Appendix A. Search strategy.

**PsycInfo and PsycArticles**

\((\text{aggress}^{*} \text{ or violen}^{*} \text{ or sexual assault or bully}^{*} \text{ or anti}^{*} \text{ behav}^{*} \text{ or abus}^{*} \text{ or relationship violence or dating violence}) \text{ and (intervention or program}^{*} \text{ or training or reduc}^{*} \text{ or prevent}^{*} \text{ or campaign}}\)).\text{ti,ab. and (review}^{*} \text{ or meta}^{*} \text{ or analysis or meta-analysis or evaluat}^{*}\)).\text{ti. and (school or campus or university or college or youth or young or adolesc}^{*} \text{ or teen}^{*}\)).\text{ti,ab.}

**Sociology collection ProQuest**

\(\text{ab(aggress}^{*} \text{ or violen}^{*} \text{ or sexual assault or bully}^{*} \text{ or anti}^{*} \text{ behav}^{*} \text{ or abus}^{*} \text{ or relationship violence or dating violence}) \text{ and ab(intervention or program}^{*} \text{ or training or reduc}^{*} \text{ or prevention or campaign}) \text{ and ti(review}^{*} \text{ or meta}^{*} \text{ or analysis or meta-analysis or evaluat}^{*}\)).\text{ti. and (school or campus or college or university or youth or young or adolesc}^{*} \text{ or teen}^{*}\))

**Medline**

\((\text{aggress}^{*} \text{ or violen}^{*} \text{ or sexual assault or bully}^{*} \text{ or anti}^{*} \text{ behav}^{*} \text{ or abus}^{*} \text{ or relationship violence or dating violence}) \text{ and (intervention or program}^{*} \text{ or training or reduc}^{*} \text{ or prevent}^{*} \text{ or campaign}}\)).\text{ti,ab. and (review}^{*} \text{ or meta}^{*} \text{ or analysis or meta-analysis or evaluat}^{*}\)).\text{ti. and (school or campus or university or college or youth or young or adolesc}^{*} \text{ or teen}^{*}\)).\text{ti,ab.}

**ERIC**

\((\text{AB aggress}^{*} \text{ OR AB violen}^{*} \text{ OR AB bully}^{*} \text{ OR AB assault OR AB abus}^{*} \text{ OR AB anti}^{*} \text{ behav}^{*}) \text{ AND (AB program}^{*} \text{ OR AB intervention OR AB campaign OR AB prevent}^{*} \text{ OR AB reduc}^{*} \text{ OR AB training}) \text{ AND (AB school OR AB young OR AB campus OR AB teen}^{*} \text{ OR AB university OR AB college}) \text{ AND (TI review OR TI meta}^{*} \text{ OR TI meta-analysis OR TI evaluat}^{*} \text{ OR TI analysis})}

### Appendix B. AMSTAR – 2 Quality appraisal results

| AMSTAR 2 Criteria* | Anderson & Whiston (2005) | Atienzo, Baxter, & Kallenthaler (2017) | Baldry & Farrington (2007) | Cassidy, Bowman, McGrath, & Matzopoulou (2016) | Cox et al. (2016) | DeKoker et al. (2013) | DeLaRue, Polanin, Espelage, & Piggott (2017) | DeGue et al. (2014) | Derzon (2006) | Edwards and Hinsz (2014) |
|-------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|------------------------|
| 1. Population, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Uncl | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2. Pre-registered protocol | No | Partial Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| 3. Study design criteria | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| 4. Comprehensive literature search | No | Partial Yes | No | Partial Yes | No | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | No |
| 5. Study selection in duplicate | No | Yes | No | Yes | Uncl | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| 6. Data extraction in duplicate | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | Uncl | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| 7. List of excluded studies | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| 8. Detail of included studies | No | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | Yes | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | No | No |
| 9. Risk of Bias (RoB) in individual studies | Uncl | Yes | No | Uncl | Uncl | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | No | No |
| 10. Sources of funding | Uncl | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| 11. Meta-analysis – appropriate statistical methods | No | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Yes | Not performed | No | Yes |
| 12. Meta-analysis – assess RoB | No | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Yes | Not performed | No | No |
| 13. Meta-analysis – incorporate RoB | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No |
| 14. Explanation for any heterogeneity observed | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | |
| 15. Publication bias | No | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Yes | Not performed | No | No |
| 16. Conflicts of interest reported | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes |

* Critical points are highlighted with yellow
## Appendix B. AMSTAR – 2 Quality appraisal results - continued

| AMSTAR 2 Criteria* | Fagan & Catalano (2013) | Fellmeth et al. (2013) | Ferguson & Kilburn (2003) | Fields & McNamara (2003) | Gavine, Donnelly, & Williams (2016) | Hahn et al. (2007) | Howard, Flora, & Griffin (1999) | Jiménez-Barbero et al. (2015) | Jouriles et al. (2018) | Katz & Moore (2013) |
|-------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 1 Population, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome | Yes | Yes | No | Uncl | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2 Pre-registered protocol | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Partial Yes | No | No |
| 3 Study design criteria | No | No | Uncl | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | Yes |
| 4 Comprehensive literature search | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | Uncl | No | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | Uncl |
| 5 Study selection in duplicate | No | Yes | No | Uncl | Uncl | Uncl | No | Yes | No | No |
| 6 Data extraction in duplicate | No | Yes | No | Uncl | Uncl | Yes | No | No | No | uncl |
| 7 List of excluded studies | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 8 Detail of included studies | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | No | No | No | Partial Yes | No | No | No |
| 9 Risk of Bias (RoB) in individual studies | No | Yes | Uncl | No | Partial Yes | No | Uncl | No | No | No |
| 10 Sources of funding | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 11 Meta-analysis – appropriate statistical methods | Not performed | Yes | No | No | Not performed | Yes | Not performed | Yes | No | Yes |
| 12 Meta-analysis – assess RoB | Not performed | Yes | Uncl | No | Not performed | Yes | Not performed | Yes | No | Yes |
| 13 Meta-analysis – incorporate RoB | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Uncl | Yes | No | Yes |
| 14 Explanation for any heterogeneity observed | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 15 Publication bias | Not performed | Yes | Yes | No | Not performed | No | Not performed | Yes | No | No |
| 16 Conflicts of interest reported | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | Uncl | No |

* Critical points are highlighted with yellow
### Appendix B. AMSTAR – 2 Quality appraisal results - continued

| AMSTAR 2 Criteria* | Kettrey & Marx (2018) | Lee, Kim, & Kim (2015) | Leen et al. (2013) | Limbos et al. (2007) | Lösel & Beelmann (2003) | Malhotra, Gonzalez-Guarda, & Mitchell (2015) | Nocentini, Zambuto, & Menesini (2016) | Park-Higgerson et al. (2008) | Petering, Wenzel, & Winetrobe (2014) | Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott (2012) |
|-------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| 1 Population, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 2 Pre-registered protocol | Uncl | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 3 Study design criteria | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No |
| 4 Comprehensive literature search | Partial Yes | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | Partial Yes |
| 5 Study selection in duplicate | Yes | Yes | Uncl | No | No | Uncl | Uncl | No | Yes | No |
| 6 Data extraction in duplicate | Yes | Yes | Uncl | No | Yes | Yes | Uncl | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| 7 List of excluded studies | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| 8 Detail of included studies | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | No | No | Partial Yes | Yes | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No |
| 9 Risk of Bias (RoB) in individual studies | No | No | No | Uncl | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 10 Sources of funding | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 11 Meta-analysis – appropriate statistical methods | No | Yes | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Yes | Not performed | Not performed | Yes | Not performed |
| 12 Meta-analysis – assess RoB | No | No | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | No | Not performed | Not performed | No | Not performed |
| 13 Meta-analysis – incorporate RoB | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 14 Explanation for any heterogeneity observed | Yes | Yes | Uncl/No | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| 15 Publication bias | No | No | Not performed | Not performed | Yes | Not performed | Not performed | Yes | Not performed | Yes |
| 16 Conflicts of interest reported | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | No | No |

* Critical points are highlighted with yellow
### Appendix B. AMSTAR – 2 Quality appraisal results - continued

| AMSTAR 2 Criteria* | Sawyer, Borduin, & Dopp (2015) | Scheckner et al. (2002) | Smith et al. (2004) | Storer, Casey, Herrenkohl (2016) | Ttofi & Farrington (2011) | Vreeman & Carroll (2007) | Whitaker et al. (2006) | Whitaker et al. (2013) | Wilson, Lipsey & Derzon (2003) | Wilson & Lipsey (2007) |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 Inclusion criteria | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Uncl | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Population, Intervention, Comparison and Outcome | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 Pre-registered protocol | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 3 Study design criteria | No | Uncl | Yes | No | Yes | Uncl | No | No | No | Yes |
| 4 Comprehensive literature search | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | Partial Yes | No | No |
| 5 Study selection in duplicate | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No | No | No |
| 6 Data extraction in duplicate | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No |
| 7 List of excluded studies | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 8 Risk of Bias (RoB) in individual studies | No | Partial Yes | No | Partial Yes | No | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | Partial Yes | No | No |
| 9 Sources of funding | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 11 Meta-analysis – appropriate statistical methods | Yes | No | Not performed | Not performed | No | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | No | Yes |
| 12 Meta-analysis – assess RoB | No | No | Not performed | Not performed | No | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | Yes | No |
| 13 Meta-analysis – incorporate RoB | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No |
| 14 Explanation for any heterogeneity observed | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| 15 Publication bias | Yes | No | Not performed | Not performed | No | Not performed | Not performed | Not performed | No | No |
| 16 Conflicts of interest reported | No | No | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | No | No | Yes |

* Critical points are highlighted with yellow
## Appendix C. Characteristics of the studies

| Authors                          | Type of review | No. of studies | Country                  | Age          | Settings | Behavior outcomes                                      | Bystander component | Quality      | Type of violence | Effectiveness for behavior in populations 15-30 years old |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Baldry & Farrington (2007)       | Meta-analysis  | 16             | Australia, Europe, Canada, USA | 8 to 17      | School   | Perpetration, victimization prevalence rates           | Yes, but no reports on effectiveness | Critically Low | Bullying         | 3 programs demonstrated small effect on reduction of perpetration and victimization, 3 increased perpetration, and 2 increased victimization. |
| Ferguson & Kilburn (2003)        | Meta-analysis  | 42 (45)        | Not specified            | School years | School   | Nonviolent and violent bullying                       | No                  | Critically Low | Bullying         | Overall small positive effect but effect sizes too small to be noticeable (including 5 high school studies, age unclear) Small to moderate positive effects on victimization, including populations 15 years old (4) |
| Lee, Kim, & Kim (2015)           | Meta-analysis  | 13             | Australia, China, Europe, USA | 7 to 16      | School   | Perpetration, victimization observations               | No                  | Critically Low | Bullying         | Small to moderate positive effects on victimization, including populations 15 years old (4) |
| Nocentini, Zambuto, & Menesini (2016) | Review        | 32             | Europe, USA              | School years | School   | Perpetration, victimization                           | Yes                 | Critically Low | Bullying         | Positive effect for bullying (2 studies included population of interest) |
| Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott (2012) | Meta-analysis  | 11             | Europe, USA              | K to 18 y.o. | School   | Bystander helping behaviors                           | Yes, and reports on effectiveness | Critically Low | Bullying         | Small positive effect for bystander behavior across all studies; larger effect sizes for younger students. Shorter programs showed larger effect sizes |
| Smith et al. (2004)              | Review         | 14             | Europe, USA              | School years | School, parent | Perpetration, victimization                           | No                  | Critically Low | Bullying         | Small negligible effect (3), mixed/harmful effect for perpetration or victimization (2) Evidence of effectiveness for perpetration and victimization for 11 years and older |
| Ttofi & Farrington (2011)        | Meta-analysis  | 44 (89)        | Europe, North America     | 7 to 18      | School   | Perpetration, victimization                           | No                  | Critically Low | Bullying         | Harmful effects (1 increased perpetration and victimization), significant reductions in perpetration and victimization (1), no significant changes (1) |
| Vreeman & Carroll (2007)         | Review         | 26 (56)        | Australia, Europe, North America, South Africa | 7 to 18 | School, not limited to | Perpetration, victimization | No | Critically Low | Bullying         | |
## Appendix C. Characteristics of the studies (continued)

| Authors | Type of review | No. of studies | Country | Age | Settings | Behavior outcomes | Bystander component | Quality | Type of violence | Effectiveness for behavior in populations 15-30 years old |
|---------|----------------|----------------|---------|-----|----------|-------------------|--------------------|---------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| DeKoker et al. (2013) | Review | 6 (8) | USA, Canada, South Africa | 11 to 26 | School, community | Physical and psychological perpetration, victimization, prevalence rates | Yes, but no reports on effectiveness | Critically Low | Dating and relationship | Significant positive effect for perpetration (3), no effect (2) |
| DeLaRue, Polanin, Espelage, & Piggott (2017) | Meta-analysis | 23 | USA, Canada | 11 to 18 | School | Perpetration victimization | Yes, but limited data | High | Dating and relationship | Small nonsignificant effect on perpetration (2) and small significant effect on victimization (unclear/none for 15 and older) was found, however, effect sizes decreased to null at follow-up. Small positive effect (overall, not specified for behaviors), interestingly, small harmful effect on attitudes (2) No statistically significant effect |
| Edwards and Hinsz (2014) | Meta-analysis | 8 | Not specified | School years | School | Self-reported behaviors, prevalence rates | No | Critically Low | Dating and relationship | Small positive effect for negative dating behavior (1) |
| Fellmeth et al. (2013) | Meta-analysis | 38 | USA, South Korea | 12 to 25 | School, university | Perpetration, victimization, bystander, prevalence rates | Yes, but no reports on effectiveness | Moderate | Dating and relationship | No statistically significant effect |
| Leen et al. (2013) | Review | 9 | Europe North America | 12 to 18 | School, not limited to | Perpetration, victimization, negative dating behavior, substance, condom use | No | Critically Low | Dating and relationship | Small positive effect for negative dating behavior (1) |
| Malhotra, Gonzalez-Guarda, & Mitchell (2015) | Review | 18 (22) | Canada, USA, not specified | School years | School, family, community | Perpetration victimization | Yes | Critically Low | Dating and relationship | Positive effect decreased over time in several programs; harmful effect or perpetration (1); positive effect maintained at a 4-year follow-up (1); positive effect on victimization but not perpetration (1) |
### Characteristics of the Studies (continued)

| Authors                          | Type of review | No. of studies | Country                  | Age       | Settings                        | Behavior outcomes                                                                 | Bystander component | Quality               | Type of violence | Effectiveness for behavior in populations 15-30 years old |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Petering, Wenzel, & Winetrobe    | Review         | 14             | USA, Canada              | 12 to 26  | School, not limited to          | Victimization Perpetration, bystander behavior, condom use                          | Yes                 | Critically Low       | Dating and relationship | Positive effects in 3 programs for perpetration and victimization, condom use (1); 1 program effective for bystander behavior in athletes |
| Storer, Casey, Herrenkohl        | Review         | 9 (15)         | USA, not specified       | College   | College                         | Bystander behavior                                                                | Yes                 | Critically Low       | Dating and relationship | Small but significant effect on bystander behavior (4); no effect (2); mixed effect (3). Perpetration or victimization not measured. Small improvement for perpetration and victimization in 1 study, including a 4-year follow-up (up to 14 years old); small decreases in physical perpetration in 1 program (effect larger for girls); 2 studies reported no or negligible effect for behavior. |
| Whitaker et al. (2006)           | Review         | 11             | Not specified            | School    | School community                | Perpetration Victimization Psychological perpetration                              | No                  | Critically Low       | Dating and relationship | Small improvement for perpetration and victimization in 1 study, including a 4-year follow-up (population up to 14 years old) |
| Whitaker et al. (2013)           | Review         | 19             | South Africa, USA, not specified | School | School and other settings | Perpetration Victimization                                                | No                  | Critically Low       | Dating and relationship | Small improvement for perpetration and victimization in 1 study, including a 4-year follow-up (population up to 14 years old) No significant effect on behavior |
| Anderson & Whiston (2005)        | Meta-analysis  | 102 (69)       | USA                      | Mean age 20 | School                          | Perpetration Victimization                                                | No                  | Critically Low       | Sexual assault      | Positive effect for perpetration and victimization (1); positive effects on perpetration (1); mixed results for bystander behavior (1, unclear); harmful effect for college men (1) Small significant effect for bystander behavior that decreased at follow-up; perpetration and victimization not reported |
| DeGue et al. (2014)              | Review         | 140            | Not specified            | 10 to 47  | School, college                 | Perpetration victimization, bystander behavior                                   | Yes, and reports on effectiveness | Critically Low | Sexual assault |                                                       |
| Jouriles et al. (2018)           | Review         | 24             | Not specified            | Undergrad   | College                         | Bystander behavior                                                             | Yes, and reports on effectiveness | Critically Low | Sexual assault |                                                       |
| Authors                | Type of review | No. of studies | Country                     | Age          | Settings              | Behavior outcomes                  | Bystander component | Quality            | Type of violence | Effectiveness for behavior in populations 15-30 years old |
|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Katz & Moore (2013)   | Meta-analysis  | 12             | Not specified               | Avg 19 College | Perpetration, bystander behavior, Bystander behavior | Yes, and reports on effectiveness | Critically Low | Sexual assault | Moderate effects for bystander behavior, no effects for perpetration |
| Kettrey & Marx (2018) | Meta-analysis  | 15             | Not specified               | College College | Perpetration, bystander behavior | Yes, and reports on effectiveness | Critically Low | Sexual assault | Small significant positive effect for bystander behavior; perpetration and victimization not reported |
| Derzon (2006)         | Meta-analysis  | 83             | Not specified               | 5 to 18 School | Aggression, perpetration, criminal behavior, prevalence rates | No | Critically Low | Antisocial | Positive effects for antisocial and aggressive behavior, however, it was unclear for which age groups |
| Fields & McNamara (2003) | Meta-analysis | Uncl.          | Not specified | Youth, not specified School community facility | Aggression, perpetration and victimization, prevalence rates | No | Critically Low | Antisocial | Significant positive effects in primary 3 studies compared to control groups (however outcome measures, as well as populations were unclear) |
| Gavine, Donnelly, & Williams (2016) | Review        | 16 (21)        | Not specified               | 11 to 18 School | Aggression, perpetration, criminal behavior, prevalence rates | No | Critically Low | Antisocial | Significant positive effect on violence rates, and victimization; significantly lesser increase in violence rates(1); no effect (1) |
| Lösel & Beelmann (2003) | Meta-analysis | 84             | Australia Canada Europe USA USA | 4 to 18 School, not limited to | Perpetration | No | Critically Low | Antisocial | Small significant positive effect overall across studies |
| Park-Higgerson et al. (2008) | Meta-analysis | 26             | 1st Grade to 17 y.o. School | Perpetration Victimization | No | Critically Low | Antisocial | Moderate effect for antisocial behavior that remained at a 4-year follow-up; however, it was unclear how many preventive programs were school-based and focused on our target age |
## Appendix C. Characteristics of the studies (continued)

| Authors                          | Type of review | No. of studies | Country            | Age          | Settings                  | Behavior outcomes | Bystander component | Quality         | Type of violence | Effectiveness for behavior in populations 15-30 years old                                                                 |
|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------------|--------------|---------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Sawyer, Borduin, & Dopp (2015)   | Meta-analysis  | 66             | Not specified      | Birth to 17 y.o. | School community parent   | Perpetration, Victimization | No                  | Critically Low  | Antisocial       | Moderate effect for antisocial behavior that remained at a 4-year follow-up; however, it was unclear how many preventive programs were school-based and focused on our target age |
| Wilson, Lipsey & Derzon (2003)  | Meta-analysis  | 221 (362)      | USA, not specified | School years  | School                    | Perpetration, Victimization | No                  | Critically Low  | Antisocial       | Small positive effect for antisocial behavior overall; larger effects in populations with higher prevalence of violence, including high school sample |
| Wilson & Lipsey (2007)          | Meta-analysis  | 249            | Australia, Canada, | School years  | School                    | Perpetration, Victimization | No                  | Critically Low  | Antisocial       | Small positive effect for antisocial behavior overall, including high school sample (those 14 years and older). |
| Atienzo, Baxter, & Kaltenthaler (2017) | Review       | 10 (9)         | Latin America      | 10 to 24     | School, favela, gang, community | Perpetration, witnessed violence, prevalence rates | No                  | Low              | General: bullying, antisocial behavior | Small reductions in witnessed bullying (1), small reductions in perpetration and witnessing antisocial behaviors among peers (1), increased involvement in deviant activities (1) |
| Cassidy, Bowman, McGrath, & Matzopoulos (2016) | Review | 6              | Europe and USA     | 10 to 29     | School, university        | Perpetration, Victimization | No                  | Critically Low  | General: antisocial, sexual assault | Small positive effect in 6 programs for populations including 15 years and older, perpetration and victimization |
| Cox et al. (2016)                | Review        | 17 (19)        | Australia          | 12 to 18     | School, community         | Perpetration, Victimization | No                  | Critically Low  | General: bullying, substance abuse related, antisocial | Antisocial - significant positive effect for physical violence (1); substance abuse: no report of effectiveness for age >15; bullying: small reductions in small sample (1) |
### Appendix C. Characteristics of the studies (continued)

| Authors                  | Type of review | No. of studies | Country | Age | Settings | Behavior outcomes | Bystander component | Quality  | Type of violence | Effectiveness for behavior in populations 15-30 years old |
|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------|-----|----------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| Fagan & Catalano (2013)  | Review         | 17             | Not specified | School years | School community family other | Perpetration, violence rates, fighting rates | No                   | Critically Low | General: antisocial relationship substance abuse | Small to moderate positive effects for dating violence and bullying (2), with long term effects up to 3 years; substance abuse: no report of effectiveness for age 15 |
| Hahn et al. (2007)       | Meta-analysis  | 53             | High-income countries | Student s | School, other | Perpetration, victimization, substance abuse-related harms | No                   | Critically Low | General: bullying relationship substance antisocial | Small positive effect at all levels for substance abuse-related harms, bullying, relationship violence, and antisocial behavior, but not maintained at follow-up. Larger effect sizes for dating and antisocial behavior |
| Howard, Flora, & Griffin (1999) | Review     | 44             | US      | School years | School | Aggression, shy behavior, perpetration victimization, fight-related nurse visits, suspension rates | No                   | Critically Low | General: bullying, relationship antisocial | Bullying - small positive effect, no effect compared with control, effect only for boys (2); dating violence: only changes for attitudes measured (1) |
| Jiménez-Barbero et al. (2015) | Meta-analysis | 14             | Australia Europe USA | 7 to 16 | School | Aggression, perpetration victimization, substance abuse-related harms, frequency | No                   | Critically Low | General: bullying, substance, antisocial | Small positive effect for substance abuse-related harms in 2 programs |
| Limbos et al. (2007)     | Review         | 41             | Not specified | 12 to 17 | School, community facility | Perpetration, substance abuse related harms | No                   | Critically Low | General: antisocial relationship substance abuse | Not effectiveness for ages 15 and older |
| Scheckner et al. (2002)  | Meta-analysis  | 16             | Not specified | School years | School, community parent | Perpetration and victimization | No                   | Critically Low | General: antisocial substance abuse | No effectiveness (negligible results) in 2 studies |