*			
Predictive validity	How well the instrument predicts true positives and true negatives.	Sensitivity: A true positive. The likelihood of getting a positive result if the individual does have the outcome of interest. Specificity: A true negative. The likelihood of getting a negative result if the individual does not have the outcome of interest.	Reported as a percentage. As close to 100% as possible.
Reliability: *Whether the instrument will give the same results each time if used in the same setting with the same subjects*			
Internal consistency	How well an instrument addresses/measures different constructs and delivers reliable scores.	Cronbach alpha (α)	Excellent: $\alpha \geq 0.9$ Good: $0.9 > \alpha \geq 0.8$ Acceptable: $0.8 > \alpha \geq 0.7$ Questionable: $0.7 > \alpha \geq 0.6$ Poor: $0.6 > \alpha \geq 0.5$ Unacceptable: $0.5 > \alpha$

Appendix D. Search Strategies

Trafficking; human traffick*; modern slavery; sex traffick*; sex* exploit*; labor traffick*; labor exploitation; indentured servitude; debt bondage; domestic servitude; survival sex; prostitution; modern slavery; forced servitude; forced enslavement; forced labor; forced marriage; "Human traffick*" OR "modern slavery" OR "sex traffick*" OR "sex* exploit*" OR "labor traffick*" OR "labor exploitation" OR "indentured servitude" OR "debt bondage" OR "domestic servitude" OR "survival sex" OR "prostitution" OR "modern slavery" OR "forced servitude" OR "forced enslavement" OR "forced labor" OR "forced marriage"; "Human traffick*" OR "modern slavery" OR "sex traffick*" OR "sex* exploit*" OR "labor traffick*" OR "labor exploitation" OR "indentured servitude" OR "debt bondage" OR "domestic servitude" OR "survival sex" OR "prostitution" OR "modern slavery" OR "forced servitude" OR "forced enslavement" OR "forced labor" OR "forced marriage"

 Youth; adolescent; underage; teenage; child; adolescent; "transition age"; TS=("transition-age" OR "youth transition*" OR "transition* youth" OR "aging out") ;

TS=("foster care" OR "foster home" OR "child welfare" OR "out-of-home" OR "residential care" OR "congregate care" OR "group home" OR "detention")

TS=(homeless* OR "unstably housed" OR "unstable housing" OR runaway)"