**Appendix B**

**Risk of bias**

There are some limitations of video interventions and their evaluation. We have adhered to the recommendations of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (version 5.1.0) (Higgins et al., 2011) and used a domain-based evaluation, in which critical assessments are made for separate domains. We assessed a risk of both selection and attrition bias. With regard to the selection bias, we focused on the following: a) method of sampling schools or universities included in the studies, b) method of sampling study participants (and related response rate) and c) randomization of participants into experimental and control group (including the related differences between the two groups). With respect to attrition bias, we focused on the response rate at the follow-up, methods used to enhance response rate at follow-up(s); and the strategies to deal with high withdrawals from study. This is summarized in the following table. None of the studies included in the final analyses described the process of sampling of particular school(s) or university**.** Participants included in the studies were chosen from the large body of eligible students, however, only eight studies stated what the response rate was. Three studies (one CBA, one Cl-RCT and one RCT) reported 100% response rate in this respect. For RCTs, students´ participation in the study was either strictly voluntary (seven out of 15), or mandatory (one out of 15) or they received credits for participation (seven out of 15). The majority of RCTs (14 out of 15) took place at universities or colleges. Cluster RCTs took place at secondary schools and students´ participation was either voluntary (one out of two), or mandatory (one out of two). CBAs took place mainly at universities and colleges (only one out of the six CBAs was conducted at high school) and the students participated either voluntarily (two out of six), or the intervention was conducted within courses they were enrolled in (two out of six), or they received credits or money for participation (one out of six). Overall, the risk of selection bias is considerable, and it is especially high in those studies where there are insufficient data on sampling and/or no data on response rates.

All the RCTs allocated the participants randomly into experimental and control group(s). However, only some of them (seven out of 15) investigated and reported differences between experimental and control group (six out of the seven RCTs found no differences). Also, one (out of the two) cluster RCT and three (out of the six) CBAs provided assessment of differences between experimental and control group(s). One cluster RCT and three CBAs did not reflect on possible differences between groups at all.

The risk of attrition bias is relevant to 12 studies which conducted follow-up measurements. Ten of them conducted one follow-up, and two of them conducted two follow-ups. The response rate at follow-up(s) was transparently reported in ten out of the 12 studies and ranged from 49,7% (Kaplan et al., 2012) to 100% (Esters et al., 1998). However, only four studies discussed possible attrition bias and compared baseline characteristics of those who did and those who did not completed all the measurements; none of them found any differences between these two groups.
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**Table: Risk of bias in included studies**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Study design | Participants | Risk of selection bias | | | | | Risk of attrition bias at follow-up | | | |
| Selection of school(s) | Selection of participants | Selection of participants (response rate) | Allocation of participants to experimental and control group(s) | Differences between experimental and control group(s) | Follow-up(s) | Response rate at follow-up(s) - all study participants | Strategy to enhance response rate at follow-up(s) | Strategy to deal with withdrawals from the study at follow-up |
| **Altindag (2006)** | CBA | 2 universities, first year, medical | unclear | all who agreed | unclear | according to schools | no differences | 1 m. | exp. 78%/eligible partic., con. 77% | no measure taken | X |
| **Brown (2010)** | RCT | university, undergraduate, introductory psychology courses | unclear | received credits for participation | unclear | randomly | random allocation and no differences | 1 w. | 95% | participants received credit for participation | unclear |
| **Chan (2009)** | Cl-RCT | secondary school, grade 9 | unclear | all students of grade 9 | 100% | random allocation of classes | no differences | 1 m. | 255/390 (65,4%) | classes of secondary school students | only complete data analysed; withdrawn students did not differ |
| **Clement (2012)** | RCT | university, first year, general nursing | unclear | all who agreed | 360/494 (73%) | random allocation of students, with stratification by level of study and intended specialty | stratified random sample; less experienced with M.I. in con. gr. | 4 m. | 193/360 (54%) | unclear | unclear |
| **Corrigan (2007)** | RCT | community college (diverse sample) | unclear | all who agreed | 244/257 (95%) | randomly | random allocation and no differences | 1 w. | unclear | unclear | unclear |
| **Demyan (2012)** | RCT | university, psychology classes | unclear | all who agreed | unclear | randomly | random allocation | X | X | X | X |
| **Esters (1998)** | CBA | high school in a rural area, grade 9, enrolled in "Health" course | unclear | all enrolled students | 100% | According to classes | allocation by classes, same school | 12 w. | 100% | classes of secondary school students | X |
| \*exp. = experiment group ; con. = control group; partic. = participants | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table: Risk of bias in included studies (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Study design | Participants | Risk of selection bias | | | | | Risk of attrition bias at follow-up | | | |
| Selection of school(s) | Selection of participants | Selection of participants (response rate) | Allocation of participants to experimental and control group(s) | Differences between experimental and control group(s) | Follow-up(s) | Response rate at follow-up(s) - all study participants | Strategy to enhance response rate at follow-up(s) | Strategy to deal with withdrawals from the study at follow-up |
| **Faigin (2008)** | CBA | university, 1st year (81.5%), general psychology course | unclear | all enrolled in 5 sections | unclear | Participating class sections were placed in the three experimental groups based on class size and class meeting times. The experimental groups were composed of students from multiple class sections with different instructors. | no differences | 1 m. | 303/544 (60%) | unclear | only complete data analysed; withdrawn students did not differ |
| **Kaplan (2012)** | RCT | college, 1st year, introductory classes | unclear | received credits for participation | unclear | randomly | random allocation and no differences | 1 w.,  3 w. | 144/290 (49,7%) | unclear | withdrawn students did not differ |
| **Kerby (2008)** | RCT | university, 4th year, medical (on psychiatry training attachment) | unclear | all who agreed | 56% | randomly | random allocation | 8 w. | exp. 87%; con. 91% | unclear | unclear |
| **Lincoln (2008)** | CBA | university, all years, psychology and medical students | unclear | by advertisements; got money or credits | unclear | by systematic variation | Allocation by systematic variation | X | X | X | X |
| **Nguyen (2012)** | CBA | university, year 3 and 4, Bachelor pharmacy | unclear | all who agreed | grade 3 (154/198 78%); grade 4 (195/278 70%) | according to year (2 groups) | allocation by year; students with professional exp. more in indirect gr. | X | X | X | X |
| **Owen (2007)** | RCT | university, undergraduates, general psychology course | unclear | all enrolled in the course | unclear | randomly | random allocation | X | X | X | X |
| \*exp = experiment group ; con = control group | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Table: Risk of bias in included studies (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Study design | Participants | Risk of selection bias | | | | | Risk of attrition bias at follow-up | | | |
| Selection of school(s) | Selection of participants | Selection of participants (response rate) | Allocation of participants to experimental and control group(s) | Differences between experimental and control group(s) | Follow-up(s) | Response rate at follow-up(s) - all study participants | Strategy to enhance response rate at follow-up(s) | Strategy to deal with withdrawals from the study at follow-up |
| **Penn (2003)** | RCT | university | unclear | partial fulfilment of course credit | unclear | randomly | random allocation and no differences | X | X | X | X |
| **Pinto-Foltz (2011)** | Cl-RCT | secondary school, grade 9 and 10 | unclear | all who agreed | 156/760 (21%) | random allocation of classes | random allocation of classes | 4 w.  8 w. | exp. 94%; con. 90% | unclear | withdrawn students did not differ |
| **Reinke (2004)** | RCT | community college, all the students | unclear | all who agreed | 164/164 (100%) | randomly | random allocation | X | X | X | X |
| **Ritterfeld (2006)** | RCT | university, students all-around of campus | unclear | all who agreed | 165 out of "large body of students" | randomly | random allocation | 1 w. | 121/165 (73%) | $20 and a movie ticket | unclear |
| **Saporito (2011)** | RCT | secondary school, mandatory physical classes | unclear | all who agreed | unclear | randomly | random allocation and no differences | X | X | X | X |
| **Walachowska (2009)** | CBA | university, technical | unclear | unclear | unclear | unclear | unclear | 1 m. | unclear | unclear | unclear |
| **West (2014)** | RCT | university | unclear | received credits for participation | unclear | randomly | random allocation and no differences | X | X | X | X |
| **Woods (2002a)** | RCT | college, introductory psychology courses | unclear | received credits for participation | unclear | randomly | random allocation | X | X | X | X |
| **Woods (2002b)** | RCT | college, introductory psychology courses | unclear | received credits for participation | unclear | randomly | random allocation | X | X | X | X |
| **Woods (2005)** | RCT | college, psychology courses | unclear | received credits for participation | unclear | randomly | random allocation | X | X | X | X |
| \*exp = experiment group ; con = control group | | | | | | | | | | | |