

<b>Programme title</b>	<b>Citation</b>	<b>Site of delivery</b>	<b>Control group</b>	<b>Study design</b>	<b>Post-intervention follow-up times</b>	<b>Analysis samples: intervention vs. control</b>
All Stars	Cross, Gottfredson, Wilson, Rorie, & Connell, 2009; Gottfredson, Cross, Wilson, Connell, & Rorie, 2010; Gottfredson, Cross, Wilson, Rorie, & Connell, 2010	Baltimore, Maryland, USA	Monthly ‘fun’ events held in programme schools	Participants randomised within programme schools	Near the end of the academic year	211 vs. 205
Maryland after-school programmes	Gottfredson, Gerstenblith, Soulé, Womer, & Lu, 2004	Maryland, USA	No intervention	Participants randomised within programme site, or comparison groups recruited prospectively, or students placed on a waitlist	Near the end of the academic year	372 vs. 355
Young People’s Development Programme	Wiggins et al., 2008	England, UK	No intervention	Comparison group recruited prospectively from similar youth work programmes	9 months (post-intervention) and 18 months after joining the programme	1054 vs. 599 (9 months) 566 vs. 338 (18 months)
Positive Youth Development Collaborative	Tebes et al., 2007	Northeast USA	After-school programme without PYD component	Comparison group recruited prospectively from similar after-school programmes	Near the end of the academic year (post-intervention) and 1 year post-baseline (4 months post-intervention)	149 vs. 155
Cool Girls, Inc.	Kuperminc, Thomason,	Atlanta,	No	Comparison group	6 months post-baseline	86 vs. 89

	DiMeo, & Broomfield-Massey, 2011	Georgia, USA	intervention	recruited prospectively from within schools hosting the programme	(post-intervention)	
Youth Action Research for Prevention	Berg, Coman, & Schensul, 2009	Hartford, Connecticut, USA	No intervention	Comparison group recruited prospectively from summer youth employment programmes	Near the end of the academic year (post-intervention)	114 vs. 202
National Guard Youth ChalleNGe Programme	Millenky, Bloom, & Dillon, 2010; Millenky, Bloom, Muller-Ravett, & Broadus, 2011; Schwartz, Rhodes, Spencer, & Grossman, 2013	USA	No intervention	Participants randomised within programme sites	21 months post-baseline (post-intervention) and 39 months post-baseline	736 vs. 460 (21 months) 722 vs. 452 (39 months)
Quantum Opportunity Program	Rodriguez-Planas, 2010a; Schirm & Rodriguez-Planas, 2004; Schirm, Rodriguez-Planas, Maxfield, & Tuttle, 2003; Schirm, Stuart, & McKie, 2006	USA	No intervention	Participants randomised within programme schools	Near the scheduled end of high school (post-intervention) and 7 months following, about three years after scheduled end of high school, and about six years after scheduled end of high school	580 vs. 489
Big Brothers Big Sisters	Tierney, 1995	USA	No intervention	Participants randomised within programme sites	18 months post-baseline (post-intervention)	487 vs. 472
Stay SMART	St Pierre & Kaltreider,	USA	After-school	Comparison group	27 months post-baseline	106 vs. 55

	1992		programme without PYD component	recruited prospectively from similar after-school programmes		
--	------	--	---------------------------------------	---	--	--