

Group-Based Comprehensive Risk Reduction Interventions for Adolescents

Summary Evidence Table

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Aarons et al., 2000 (1996–1997) Washington, DC Greatest: RCT: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: primarily minority Washington DC schools <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> "Let's Talk About Sex Baby" & Postponing Sexual Involvement <i>Dosage:</i> not reported <i>Deliverers:</i> health professional (Project facilitator) and peer leader <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> pregnancy</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> students from primarily minority schools <i>Age:</i> Females: Mean: 12.7 years Males: Mean: 12.94 years <i>Gender:</i> not reported <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Females: Black/African American: 84.9% Hispanic 11.5% Other: 2.9% Males: Black/African American: 87.8% Hispanic 10.6% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Female: 83.7% Male: 44.9% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 262 Comparison: 260 Total: 522 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 38% 2nd follow up: Total: 17% 3rd follow up: Total: 39%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Female: OR= 1.88, 95% CI (1.02, 3.47) Male: OR= 1.18, 95% CI (0.61, 2.29) <i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.80, 95% CI (0.66, 0.96) <i>Use of Protection (dual use):</i> Female: OR= 7.43, 95%CI (1.90, 29.02) Male: OR= 1.03, 95%CI (0.41, 2.60)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Aten et al., 2002 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Rochester, NY</p> <p>Greatest non-randomized trial: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: Middle school health education classes in Rochester, NY</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Rochester AIDS Prevention Project (RAPP)</p> <p>Arm 1: RAPP delivered by an adult</p> <p>Arm 2: RAPP delivered by a peer</p> <p>Arm 3: RAPP delivered by a teacher</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 12 total contacts</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: trained adult health educators</p> <p>Arm 2: peer educator</p> <p>Arm 3: school district's health education teacher</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender and race/ethnicity</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> urban, predominantly minority, middle school students</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Arm 1: Mean (SD): 13.2 (0.77) years Arm 2: Mean (SD): 13.2 (0.67) years Arm 3: Mean (SD): 13 (0.65) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Male: 50% Female: 50% Arm 2: Male: 49.1% Female: 51.9% Arm 3: Male: 50.6% Female: 49.4%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Black/African American: 46.7% White: 18.8% Hispanic 18.6% Other: 15.9%</p> <p>Arm 2: Black/African American: 48.7% White: 16.2% Hispanic 21.5% Other: 13.6%</p> <p>Arm 3: Black/African American: 51.5% White: 15.4% Hispanic 16.4% Other: 16.6%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: 55.2% Arm 2: 58% Arm 3: 63.9%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: 523 Arm 2: 412 Arm 3: 313 Comparison: 467 Total: 1715</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i></p> <p>2nd follow up: Arm 1: 35 % Arm 2: 30% Arm 3: 35% Comparison: 38%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 0.90, 95% CI (0.61, 1.33) Female: OR= 0.94, 95% CI (0.55, 1.59) Male: OR= 0.75, 95% CI (0.41, 1.36)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 0.95, 95% CI (0.64, 1.41) Female: OR= 1.35, 95% CI (0.81, 2.24) Male: OR= 0.54, 95% CI (0.27, 1.07)</p> <p>Arm 3: OR= 0.62, 95% CI (0.40, 0.97) Female: OR= 0.81, 95% CI (0.45, 1.46) Male: OR= 0.35, 95% CI (0.18, 0.69)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Barth et al., 1992 (1998–1999) California Greatest: non-randomized trial: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: high school <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Reducing the Risk (RTR) <i>Dosage:</i> 12 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> teacher <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and cultural/subcultural identity <i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> 10th graders <i>Age:</i> Mean: 15.4 years <i>Gender:</i> Male: 50% Female: 50% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> American Indian/Alaska Native: 2% Asian: 10% Black/African American: 2% White: 60% Hispanic 20% Other: 6% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 586 Comparison: 447 Total: 1033 <i>Attrition:</i> Post test: Total: 19.5% 2nd follow up: Total: 30.1 % 3rd follow up: Total: 26.6%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.82, 95% CI (0.60, 1.10) <i>Frequency of Sex:</i> nonvirgins: pretest Mean= 3.1 posttest Mean= 3.9 Comparison: pretest Mean= 2.2 posttest Mean= 3.5 Virgins: pretest Mean= 0.0 posttest Mean= 3.1 Comparison: pretest Mean= 0.0 posttest Mean= 3.0 <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.85, 95% CI (0.37, 1.93) <i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> OR= 1.13, 95%CI (0.76, 1.69) <i>Pregnancy:</i> OR= 1.29, 95% CI (0.69, 2.40)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Booth et al., 1999 (1992–1993) Colorado Greatest: Other: modified crossover design with 3 month washout periods Fair	<i>Setting:</i> Community: runaway centers <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program - peer helper program <i>Dosage:</i> 8 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> not reported <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for cultural/subcultural identity <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD	<i>Target population:</i> runaway youth <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 17.4 (1.5) years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 51% Female: 49% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: American Indian/Alaska Native: 5% Black/African American: 8% White: 73% Hispanic 12% Other: 3% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 0% <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Arm 1: 72 Comparison 1: 75 Total: 147 <i>Attrition:</i> not reported	<i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 1.14, 95% CI (0.64, 2.06)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Boyer et al., 1997 (1992) California Greatest: non-randomized trial: group Fair	<i>Setting:</i> School: urban public high school <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program - STD/HIV prevention <i>Dosage:</i> 3 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> group facilitator <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> treated control <i>Tailoring:</i> none <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD	<i>Target population:</i> high school students from urban public high schools <i>Age:</i> Mean: 14.7 years <i>Gender:</i> Male: 63% Female: 37% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Asian: 47% Black/African American: 12% White: 8% Hispanic 30% Other: 3% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 78% <i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Intervention: 210 Comparison: 303 Total: 513 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Intervention: 32% Comparison: 22% Total: 26%	<i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 1.12, 95% CI (0.55, 2.29) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.26, 95% CI (0.63, 2.52)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Coyle, Kirby et al., 2006 (2000–2003)</p> <p>Northern California</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: community day (alternative) schools from four large urban northern California counties</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> All4You!</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 26 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> health educator</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> community service & learning</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents in alternative schools</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Range: 14–18+ years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 61.2% Female: 38.8%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Asian: 16.9% Black/African American: 29% White: 12.2% Hispanic 27.6% Other: 14.2%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 18%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 597 Comparison: 391 Total: 988</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 27% 2nd follow up: Total: 38% 3rd follow up: Total: 44%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.23, 95% CI (0.51, 2.97)</p> <p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.78, 95% CI (0.62, 0.99)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 1.00, 95% CI (0.79, 1.26)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.69, 95% CI (0.55, 0.87)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 2.12, 95% CI (1.25, 3.59)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> OR= 1.15, 95% CI (0.78, 1.70)</p> <p><i>Pregnancy:</i> OR= 1.15, p= 0.66</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Coyle, Basen-Engquist et al., 2001 (1993–1996)</p> <p>northern California and southeastern Texas</p> <p>Greatest RCT: group</p> <p>Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: high schools in urban northern California and urban southeastern Texas</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Safer Choices</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 104 weeks in duration</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> teacher</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> school and community health promotion council and school-wide activities to change normative culture of school</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> 9th grade students</p> <p><i>Grade:</i> 9th grade</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 49.7% Female: 50.3%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Asian: 13.7% Black/African American: 19.6% White: 28.7% Hispanic 28.7% Other: 7.7</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 68.9%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 1983 Comparison: 1886 Total: 3869</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 5% 2nd follow up: Total: 17% 3rd follow up: Total: 21%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.83, 95% CI (0.54, 1.27)</p> <p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.81, 95% CI (0.63, 1.05)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.63, 95% CI (0.40, 0.99)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.68, 95% CI (1.02, 2.78)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> OR= 1.76, 95% CI (1.01, 3.07)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Coyle, Kirby et al., 2004 (1997–2000) urban northern California Greatest: RCT: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: Middle schools from northern California school districts <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Draw the Line/Respect the Line <i>Dosage:</i> 104 weeks in duration, 20 total contacts <i>Deliverer:</i> health educator <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity <i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> diverse middle school students <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean: 11.5 years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 49.9% Female: 50.1% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Asian: 15.9% Black/African American: 5.2% White: 16.5% Hispanic 59.3% Other: 3.1% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 96% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Total: 2829 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 3% 2nd follow up: Total: 12% 3rd follow up: Total: 36%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Female: OR= 0.65, 95% CI (0.47, 0.90) Male: OR= 0.67, 95% CI (0.49, 0.93)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>DiClemente et al., 2004 (1995–2002)</p> <p>Birmingham, AL</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: (details unknown)</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program - HIV prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 16 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i> African American female health educator and African American female peer educator</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> STD testing</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender, race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> African American sexually active females</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 15.99 (1.25) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Female: 100%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 100%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 0%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 251 Comparison: 271 Total: 522</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> Posttest: Intervention: 10% Comparison: 10.3% Total: 10.2% 2nd follow up: Intervention: 3.1% Comparison: 0.8% Total: 1.9%</p>	<p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.59, 95% CI (0.19, 1.84)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.71, 95% CI (0.51, 0.99)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 2.49, 95% CI (1.67, 3.71)</p> <p><i>Pregnancy:</i> OR= 0.74, 95% CI (0.30, 1.82)</p> <p><i>STI:</i> OR= 0.47, 95%CI (0.25, 0.88)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Dilorio, Resnicow et al., 2006 (1996–2001)</p> <p>Atlanta, GA</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: Boys and Girls Clubs</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Keepin' it Real!</p> <p>Arm 1: Life Skills Program (LSK)</p> <p>Arm 2: Social Cognitive Theory (SCT)</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 14 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> facilitators</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Structural component: creation of new social networks Community service & learning</p> <p>Arm 2: Structural component: creation of new social networks</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents in Boys and Girls clubs</p> <p><i>Age:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Mean: 12.4 years</p> <p>Arm 2: Mean: 12.2 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i></p> <p>Arm 1:</p> <p>Male: 55.6%</p> <p>Female: 44.4%</p> <p>Arm 2:</p> <p>Male: 61.9%</p> <p>Female: 38.1%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i></p> <p>Total:</p> <p>Black/African American: 97.9%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: 92%</p> <p>Arm 2: 93%</p> <p><i>Number of participants analyzed:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: 180</p> <p>Arm 2: 170</p> <p>Comparison 1: 175</p> <p>Total: 525</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i></p> <p>3rd follow up:</p> <p>Arm 1: 5%</p> <p>Arm 2: 9%</p> <p>Comparison 1: 13%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 1.04, 95% CI (0.60, 1.80)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 1.38, 95% CI (0.82, 2.33)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 15.9, 95% CI (0.88, 288.64)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 4.24, 95% CI (0.80, 22.56)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Dilorio, McCarty et al., 2007 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Atlanta, GA</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: Boys and Girls Clubs</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Real Men (Responsible, Empowered, Aware, Living)</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 14 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents with fathers or father figures in Boys and Girls clubs</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 12.8 (1.2) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 100%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 97.7%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 76%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 277 Comparison: 277 Total: 554</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> not reported</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.02, 95% CI (0.59, 1.75)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 3.54, 95% CI (1.17, 10.70)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Ferguson et al., 1998 (study period not reported) Charlottesville, VA Greatest: RCT: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: four subsidized housing neighborhoods in Charlottesville, VA <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – peer counseling pregnancy prevention <i>Dosage:</i> 16 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> peer educators <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> treated control <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender, race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> pregnancy</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> African American adolescent females from subsidized housing neighborhoods <i>Grade:</i> Mean: 6th grade <i>Gender:</i> Female: 100% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 100% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 33 Comparison: 30 Total: 63 <i>Attrition:</i> 2nd follow up: Intervention: 9% Comparison: 27% Total: 17%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 3.00, 95% CI (0.25, 35.44) <i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> OR= 2.00, 95% CI (0.27, 14.78) <i>Pregnancy:</i> OR= 1.00, 95% CI (0.08, 12.48)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Fisher et al., 2002 (1995–1999)</p> <p>Connecticut</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: inner-city Connecticut high school</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Arm 1: Information Motivation Behavior Skills Arm 2: Information Motivation Behavior Skills and SWAT</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> Arm 1: 1week in duration, 5 contacts per week, 5 total contacts Arm 2: 3 weeks in duration, 7 contacts per week, 7 total contacts</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> Arm 1: regular teacher Arm 2: regular teacher and peer</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> Arm 1: none Arm 2: Structural component: opinion leader model</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and cultural/subcultural identity</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> inner city minority adolescents</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Arm 1: Mean: 14.5 years Arm 2: Mean: 14.6 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Arm 1: Male: 42% Female: 58% Arm 2: Male: 42% Female: 58%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Arm 1: Black/African American: 47% Hispanic 34% Other: 19% Arm 2: Black/African American: 88% Hispanic 7% Other: 5%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 71%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Arm 1: 310 Arm 2: 296 Comparison 1: 589 Total: 1195</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> not reported</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.93, 95% CI (0.74, 5.08) Arm 2: OR= 1.04, 95% CI (0.45, 2.37)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.93, 95% CI (1.19, 3.11) Arm 2: OR= 3.38, 95% CI (1.98, 5.79)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Flay et al., 2004 (1994–1998) Chicago, IL Greatest: RCT: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: metropolitan, Chicago, IL school <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Aban Aya Youth Project Arm 1: Social Development Curriculum (SDC) Arm 2: School/Community Intervention (SCI) <i>Dosage:</i> not reported <i>Deliverer:</i> University-based health educators <i>Additional Components:</i> Arm 1: none Arm 2: Social component: "rebuilding the village" to create community-wide support Structural component: formation of a multi-sectoral task force <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> African American middle school students from metropolitan area high risk schools <i>Grade:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 10.8 (0.6) years <i>Gender:</i> Arm 1: Male: 48.9% Female: 51.1% Arm 2: Male: 50.5% Female: 49.5% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> not reported <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Total: 644 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 6.8% 2nd follow up: Total: 10.5%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: Female: OR= 0.81, 95% CI (0.50, 1.31) Male: OR= 0.43, 95% CI (0.28, 0.63) Arm 2: Female: OR= 0.49, 95% CI (0.29, 0.82) Male: OR= 0.28, 95% CI (0.19, 0.43) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: Female: OR= 1.02, 95%CI (0.57, 1.81) Male: OR= 1.99, 95%CI (1.26, 3.14) Arm 2: Female: OR= 0.15, 95%CI (0.09, 0.25) Male: OR= 3.29, 95%CI (2.07, 5.21)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Gillmore et al., 1997 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Northwest US</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: urban community juvenile detention facility</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – group skills training HIV/STD prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 8 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i> adult facilitator and peer tutor</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment (group 1: comic book, group 2: video)</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for cultural/subcultural identity</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> high risk adolescents recruited from an urban juvenile detention facility</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Total: Mean: 15.74 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 54% Female: 46%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 52% White: 48%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 0%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Total: 228</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 19% 2nd follow up: Total: 29% 3rd follow up: Total: 24%</p>	<p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Comparison group 1: OR= 1.72, 95% CI (0.99, 2.98) Comparison group 2: OR= 0.58, 95% CI (0.34, 1.01)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Hubbard et al., 1998 (1994–1996) Arkansas Greatest: non-randomized trial: group Fair	<i>Setting:</i> School: high schools in rural and urban areas of Arkansas <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Reducing the Risk (RTR) <i>Dosage:</i> 16 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> teachers <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> none <i>Focus:</i> multifocus	<i>Target population:</i> rural and urban high school students <i>Grade:</i> 9–12 grades <i>Gender:</i> Male: 42% Female: 58% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 13% White: 87% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 81% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 267 Comparison: 265 Total: 532 <i>Attrition:</i> Post test: Total: 58%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.50, 95% CI (0.24, 1.07) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 9.50, 95% CI (1.83, 49.26)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Jemmott et al., 1992 (1988–1989) Philadelphia, PA Greatest: RCT: individual Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: outpatient clinic, local YMCA and local school <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program -AIDS prevention <i>Dosage:</i> 5 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> facilitators <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> treated control <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender, race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> African American, male adolescents from inner city <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 14.64 (1.66) years <i>Gender:</i> Male: 100% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 100% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Intervention: 83 Comparison: 67 Total: 150 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 4%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Intervention: posttest Mean = 0.48 Comparison: posttest Mean= 0.60 <i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.38, 95% CI (0.18, 0.78) <i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.35, 95% CI (0.18, 0.69) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.34, 95% CI (0.17, 0.69) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 3.81, 95% CI (1.24, 11.70)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Jemmott et al., 1998 (study period not reported) Philadelphia, PA Greatest: RCT: individual Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: 3 middle schools serving low income African America communities <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Spruce Adolescent Health Promotion Project Arm 1: Abstinence HIV prevention Arm 2: Safer Sex HIV prevention <i>Dosage:</i> 8 hours of contact <i>Deliverers:</i> adult facilitator and high school student peer co-facilitator <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> African American adolescents from inner city <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean: 11.8 years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 47% Female: 53% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/ African American: 100% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 74.8% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Arm 1: 215 Arm 2: 218 Comparison: 214 Total: 647 <i>Attrition:</i> Post test: Arm 1: 0.9% Arm 2: 0.9% Comparison: 3.3% Total: 3.5% 2nd follow up: Arm 1: 5.1% Arm 2: 5.0% Comparison: 1.4% Total: 5.6% 3rd follow up: Arm 1: 7.0% Arm 2: 5.5% Comparison: 4.7% Total: 7.4%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.83, 95% CI (0.50, 1.39) Nonvirgin: OR= 0.52, 95% CI (0.22, 1.27) Virgin: OR= 0.26, 95% CI (0.08, 0.83) Arm 2: OR= 0.66, 95% CI (0.38, 1.13) Nonvirgin: OR= 0.55, 95% CI (0.23, 1.33) Virgin: OR= 0.82, 95% CI (0.35, 1.91) <i>Frequency of Sex:</i> Arm 1: OR = 0.92, 95% CI (0.65,1.30) Nonvirgin: OR= 0.42, 95%CI (0.16 1.07) Virgin: OR= 0.90, 95%CI (0.58 1.40) Arm 2: OR = 0.82, 95% CI (0.58,1.15) Nonvirgin: OR= 0.23, 95%CI (0.09 0.58) Virgin: OR= 0.90, 95%CI (0.58 1.41) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.41, 95% CI (0.17, 1.03) Nonvirgin: OR= 0.63, 95%CI (0.21, 1.83) Virgin: OR= 0.03, 95%CI (0.00, 6.78) Arm 2: OR= 0.42, 95% CI (0.17, 1.03) Nonvirgin: OR= 0.20, 95%CI (0.06, 0.68) Virgin: OR= 0.46, 95%CI (0.08, 2.59) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.09, 95% CI (0.36, 3.32) Arm 2: OR= 3.38, 95% CI</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Jemmott et al., 1999 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Trenton, NJ</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: individual</p> <p>Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: public schools</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program - HIV prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 5 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> facilitators</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> African American middle school students</p> <p><i>Grade:</i> Mean: 7.51 grade</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 46.2% Female: 53.8%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 100%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 44.7%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 269 Comparison: 227 Total: 496</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Intervention: 2.2% Comparison: 4.4% Total: 3.2%</p> <p>2nd follow up: Intervention: 6% Comparison: 8.8% Total: 7.3%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Intervention: pretest Mean= 0.27 posttest Mean= 0.21 Comparison: pretest Mean= 0.32 posttest Mean= 0.24</p> <p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.87, 95% CI (0.62, 1.21)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.77, 95% CI (0.55, 1.08)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.63, 95% CI (0.45, 0.87)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Jemmott et al., 2005 (study period not reported) Philadelphia, PA Greatest: RCT: individual Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: adolescent medicine clinic <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – HIV/STD prevention Arm 1: information-based Arm 2: skills-based <i>Dosage:</i> 4.5 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> facilitators <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender and race/ethnicity <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> African American and Latino adolescents attending an adolescent medicine clinic <i>Age:</i> Arm 1: Mean (SD): 15.49 (0.1) years Arm 2: Mean (SD): 15.53 (0.1) years <i>Gender:</i> Arm 1 and Arm 2 Female: 100% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Arm 1: Black/African American: 68% Arm 2: Black/African American: 67.6% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Arm 1: 196 Arm 2: 209 Comparison 1: 199 Total: 604 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Arm 1: 7.9% Arm 2: 4.3% Comparison: 5% Total: 5.7% 2nd follow up: Arm 1: 9.6% Arm 2: 6% Comparison: 5.9% Total: 7.2% 3rd follow up: Arm 1: 14% Arm 2: 11.1% Comparison: 9% Total: 11.4%</p>	<p><i>Number of Partners:</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.00, 95% CI (0.70 ,1.43) Arm 2: OR= 0.69, 95% CI (0.49 ,0.98) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.02, 95% CI (0.72, 1.45) Arm 2: OR= 1.01, 95% CI (0.72, 1.42) <i>STI:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.82, 95%CI (0.48, 1.39) Arm 2: OR= 0.53, 95%CI (0.30, 0.93)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Kennedy et al., 2000 (1997) Sacramento, CA Greatest: RCT: individual Fair	<i>Setting:</i> Community: (details unknown) <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Prevention Marketing Initiative (PMI) – Sacramento; Be Proud Be Responsible <i>Dosage:</i> 9 hours of contact <i>Deliverers:</i> facilitators and "near peer" co-facilitators <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD	<i>Target population:</i> sexually active adolescents <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean: 15.28 years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 45% Female: 55% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Black/African American: 18% White: 25% Other 18% Hispanic/Latino: 39% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 54.6% <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Intervention: 192 Comparison: 188 Total: 380 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Intervention: 52.7% Comparison: 42.9%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.16, 95% CI (0.62, 2.18) <i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.90, 95% CI (0.45, 1.79) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.85, 95% CI (0.41, 1.74) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.70, 95% CI (0.88, 3.32)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Kennedy et al., 2000 (1997) Nashville, TN Greatest: RCT: individual Fair	<i>Setting:</i> Community: low income communities <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Prevention Marketing Initiative (PMI) - Nashville <i>Dosage:</i> 9 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> facilitators <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD	<i>Target population:</i> African American adolescents in a low income communities <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 14.4 (1.13) years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 40.7% Female: 59.3% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Black/ African American: 77.4% White: 0.3% Other: 5.4% Hispanic/Latino: 16.9% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 49.8% <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Intervention: 160 Comparison: 140 Total: 300 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: Intervention: 53.7% Comparison: 25.7%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.10, 95% CI (0.57, 2.12) <i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.73, 95% CI (0.38, 1.39) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.55, 95% CI (0.28, 1.07) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.00, 95% CI (0.46, 2.14)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Kennedy et al., 2000 (1997) Phoenix, AZ Greatest: non-randomized trial: individual Fair	<i>Setting:</i> Community: (details unknown) <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Prevention Marketing Initiative (PMI) - Phoenix <i>Dosage:</i> 9 hours of contact <i>Deliverers:</i> facilitators and "near peers" <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> multifocus	<i>Target population:</i> sexually active adolescents <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD) 16.5 (1.51) years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 40.8% Female: 59.2% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Black/African American: 12% White: 34.6% Other: 9.2% Hispanic/Latino: 44.2% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 27.5% <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Intervention: 159 Comparison: 54 Total: 213 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: Intervention: 50.6% Comparison: 62.6%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.08, 95% CI (0.53, 2.22) <i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 1.10, 95% CI (0.54, 2.27) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 1.36, 95% CI (0.66, 2.79) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.77, 95% CI (0.86, 3.65)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Kirby, Korpi et al., 1997 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Hollywood-Wilshire, Central Los Angeles, California</p> <p>Greatest RCT: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: 6 middle schools</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Project SNAPP</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 2 weeks in duration, 8 total contacts</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> peer</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> 7th grade students from urban area</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Total: Mean: 12.3 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 46% Female: 54%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Asian: 13% Black/African American: 9% White: 5% Hispanic 64%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 92%</p> <p><i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Intervention: 783 Comparison: 746 Total: 1529</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> Post test: Intervention: 22.9% Comparison 1: 23.1%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.02, 95% CI (0.76, 1.35) Female: OR= 1.02, 95% CI (0.67, 1.55) Male: OR= 1.01, 95% CI (0.68, 1.50)</p> <p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.99, 95% CI (0.61, 1.60)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 0.78, 95% CI (0.46, 1.34)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> OR= 0.73, 95% CI (0.42 1.28)</p> <p><i>Pregnancy:</i> OR= 0.80, 95%CI (0.33, 1.94)</p> <p><i>STI:</i> OR= 0.78, 95%CI (0.25, 2.44)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Koniak-Griffin et al., 2003 (study period not reported) Los Angeles County Greatest: RCT: group Fair	<i>Setting:</i> School: schools with adolescent mothers or pregnant adolescents <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone <i>Intervention Name:</i> Project CHARM <i>Dosage:</i> 8 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> nurse facilitator <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender, race/ethnicity and cultural/subcultural identity <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD	<i>Target population:</i> adolescents mothers or pregnant adolescents <i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 16.64 (1.16) years <i>Gender:</i> Female: 100% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Asian: 2.6% Black/African American: 17.5% White: 1.8% Hispanic 77.8% Other: 0.3% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 0% <i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Intervention: 347 Comparison: 150 Total: 497 <i>Attrition:</i> 3 rd follow up: Total: 8%	<i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.73, 95% CI (0.51, 1.03) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.86, 95% CI (0.58, 1.27) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.45, 95% CI (0.99, 2.12)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>LaChausse et al., 2006 (2003–2004)</p> <p>Southern California</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: physical science classes in four high schools</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Positive Prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 6 hours of contact, 6 total contacts</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> teacher</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> 9th grade students</p> <p><i>Grade:</i> 9th grade</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 42.5% Female: 57.8%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> American Indian/Alaska Native: 1.1% Asian: 4% Black/African American: 16.7% White: 10.2% Hispanic 58.6% Other: 9.4%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 88%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 216 Comparison: 137 Total: 353</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> 2nd follow up: Intervention: 20% Comparison: 18% Total: 19%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.31, 95% CI (0.15, 0.64)</p> <p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.67, 95% CI (0.27,1.69)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.80, 95% CI (0.71, 4.53)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Li, Stanton et al., 2002 (1993–1996) Baltimore, Maryland Greatest: RCT: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: recreation centers serving public housing communities <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Focus on Kids (FOK) <i>Dosage:</i> 8 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> interventionists recruited from community <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> low income African American youth <i>Age:</i> Mean: 11.5 years <i>Gender:</i> Male: 54% Female: 46% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> African American: 100% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 60% <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Intervention: 85 Comparison: 93 Total: 178 <i>Attrition:</i> not reported</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.88, 95% CI (0.53, 1.45) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.63, 95%CI (0.58, 4.54) Female: OR= 0.52, 95%CI (0.02, 16.32) Male: OR= 2.47, 95%CI (0.73, 8.28) <i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> OR= 0.77, 95%CI (0.05, 12.81) <i>Use of Protection (dual use):</i> OR= 1.58, 95%CI (0.53, 4.65)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Lieberman et al., 2000 (1996–1997)</p> <p>New York City (Brooklyn and Bronx)</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: middle schools in urban NYC</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Project IMPPACT (Inwood House Pregnancy Prevention and Care for Teenagers)</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 10 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> social workers</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> middle school students in urban schools</p> <p><i>Grade:</i> Female: Mean: 12.8 years Male: Mean: 13.1 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 17.6% Female: 82.4%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Female: Black/African American: 70.3% Hispanic 19.8% Other: 9.9% Male: Black/African American: 64.7% Hispanic 17.6% Other: 17.6%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 85.5%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 223 Comparison: 304 Total: 527</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Total: 21% 2nd follow up: Total: 41%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.11, 95% CI (0.58, 2.14) Female: OR= 1.11, 95% CI (0.48, 2.59) Male: OR= 2.23, 95% CI (0.68, 7.31)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 0.82, 95% CI (0.26, 2.58)</p> <p><i>Pregnancy:</i> OR= 3.06, 95%CI (0.87, 10.81) Female: OR= 1.31, 95%CI (0.34, 5.10) Male: OR= 1.00, 95%CI (0.04, 25.40)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Lightfoot et al., 2007 (study period not reported)</p> <p>location not reported</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: alternative education schools</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Project LIGHT (Living in Good Health Together)</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> students unsuccessful at mainstream schools and at risk for becoming involved or currently involved with the juvenile justice system</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 16.2 (1.5) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 36% Female: 65%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 52% White: 3% Hispanic 45%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 31 Comparison: 38 Total: 69</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> not reported</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.51, 95% CI (0.58, 3.94)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.38, 95% CI (0.16, 0.91)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 1.10, 95% CI (0.38, 3.21)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Magura et al., 1994 (1991–1992)</p> <p>New York City</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: NYC's main jail facility</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – AIDS education</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 4 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> counselor</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> detained and sentenced male youths in a main jail facility</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 17.8 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 100%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 64% White: 3% Hispanic 33%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 110 Comparison: 301 Total: 411</p> <p><i>Attrition calculated:</i> Posttest: Total: 34%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.55, 95% CI (0.31, 1.00)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.82, 95% CI (0.45, 1.47)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 2.02, 95%CI (1.12, 3.66)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Main et al., 1994 (1991–1992)</p> <p>Colorado</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: health classes in 10 selected high schools</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – HIV prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 2 weeks in duration, 15 total contacts</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> teacher</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescent high school students (including students from an alternative school)</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 14.99 (1.02) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 47.8% Female: 52.2%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> White: 65%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 68.6%</p> <p><i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Intervention: 560 Comparison: 419 Total: 979</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: Total: 36.1% 2nd follow up: Total: 48.1%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.93, 95% CI (0.61, 1.41)</p> <p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> Beta coefficient= 0.03, SE (0.30), p=0.91</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> Beta coefficient= -0.196, SE (0.098), p = 0.046</p> <p><i>Use of Protection:</i> Beta coefficient= 0.31, SE (0.16), p = 0.048</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>McBride et al., 2000 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Washington State</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: (details unknown)- Site G</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – client-centered pregnancy prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i> health educator, social worker and mentor</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> expansion of services</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> pregnancy</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescent females identified as high risk or potentially high risk for sexual activity and pregnancy</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Range: 14–17 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Female: 100%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at end of study:</i></p> <p>Intervention: 127</p> <p>Comparison: 105</p> <p>Total: 232</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i></p> <p>Post test:</p> <p>Total: 32%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.92, 95% CI (0.41, 2.06)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> OR= 0.29, 95% CI (0.10, 0.84)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>McBride et al., 2000 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Washington State</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: middle and high schools (Site F)</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – client-centered pregnancy prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> health educator</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> referrals to clinics and other resources</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescent females identified as high risk or potentially high risk for sexual activity and pregnancy</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Range: 14–17 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Female: 100%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Intervention: 94 Comparison: 72 Total: 166</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 20%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.20, 95% CI (0.06, 0.74)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> OR= 7.17, 95%CI (1.00, 51.37)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>McGraw, 2002 (1989–1992)</p> <p>Boston, MA and Hartford, CT</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: (details unknown)</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Poder Latino</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 78 weeks in duration</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i> peer, parents and CBO staff</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> condom promotion, media campaign</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> Latino adolescents</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean: 16.8 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 53% Female: 47%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Hispanic 100%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Intervention: 168 Comparison: 313 Total: 481</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Intervention: 7.2% Comparison: 9.3% Total: 8.5%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Females: OR= 1.24, p= 0.692 Males: OR= 0.08, p= 0.011</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> Females: OR= 0.06, p= 0.005 Males: OR=0.90, p= 0.79</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Females: OR= 1.36, 95%CI (0.72, 2.58) Males: OR= 1.22, 95%CI (0.69, 2.17)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Moberg et al., 1998 (1987–1993)</p> <p>Wisconsin</p> <p>Greatest: Other: randomized control group design nested within 2 self- selected treatment groups</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: small town middle school</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Healthy for Life (HFL)</p> <p>Arm 1: Age Appropriate Arm 2: Intensive</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 54 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i> health educator (hired and supervised by research team), classroom teacher and peer</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> community mobilization</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> middle school students in small towns</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Range: 14–15 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Arm 1: Male: 49% Female: 51% Arm 2: Male: 50% Female: 50%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Arm 1: White: 96% Other: 4% Arm 2: White: 96% Other: 4%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Total: 1677</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: 2nd follow up: Total: 20% 3rd follow up: Total: 32%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.21, 95% CI (0.87, 1.67) Arm 2: OR= 1.43, 95% CI (1.03, 1.97)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.30, 95%CI (0.85, 2.00) Arm 2: OR= 0.89, 95%CI (0.59 1.34)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Morrison et al., 2007 (study period not reported) Seattle, Washington Greatest: RCT: individual Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: community centers and after school programs <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Teens Taking Charge (replication of Focus on Kids) <i>Dosage:</i> 16 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> trainer <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity, cultural/subcultural identity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents from multicultural city with diverse race and socioeconomic status <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 12.7 (1.3) years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 37% Female: 63% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Black/African American: 37% White: 9% Other: 33% Hispanic/Latino: 2% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 90% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 217 Comparison: 237 Total: 454 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> 3rd follow up: Total: 11%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 1.65, 95% CI (0.98, 2.77) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.60, 95% CI (0.19, 1.91)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Morrison-Beady et al., 2005 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Rochester/Syracuse, NY</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p>Setting: Community: Family Planning clinic in Rochester, NY</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program - HIV prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 8 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> two nurses</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender, cultural/subcultural identity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> sexually active unmarried girls in disadvantaged communities</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 17.3 (1.4) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Total: Female: 100%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Asian: 2% Black/African American: 29% White: 59% Hispanic 10%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 0%</p> <p><i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Intervention: 33 Comparison: 29 Total: 62</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> Post test: Total: 52%</p>	<p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.48, 95% CI (0.19, 1.19)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 1.53, 95% CI (0.62 ,3.79)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> Intervention: pretest Mean= 5.4 posttest Mean= 7.6 Comparison: pretest Mean= 4.3 posttest Mean= 6.0</p> <p><i>Use of Protection:</i> Intervention: pretest Mean= 5.8 posttest Mean= 6.3 Comparison: pretest Mean= 8.1 posttest Mean= 13.2</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>O'Donnell et al., 1999 (1994–1995) Brooklyn, NY Greatest: non-randomized trial: group Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: Two large public urban middle schools <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Reach for Health (RFH) Arm 1: RFH and Community Youth Service Learning Arm 2: RFH only <i>Dosage:</i> not reported <i>Deliverer:</i> teacher <i>Additional Components:</i> Arm 1: community service & learning Arm 2: none <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> none <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> middle school students from urban area <i>Grade:</i> Total: middle school <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 47.2% Female: 52.8% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Black/ African American: 79.2% Hispanic/Latino: 15.9% Other: 4.9% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Arm 1: 72.2% Arm 2: 65.7% <i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Arm 1: 255 Arm 2: 222 Comparison: 584 Total: 1061 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 8.3%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.74, 95% CI (0.52, 1.05) Non-virgin: OR= 0.73, 95% CI (0.41, 1.29) Virgin: OR = 0.56, 95% CI (0.34, 0.94) Arm 2: OR= 0.90, 95% CI (0.64, 1.26) Non-virgin: OR= 1.07, 95% CI (0.59, 1.93) Virgin: OR = 0.78, 95% CI (0.46, 1.30) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.43, 95% CI (0.31, 0.59) Arm 2: OR= 0.52, 95% CI (0.38, 0.72)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Paine-Andrews et al., 1999 (1993–1996)</p> <p>Kansas</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: group</p> <p>Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: 2 Kansas communities:</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – pregnancy prevention program</p> <p>Arm 1: Greary county</p> <p>Arm 2: Franklin county</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 156 weeks in duration</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> multiple deliverers (peer, clergy, parents, teachers and other community members)</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> expanded access to mentoring, contraception, other supports, mass media campaign</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and cultural/subcultural identity</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> pregnancy</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents from low income communities</p> <p><i>Grade:</i> Arm 1 &2: high school</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Asian: 4% Black/African American: 23% White: 66% Hispanic 6%</p> <p>Arm 2: Black/African American: 1% White: 97% Hispanic 2%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Females 9–10 grade: 49.4% Females 11–12 grade: 26.9% Males 9–10 grade: 36.8% Males 11–12 grade: 33.3%</p> <p>Arm 2: Females 9–10 grade: 66.7% Females 11–12 grade: 45.9% Males 9–10 grade: 70.1% Males 11–12 grade: 43.1%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Greary County population: 30,353 Arm 2: Franklin County population: 22, 000</p>	<p><i>Pregnancy:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: pretest Pregnancy rate (range)= 55.2–69.0 posttest Pregnancy rate (range)= 49.5–62.1 Comparison: pretest Pregnancy rate (range)= 52.4–65.9 posttest Pregnancy rate (range)= 60.6–74.4</p> <p>Arm 2: pretest Pregnancy rate (range)= 29.7–57.8 posttest Pregnancy rate (range)= 33.0–39.6 Comparison: pretest Pregnancy rate (range)= 33.4–42.8 posttest Pregnancy rate (range)= 32.9–43.6 Pregnancy rate: number of pregnancies per 1000 14–17 year old females</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Pearlman et al., 2002 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Massachusetts</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: communities with Massachusetts Protect Teen Health Programs</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Protect Teen Health Peer Leaders Arm 1: new peer leaders Arm 2: repeat peer leaders</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 39 weeks in duration</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i> adult supervisor and peer</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> opinion leader model</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> Arm 1: minimal treatment Arm 2: comparable treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents drawn from Protect Teen Health programs</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Arm 1: Mean: 15.2 years Arm 2: Mean: 16.6 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Arm 1: Male: 34% Female: 66% Arm 2: Male: 30.3% Female: 69.7%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Arm 1: Black/African American: 12.5% White: 25% Hispanic 40.6% Other: 21.9% Arm 2: Black/African American: 19.4% White: 17.9% Hispanic: 31.3% Other: 31.3%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Arm 1: 69.1% Arm 2: 62.7%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Arm 1: 97 Arm 2: 67 Comparison: 71 Total: 168</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> not reported</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity (sexual risk taking scale):</i> Arm 1: No statistically significant differences were found between comparison youth and newly enrolled peer leaders using the 3-item sexual risk-taking scale as the dependent measure or using each scale component as dependent measures. In the analyses for newly enrolled peer leaders and comparison youth, a nonsignificant trend suggested that boys were more likely to engage in sexual risk-taking behaviors than girls ($p = .07$, data not shown). Arm 2: No statistically significant differences were found between comparison youth and repeat peer leaders using the 3-item sexual risk-taking scale as the dependent measure or using each scale component as dependent measures.</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Philliber Allen et al., 1992 (1988–1989)</p> <p>United States and one site in Canada</p> <p>Greatest: Prospective Cohort</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: schools across the US and 1 in Canada</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Teen Outreach</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 39 weeks in duration</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> facilitator</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> community service & learning</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> pregnancy</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents in Teen Outreach sites across the US</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean: 14.9 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 23.6% Female: 76.4%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> American Indian/Alaska Native: 4.7% Asian: 0.6% Black/African American: 40.1% White: 40.6% Hispanic 13.4% Other: 0.6%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 495 Comparison: 490 Total: 985</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> Post test: Total: 10.1%</p>	<p><i>Pregnancy:</i> Intervention: pretest proportion: 0.05 posttest proportion: 0.04 Comparison pretest proportion: 0.08 posttest proportion: 0.07</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Philliber, Kaye et al., 2002 (1997–2000) Harlem, NY Greatest: RCT: individual Fair	<i>Setting:</i> Community: after-school <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> CAS-Carrera Program (Children's Aid Society) <i>Dosage:</i> 156 weeks in duration, 4 hours of contact per week <i>Deliverer:</i> CBO staff <i>Additional Components:</i> on-site reproduction counseling, psychotherapy, annual physical <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> none <i>Focus:</i> pregnancy	<i>Target population:</i> disadvantaged adolescents <i>Age:</i> Mean: 13.85 years <i>Gender:</i> Male: 46.3% Female: 53.7% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 60% Hispanic 39% Other: 1% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 74% <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Intervention: 242 Comparison: 242 Total: 484 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: Total: 19.4%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.63, 95% CI (0.43, 0.92) Female: OR= 0.82, 95% CI (0.50, 1.34) Male: OR= 0.57, 95% CI (0.30, 1.07) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.26, 95% CI (0.77, 2.06) Female: OR= 1.75, 95%CI (0.95, 3.21) Male: OR= 0.64, 95%CI (0.26, 1.58) <i>Use of Protection (dual use):</i> OR= 1.06, 95% CI (0.68, 1.65) Female: OR= 2.25, 95% CI (1.30, 3.90) Male: OR= 0.40, 95% CI (0.18, 0.89) <i>Pregnancy:</i> OR= 0.54, 95% CI (0.32, 0.93) Female: OR= 0.39, 95%CI (0.20, 0.79) Male: OR= 1.11, 95%CI (0.46, 2.66)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Rotheram-Borus, Koopman et al., 1991 (1988–1990) New York City, NY Greatest: non-randomized trial: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: New York City residential shelter <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – HIV prevention <i>Dosage:</i> 40 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> shelter staff <i>Additional Components:</i> expanded access to care, individual counseling <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> none <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> runaway youth in urban areas <i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 15.4 (1.5) years <i>Gender:</i> Male: 33% Female: 67% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 58% White: 7% Hispanic 27% Other: 8% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 31 % <i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Intervention: 78 Comparison: 67 Total: 145 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: Intervention: 34% Comparison: 15% Total: 23%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Beta coefficient= 0.37, p<0.06 <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Beta coefficient= 0.10, p<0.06</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Rotheram-Borus, Gwadz et al., 1998 (study period not reported)</p> <p>New York City, NY</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: The Door, a NYC community-based service agency for youth</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – HIV prevention</p> <p>Arm 1: 3-session intervention</p> <p>Arm 2: 7-session intervention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 10.5 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i> CBO services agency worker and research staff</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> urban minority youth from high risk neighborhoods with high seroprevalence</p> <p><i>Age:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Mean (SD): 18.3 (1.8) years</p> <p>Arm 2: Mean (SD): 18.1 (1.7) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i></p> <p>Arm 1:</p> <p>Male: 44%</p> <p>Female: 54%</p> <p>Arm 2:</p> <p>Male: 47.2%</p> <p>Female: 52.8%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i></p> <p>Arm 1:</p> <p>Black/African American: 59%</p> <p>Hispanic 33%</p> <p>Other: 8%</p> <p>Arm 2:</p> <p>Black/African American: 56%</p> <p>Hispanic 39%</p> <p>Other: 6%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: 30%</p> <p>Arm 2: 26.4%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i></p> <p>Total: 151</p> <p><i>Attrition rate:</i></p> <p>Posttest:</p> <p>Total: 18%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 1.00, 95% CI (0.43, 2.30)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 1.00, 95% CI (0.43, 2.31)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 2.02, 95% CI (0.81 ,5.02)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 1.30, 95% CI (0.54 ,3.15)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 0.52, 95% CI (0.24, 1.13)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 0.32, 95% CI (0.13, 0.78)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Rotheram-Borus, Song et al., 2003 (study period not reported)</p> <p>New York City, NY</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: adolescent homeless shelters in NYC</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Street Smart</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> shelter staff and researchers</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> training all shelter staff to create reinforcing environment, expanded access to care</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> urban runaway youth</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 15.6 (1.42) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 50.5% Female: 49.5%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 55.6% Hispanic 29.3% Other: 15.2 %</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 11%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 101 Comparison: 86 Total: 187</p> <p><i>Attrition rate:</i> Posttest: Total: 43% 2nd follow up: Total: 42% 3rd follow up: Total: 50%</p>	<p><i>Number of Partners:</i> Females: OR= 0.85, 95% CI (0.57, 1.28) Males: OR= 1.49, 95% CI (0.84, 2.65)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> Females: OR= 0.29, 95% CI (0.08, 1.02) Males: OR= 1.43, 95% CI (0.53, 3.89)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Rotheram-Borus, Stein et al., 2006 (1993–1999) New York City, NY Greatest: RCT: individual Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: (details unknown) <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Project TALC (Teens & Adults Learning to Communicate) <i>Dosage:</i> 32 hours of contact <i>Deliverers:</i> social workers and graduate students in clinical psychology <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents whose parents were HIV positive <i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 14.57 (2.02) years <i>Gender:</i> Male: 47% Female: 53% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 35% White: 4% Hispanic 50% Other: 11% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 55% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 206 Comparison: 207 Total: 413 <i>Attrition rate:</i> Post test: Total: 10% 2nd follow up: Total: 10%</p>	<p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 1.22, 95% CI (0.80 ,1.85)</p>
<p>Siegel et al., 2001 (study period not reported) Rochester, NY Greatest: non-randomized trial: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: Middle school and high school health classes at selected schools in Rochester, NY <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Rochester AIDS Prevention Project (RAPP) Arm 1: RAPP with adult health educator</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> urban, predominantly minority middle and high school students <i>Age:</i> Arm 1: Middle School: Mean: 13.2 years High School: Mean: 17.3 years Arm 2: Middle School: Mean: 13 years High School: Mean: 17.1 years Arm 3: Middle School: Mean: 13 years <i>Gender:</i></p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity (sex activity scale):</i> Arm 1: Middle School: Male: posttest Mean= 7.4 Comparison group posttest Mean= 7.4 Female: posttest Mean= 8.3 Comparison group posttest Mean= 8.4 High School: Male: posttest Mean= 6.5</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
	<p>Arm 2: RAPP with peer educator Arm 3: RAPP with teacher <i>Dosage:</i> 7 weeks in duration, 3 contacts per week, 12 total contacts <i>Deliverer:</i> Arm 1: adult health educator Arm 2: peer educators (volunteer high school students) Arm 3: regular health teachers <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> none <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p>Arm 1: Middle School: Male: 50% Female: 50% High School: Male: 47.6% Female: 52.4% Arm 2: Middle School: Male: 48.1% Female: 51.9% High School: Male: 46.4% Female: 53.6% Arm 3: Middle School: Male: 50.7% Female: 49.3% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Arm 1: Middle School: Black/African American: 46.7% White: 18.8% Hispanic 18.6% Other: 15.9% High School: Black/African American: 53.3% White: 22.7% Hispanic 11.4% Other: 12.6% Arm 2: Middle School: Black/African American: 48.7% White: 16.2% Hispanic 21.5% Other: 13.6% High School: Black/African American: 51.9% White: 26.4% Hispanic 7.7% Other: 14</p>	<p>Comparison group posttest Mean= 6.5 Female: posttest Mean= 7.3 Comparison group posttest Mean= 7.4 Arm 2: Male: posttest Mean= 7.5 Comparison group posttest Mean= 7.4 Female: posttest Mean= 8.6 Comparison group posttest Mean= 8.4 High School: Male: posttest Mean= 7.1 Comparison group posttest Mean= 6.5 Female: posttest Mean= 7.5 Comparison group posttest Mean= 7.4 Arm 3: Middle School: Male: posttest Mean= 8.0 Comparison group posttest Mean= 7.4 Female: posttest Mean= 9.1 Comparison group posttest Mean= 8.4</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
		<p>Arm 3: Middle School: Black/African American: 51.5% White: 15.4% Hispanic 16.4% Other: 16.6%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: Middle School: Male: 39.2% Female: 65.8% High School: Male: 19.8% Female: 33.1%</p> <p>Arm 2: Middle School: Male: 33.8% Female: 76.8% High School: Male: 30.7% Female: 39.4%</p> <p>Arm 3: Middle School: Male: 46.8% Female: 81.6%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: 1404 Arm 2: 1020 Arm 3: 313 Comparison: 1264 Total: 4001</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i></p> <p>Posttest: Total: 35.2%</p>	

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Sikkema et al., 2005 (1998–2000)</p> <p>Milwaukee, Racine, Roanoke, Seattle, Tacoma</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: 15 housing developments in 5 U.S. cities</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – HIV prevention</p> <p>Arm 1: Workshop only</p> <p>Arm 2: Community component + Workshop</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i></p> <p>Arm1: 6 hours of contact</p> <p>Arm 2: 27 weeks in duration</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: facilitator</p> <p>Arm 2: peer</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: none</p> <p>Arm 2: leadership council, activities to create social and environmental supports</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: tailored for gender</p> <p>Arm 2: tailored for gender, attempts made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents living in high poverty housing developments</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 14.5 (1.7) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i></p> <p>Total:</p> <p>Male: 50%</p> <p>Female: 50%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i></p> <p>Total:</p> <p>American Indian/Alaska Native: 1%</p> <p>Asian: 20%</p> <p>Black/African American: 51%</p> <p>White: 5%</p> <p>Hispanic 3%</p> <p>Other: 20%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i></p> <p>Total: 73%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: 428</p> <p>Arm 2: 392</p> <p>Comparison: 352</p> <p>Total: 1172</p> <p><i>Attrition rate:</i></p> <p>Post test:</p> <p>Arm 1: 30%</p> <p>Arm 2: 26%</p> <p>Comparison: 21%</p> <p>Total: 28%</p> <p>2nd follow up:</p> <p>Arm 1: 36%</p> <p>Arm 2: 40%</p> <p>Comparison: 30%</p> <p>Total: 36%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 0.56, 95% CI (0.33, 0.95)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 0.89, 95% CI (0.56, 1.44)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 1.80, 95% CI (0.94, 3.46)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 3.61, 95% CI (1.68, 7.77)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Slonim-Nevo et al., 1996 (study period not reported) St. Louis, MO Greatest: RCT: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: Fifteen residential centers <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – AIDS prevention Arm 1: Skills training Arm 2: Discussion groups <i>Dosage:</i> 18 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> social work students <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> high risk youth from urban areas living in residential centers <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 14.7 1.6 years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 56% Female: 44% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Black/African American: 46% White: 54% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Total: 358 <i>Attrition rate:</i> Posttest: Total: 39%</p>	<p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.81, 95% CI (1.00, 3.28) Arm 2: OR= 1.81, 95% CI (1.00, 3.26)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Smith, 1994 (1989) Queens, NY Greatest: RCT: individual Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: inner-city high school in Queens, NY <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Teen Incentive Program <i>Dosage:</i> 26 weeks in duration <i>Deliverer:</i> not reported <i>Additional Components:</i> access to family planning service, mentoring with health professionals, individual/group counseling <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> none <i>Focus:</i> pregnancy</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> inner city high school students <i>Age:</i> Mean (SD): 15.3 (1.02) years <i>Gender:</i> Male: 23.3% Female: 76.7% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/African American: 48.3% Other Race: 5% Hispanic 13.3% Other Ethnicity: 33.3% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 60 Comparison: 60 Total: 120 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: Intervention: 30% Comparison: 12% Total: 21%</p>	<p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.51, 95% CI (0.25, 1.08) <i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> Beta coefficient = 0.5</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Smith, Weinman et al., 1997 (1992–1994) Houston, TX Greatest: non-randomized trial: group Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: one of 2 selected teen health clinics <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Risk Reduction Alone <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – condom motivation education <i>Dosage:</i> 1 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> STD educator <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> STD positive adolescent females <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean age: 17.32 years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Female: 100% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Black/African American: 72.7% White: 9.7% Hispanic/Latino: 17.6% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 0% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 86 Comparison: 119 Total: 205 <i>Attrition:</i> Post test: Intervention: 26.7% Comparison: 32.8% Total: 30.2%</p>	<p>STI: OR= 1.56, 95%CI (0.56, 4.34)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Smith, Dane et al., 2000 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Two counties in rural Georgia</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: 10th grades</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Stand Together Against Negative Decisions (STAND)</p> <p>Arm 1: school program</p> <p>Arm 2: diffusion program</p> <p>Comparison 1: school comparison</p> <p>Comparison 2: diffusion comparison</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 36 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverers:</i> middle school counselor, AIDS Education Specialist and college interns</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> media campaign</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> multifocus</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> 10th grade students from rural area identified as opinion leaders</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Arm 1: Mean: 15.8 years Arm 2: Mean: 15.4 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Arm 1: Male: 48% Female: 52% Arm 2: Male: 43% Female: 57%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Arm 1: Black/African American: 71% White: 29% Arm 2: Black/African American: 74% White: 26%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Arm 1: 33% Arm 2: 50%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Arm 1: 21 Arm 2: 167</p> <p>Comparison 1: 53 Comparison 2: 74</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> not reported</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.88, 95% CI (0.27, 2.83) Arm 2: OR= 0.86, 95% CI (0.49, 1.50)</p> <p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> Arm 1: prettest Mean= 5.3 posttest Mean= 15.1 Comparison: prettest Mean= 5.1 posttest Mean= 7.9</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.88, 95% CI (0.34, 10.55) Arm 2: OR= 0.68, 95% CI (0.18, 2.51)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.64, 95% CI (0.25, 1.60) Arm 2: prettest Mean= 1.8 posttest Mean= 2.6 Comparison: prettest Mean= 1.6 posttest Mean= 2.0</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.39, 95% CI (0.39, 5.00) Arm 2: OR= 0.39, 95% CI (0.11, 1.32)</p> <p><i>Pregnancy:</i> Arm 1: OR= 5.22, 95% CI (0.75, 36.41) Arm 2: OR= 1.90, 95% CI (0.4, 9.02)</p> <p><i>STI:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.25, 95%CI (0.01, 5.52) Arm 2: OR= 1.17, 95%CI (0.05, 25.75)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>St. Lawrence, Jefferson et al., 1995 (study period not reported) Jackson, Mississippi Greatest: RCT: individual Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: a residential treatment facility <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – behavioral skills training <i>Dosage:</i> 9 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> group leaders <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> treated control <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> high risk adolescents (high risk area, substance users, sexually active, low education) <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean 15.6 years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 73% Female: 26% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Black/ African American: 16% White: 84% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 20% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 17 Comparison: 17 Total: 34 <i>Attrition:</i> Posttest: Total: 0%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.43, 95% CI (0.07, 2.76) <i>STI:</i> OR= 0.12, 95% CI (0.01, 1.11)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>St. Lawrence, Brasfield et al., 1995 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Mississippi</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: a low-income population</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – behavioral skills training</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 16 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> project staff</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> treated control</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender and race/ethnicity</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> African American adolescents in a low income, urban community</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Total: Mean: 15.3 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 28% Female: 72%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Black/ African American: 100%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Total: 225</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> 3rd follow up: Total: 8.5%</p>	<p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.40, 95% CI 0.22, 0.75) Females: OR= 0.37, 95%CI (0.18, 0.78) Males: OR= 0.47, 95%CI (0.15, 1.52)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.56, 95% CI (0.31, 1.04) Females: OR= 0.70, 95%CI (0.22, 2.21) Males: OR= 0.45, 95%CI (0.22, 0.93)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 3.57, 95%CI (1.95, 6.57) Female: OR= 1.72, 95%CI (0.85, 3.45) Male: OR= 8.22, 95%CI (2.44, 27.72)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>St. Lawrence, Crosby, Belcher et al., 1999 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Mississippi</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: individual</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: state reformatory in a southern state with high teen pregnancy, syphilis, and gonorrhea rates</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Becoming a Responsible Teen (BART)</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 6 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> trained facilitator</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> incarcerated male adolescents</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 15.8 (0.7) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 100%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> American Indian or Alaska Native: 0.2% Black/African American: 69.9% White: 28% Hispanic/Latino: 1.9%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 2.8%</p> <p><i>Number of participants analyzed:</i> Intervention: 160 Comparison: 161 Total: 321</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Total: 11%</p>	<p><i>Frequency of Sex:</i> OR = 0.83, 95% CI (0.56, 1.24)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.75, 95% CI (0.51 ,1.12)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i> OR= 0.83, 95% CI (0.56, 1.23)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.01, 95% CI (0.68, 1.49)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>St. Lawrence, Crosby, Brasfield et al., 2002 (1995–1998)</p> <p>Mississippi</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Good</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> Community: residential drug treatment facilities in the state of Mississippi</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – behavioral skills training</p> <p>Arm 1: information + skills-based safer sex training</p> <p>Arm 2: information + skills-based safer sex training + risk-sensitization manipulation</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 18 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> trained individuals with degrees in psychology</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> treated control</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for gender and cultural/subcultural identity</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> adolescents enrolled in a residential drug treatment program</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 16.0 (1.3) years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i></p> <p>Male: 68%</p> <p>Female: 32%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i></p> <p>American Indian/Alaskan Native: 2%</p> <p>Black/African American: 22%</p> <p>White: 75%</p> <p>Hispanic 1%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 3%</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: 53</p> <p>Arm 2: 53</p> <p>Comparison: 53</p> <p>Total: 159</p> <p><i>Attrition rate:</i></p> <p>Posttest:</p> <p>Total: 0%</p> <p>2nd follow up:</p> <p>Total: 3%</p> <p>3rd follow up:</p> <p>Total: 11%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 0.15, 95% CI (0.05, 0.41)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 0.08, 95% CI (0.03, 0.21)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 0.78, 95% CI (0.37 ,1.62)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 0.78, 95% CI (0.37 ,1.62)</p> <p><i>Unprotected Sex:</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 0.49, 95% CI (0.24, 1.00)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 0.49, 95% CI (0.24, 1.00)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i></p> <p>Arm 1: OR= 2.05, 95% CI (1.01, 4.16)</p> <p>Arm 2: OR= 2.03, 95% CI (1.00, 4.11)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Stanton, Cole et al., 2004 (1999: not reported) Baltimore, MD Greatest RCT: group Fair	<i>Setting:</i> Community: low-income housing areas in Baltimore <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Focus on Kids (FOK) + ImPACT (Informed Parents and Children Together) Arm 1: FOK + ImPACT with and without boosters Arm 2: FOK + ImPACT with boosters only <i>Dosage:</i> 12 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> interventionists <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> treated control <i>Tailoring:</i> none <i>Focus:</i> multifocus	<i>Target population:</i> low income, inner city adolescents <i>Age:</i> Arm 1 and 2: Range: 13–16 years <i>Gender:</i> Arm 1 & Arm 2: Male: 40% Female: 60% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Arm 1 and 2: Black/African American: 100% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Arm 1: 65% Arm 2: 62% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Arm 1: 258 Arm 2: 238 Comparison: 321 Total: 817 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: Comparison: 25% Total: 26% 2nd follow up: Comparison: 24% Total: 29% 3rd follow up: Arm 1: 40% Arm 2: 41% Comparison: 38% Total: 40%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.96, 95% CI (0.63, 1.48) Arm 2: OR= 1.38, 95% CI (0.89, 2.13) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> Arm 1: pretest Mean= 0.22 posttest Mean= 0.30 Arm 2: pretest Mean= 0.22 posttest Mean= 0.26 Comparison: pretest Mean= 0.27 posttest Mean= 0.26 <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.22, 95% CI (0.76, 1.98) Arm 2: OR= 1.29, 95% CI (0.79, 2.13) <i>Use of Protection (oral contraceptives):</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.34, 95% CI (0.81, 2.21) Arm 2: OR= 1.91, 95% CI (1.17, 3.13) <i>Pregnancy:</i> Arm : OR= 0.24, 95% CI (0.10, 0.56) Arm 2: OR= 0.88, 95%CI (0.49, 1.59)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Stanton, Guo et al., 2005 (study period not reported) Rural West Virginia Greatest: RCT: group Good	<i>Setting:</i> School: rural middle and high schools <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Focus on Kids (FOK) Arm 1: Original FOK Arm 2: West Virginia FOK <i>Dosage:</i> 12 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> interventionist <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for cultural/subcultural identity <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD	<i>Target population:</i> adolescents from a rural area <i>Age:</i> Arm 1: Range: 12–16 years Arm 2: Range: 12–16 years <i>Gender:</i> Arm 1: Male: 76.2% Female: 23.8% Arm 2: Male: 29.3% Female: 70.7% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> not reported <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported <i>Number of participants at end of study:</i> Total: 810 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Posttest: Total: 17% 2nd follow up: Total: 15% 3rd follow up: Total: 19%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.40, 95% CI (1.00, 1.95) Arm 2: OR= 1.34, 95% CI (1.00, 1.78) <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.72, 95% CI (0.51, 1.00) Arm 2: OR= 0.75, 95% CI (0.56, 1.00) <i>Use of Protection (dual use):</i> OR= 0.68, 95% CI (0.51, 0.91)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Villarruel et al., 2006 (2000–2003) Philadelphia, PA Greatest: RCT: individual Good	<i>Setting:</i> Community: schools and community-based organizations <i>Intervention strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> ¡Cúdate! <i>Dosage:</i> 8 hours of contact <i>Deliverer:</i> facilitators <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for race/ethnicity and attempts were made to ensure deliverers were culturally appropriate <i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD	<i>Target population:</i> Latino adolescents <i>Grade:</i> Total: Mean (SD): 14.9 (1.49) years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 45% Female: 55% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: Hispanic/ Latino: 100% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> 59.1% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Intervention: 312 Comparison: 341 Total: 653 <i>Attrition rate:</i> 3rd follow up: Total: 18%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> OR= 0.66, 95% CI (0.46, 0.95) <i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.53, 95% CI (0.31 ,0.90) <i>Unprotected Sex:</i> RR = 0.47, 95%CI (0.26, 0.84), p<0.05 <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> OR= 1.30, 95% CI (0.75, 2.26)

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Walter et al., 1993 (1990–1991)</p> <p>New York City borough</p> <p>Greatest: non-randomized trial: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: four public high schools in a New York City borough</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> no named program – HIV prevention</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 6 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> regular health teacher</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> untreated</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> inner city public high school students</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Mean: 15.7 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Male: 45% Female: 55%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Other: 76.6%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Arm 1: 667 Comparison 1: 534 Total: 1201</p> <p><i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Post test: Intervention: 28.5% Comparison: 27% Total: 27.8%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Intervention: posttest Proportion= 0.09 Comparison posttest Proportion= 0.11 p<0.60</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> OR= 0.70, 95% CI (0.51 ,0.96)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Intervention: posttest Proportion= 0.05 Comparison posttest Proportion= 0.01 p<0.05</p> <p><i>STI:</i> Intervention: posttest Proportion= 0.02 Comparison posttest Proportion= 0.04 p<0.10</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
<p>Weeks et al., 1997 (study period not reported)</p> <p>Midwest</p> <p>Greatest: RCT: group</p> <p>Fair</p>	<p><i>Setting:</i> School: middle and junior high schools from 15 high-risk school districts</p> <p><i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction</p> <p><i>Intervention Name:</i> Youth AIDS Prevention Project (YAPP)</p> <p>Arm 1: YAPP with parental involvement</p> <p>Arm 2: YAPP without parental involvement</p> <p><i>Dosage:</i> 10 hours of contact</p> <p><i>Deliverer:</i> Master's graduate level health educators</p> <p><i>Additional Components:</i> none</p> <p><i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment</p> <p><i>Tailoring:</i> none</p> <p><i>Focus:</i> HIV/STD</p>	<p><i>Target population:</i> middle school students from high risk school districts</p> <p><i>Age:</i> Arm 1: Mean: 12.4 years Arm 2: Mean: 12.6 years</p> <p><i>Gender:</i> Arm 1: Male: 49.9% Female: 50.1% Arm 2: Male: 50.1% Female: 49.9%</p> <p><i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Arm 1: Black/African American: 52.2% White: 26.9% Hispanic 14.1% Other: 5.9% Arm 2: Black/African American: 65.1% White: 14% Hispanic 17.1% Other: 3.9%</p> <p><i>Virginity at baseline:</i> not reported</p> <p><i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Arm 1: 770 Arm 2: 689 Comparison: 933 Total: 2392</p> <p><i>Attrition:</i> Posttest: Arm 1: 22.1% Arm 2: 28.7% Comparison: 19.5% 2nd follow up: Arm 1: 54.9% Arm 2: 60.2% Comparison: 50.9%</p>	<p><i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.00, 95% CI (0.57, 1.75) Arm 2: OR= 0.95, 95% CI (0.59, 1.54)</p> <p><i>Number of Partners:</i> Arm 1 & Arm 2: OR= 0.94, 95% CI (0.62 ,1.42)</p> <p><i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.99, 95% CI (0.55 1.80) Arm 2: OR= 0.78, 95% CI (0.42 1.45)</p>

Author(s) & Date (Study period) Location Design suitability Quality of execution	Intervention Description	Study population description and Attrition	Study Results for Index follow-up
Zimmerman et al., unpublished (1999) Rural Kentucky Greatest: non-randomized trial: group Fair	<i>Setting:</i> School: high schools in rural south and southeast Kentucky <i>Intervention Strategy:</i> Comprehensive Risk Reduction <i>Intervention Name:</i> Arm 1: Modified Reducing the Risk (MRTR) Arm 2: Reducing the Risk (RTR) <i>Dosage:</i> 12 total contacts <i>Deliverers:</i> Arm 1: teacher and peer Arm 2: teacher <i>Additional Components:</i> none <i>Comparison Group:</i> minimal treatment <i>Tailoring:</i> tailored for cultural/subcultural identity <i>Focus:</i> multifocus	<i>Target population:</i> high school students from a rural community <i>Age:</i> Total: Mean: 14.53 years <i>Gender:</i> Total: Male: 48.1% Female: 51.9% <i>Race/Ethnicity:</i> Total: White: 96.5% Other: 3.5% <i>Virginity at baseline:</i> Total: 69% <i>Number of participants at beginning of study:</i> Total: 5798 <i>Attrition Calculated:</i> Total: 18% 2nd follow up: Total: 29.6%	<i>Sexual Activity:</i> Arm 1: OR= 0.72, p<0.05 Arm 2: OR= 0.76, p<0.05 <i>Use of Protection (condoms):</i> Arm 1: OR= 1.60, p<0.05 Arm 2: OR= 1.78, p<0.05

Studies that provided enough information to calculate an OR and 95% CI were included in the analysis