

Bradford.& Rickwood, (2014),	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong
Burns et al (2016).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong
Burns et al (2010).	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Not sure	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Ellis et al. (2013).	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Not sure	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Ellis et al(2012).	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Not sure	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Feng, & Campbell (2011).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not sure	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong
Frost & Casey (2016)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not sure	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong
Horgan & Sweeney (2010).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not sure	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong
Mars et al (2015).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not sure	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong
Mok, Jorm & Pirkis (2016)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Not sure	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
O'Dea & Campbell (2011).	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Not sure	Not sure	Yes	Not sure	Not sure	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Weak
Ruppel & McKinley (2015).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not sure	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Spears et al (2015).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong

Quality Assessment for Cohort Studies

1. Did study address a clearly focused issue?
2. Cohort/ sample recruited in an acceptable way?
3. Exposure accurately measured to minimise bias?
4. Outcome accurately measured to minimise bias?
5. Have authors identified important confounding factors?
6. Have authors accounted for confounding factors in design and/or analysis?
7. Do you believe the results?
8. Can results be more widely applied?
9. Do the results of this study fit with other available evidence?

Authors (year)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	Overall quality rating
Barker et al (2017).	Yes	Not sure	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Haner & Pepler, D. (2016).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not sure	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong
Rickwood, Mazzer, & Telford (2015).	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong

Quality Assessment Table for RCT Studies

1. Did study address a clearly focused issue?

2. Was the assignment of participants to conditions randomised?
3. Were all of participants who entered the trial properly accounted for at its conclusion?
4. Were participants, health workers and study personal 'blind' to treatment?
5. Were the groups similar at the start of the trial?
6. Aside from the experimental intervention, were the groups treated equally?
7. How large was the treatment effect?
8. Will the results help locally?
9. Can the results be applied to the local population?
10. Were all clinically important outcomes considered?
11. Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?

Authors (year)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Overall quality rating
Kauer et al (2017)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not large	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong
Sanci, Kauer, & Buhagiar (2017)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not Sure	Yes	Yes	Not large	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Strong