

Sample Search String		
Database: Medline		
Run Date: February 1, 2016		
#	Query	Results
S1	(Educat* OR school).ti,ab.	542740
S2	(Goal* OR likelihood OR intention* OR aspiration* OR engagement OR involvement OR commitment OR interest OR contribution OR dislike OR attainment OR asset* OR failure OR attendance OR success* OR system*).ti,ab.	4710960
S3	S1 AND S2	156100
S4	("locus of control" OR "internal poverty" OR "external poverty").ti,ab.	5252
S5	S1 OR S3 OR S4	547203
S6	(Teen* OR adolesc* OR youth* OR pubescent OR juvenile* OR "young person" OR "young people" OR girl OR "young women" OR minor*).ti,ab.	587014
S7	(student OR "school-aged" OR "dropout" OR "middle school" or "high school" OR pupil).ti,ab.	98751
S8	S6 OR S7	670157
S9	(pregnan* OR conception OR abortion OR "family planning" OR "safe* sex" OR "protected sex" OR "unsafe sex" OR "unprotected sex" OR "sexual behavio?r" OR "sexual risk" OR "sexual risk-taking" OR "sexual intercourse" OR "sexually active" OR sexuality OR (sex* ADJ2 initiation) OR (sex* ADJ2 activity) OR (sex* ADJ2 debut) OR condom OR STI OR STD OR "sexually transmitted infection" OR "sexually transmitted disease" OR chlamydia OR gonorrhea OR contracept* OR "birth control" OR abstinen* OR "barrier method*" OR (intrauterine ADJ1 (device OR system OR contracept*)) OR "long-acting reversible contracept*" OR LARC).ti,ab.	580345
S10	S8 AND S9	41571
S11	("teen* parent*" OR "young parent*" OR "teen* mother*" OR "teen* mom*" OR "young mother*" OR "early pregnan*").ti,ab.	16229
S12	S10 OR S11	56379
S13	S5 AND S12	12054
S14	((interview* OR discussion*) ADJ3 (semi-structured OR unstructured OR informal OR in-depth OR face-to-face OR structured OR guide)).ti,ab.	58605
S15	(qualitative OR "focus group*" OR interview* OR narration OR stories OR meaning* OR perspective* OR concept* OR belief* OR attitude* OR perceive* OR perception* OR fieldwork OR "field work" OR "key informant" OR "case stud*" OR ethnograph* OR "purpos* sampl*" OR "content analysis" OR "action research" OR discourse*).ti,ab.	1297136
S16	(Qualitative research OR interviews OR grounded theory).sh.	25089
S17	((((process OR formative OR pilot OR preliminary) ADJ2 evaluation) OR feasib* OR accept* OR delivery OR (intervention ADJ3 (implementation OR planning))).ti,ab.	818919
S18	S14 OR S15 OR S16 OR 17	2009857
S19	S13 AND S18	6062
S20	limit 17 to yr="1990 -Current"	5237

Eligibility Criteria Tool		
Criteria	Description	Guidance
Date	Exclude studies published before <u>1990</u>	Filter search on date. If filter is not available, apply this criteria first.
Language and Location	Do <u>not</u> exclude studies based on language.	Studies are not excluded on geographical location or language. Include all high, middle and low income countries.
Type of Studies	Exclude studies that are not qualitative OR did not collect data directly from study participants.	Exclude: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intervention studies and outcome evaluations • Observational studies measuring quantitative associations • Methodological studies • Policy papers or articles • Opinion/think articles Qualitative studies may include participant observation or ethnography but must include individual or group interviews or other data collected in participants' own words.
Population	Exclude studies where the majority of the population are not female.	Exclude studies where participants are not overwhelmingly female.
Topic	Exclude studies which do not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report on school or education experiences and assets described to the right. AND <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide accounts or analyses on how school or education-related experiences and assets influence decisions on sexual behavior, contraception use, pregnancy, abortion or parenthood 	Exclude studies which do not report on school and education experiences and assets as they related to sexual health and pregnancy. Example topics include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Caring adult relationships at school • School climate and culture (e.g. • School safety (including physical and emotional violence) • School boundaries (e.g. clear and fair rules and consequences) • High expectations from teachers and other school staff • Adult role models at school • School connected to community • High expectations for school work • High optimism for future educational opportunities • Academic achievement and support • Engagement in learning and school • School bonding (e.g. cares about school, feels connected to school)

Quality Assessment Tool*	
Criteria used for quality appraisal	Codes
<p>1. Were steps taken to increase rigour in the sampling? Consider whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the sampling strategy was appropriate to the questions posed in the study (e.g. was the strategy well reasoned and justified?); • attempts were made to obtain a diverse sample of the population in question (think about who might have been excluded; who may have had a different perspective to offer); • characteristics of the sample critical to the understanding of the study context and findings were presented (i.e. do we know who the participants were in terms of, for example, basic socio-demographics, characteristics relevant to the context of the study, etc.). 	<p>Yes, a fairly thorough attempt was made Yes, several steps were taken Yes, a few steps were taken No, not at all/ Not stated/Can't tell</p>
<p>2. Were steps taken to increase rigour in the data collected? Consider whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data collection tools were piloted/(and if quantitative) validated; • (if qualitative) data collection was comprehensive, flexible and/or sensitive enough to provide a complete and/or vivid and rich description of people's perspectives and experiences (e.g. did the researchers spend sufficient time at the site/with participants? Did they keep 'following up'? Was more than one method of data collection used?); • steps were taken to ensure that all participants were able and willing to contribute (e.g. processes for consent, language barriers, power relations between adults and children/young people). 	<p>Yes, a fairly thorough attempt was made Yes, several steps were taken Yes, a few steps were taken No, not at all/ Not stated/Can't tell</p>
<p>3. Were steps taken to increase rigour in the analysis of the data? Consider whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • data analysis methods were systematic (e.g. was a method described/can a method be discerned?); • diversity in perspective was explored; • (if qualitative) the analysis was balanced in the extent to which it was guided by preconceptions or by the data); • the analysis sought to rule out alternative explanations for findings (in qualitative research this could be done by, for example, searching for negative cases/exceptions, feeding back preliminary results to participants, asking a colleague to review the data, or reflexivity; in quantitative research this may be done by, for example, significance testing). 	<p>Yes, a fairly thorough attempt was made Yes, several steps were taken Yes, a few steps were taken No, not at all/ Not stated/Can't tell</p>
<p>4. Were the findings of the study grounded in/ supported by the data? Consider whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enough data are presented to show how the authors arrived at their findings; • the data presented fit the interpretation/support claims about patterns in data; • the data presented illuminate/illustrate the findings; 	<p>Good grounding/support Fair grounding/support Limited grounding/support</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (for qualitative studies) quotes are numbered or otherwise identified and the reader can see that they don't just come from one or two people. 	
<p>5. Please rate the findings of the study in terms of their breadth and depth.</p> <p>Consider whether: (NB: it may be helpful to consider 'breadth' as the extent of description and 'depth' as the extent to which data has been transformed/analysed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a range of issues are covered; • the perspectives of participants are fully explored in terms of breadth (contrast of two or more perspectives) and depth (insight into a single perspective); • richness and complexity has been portrayed (e.g. variation explained, meanings illuminated); • there has been theoretical/conceptual development. 	<p>Good/fair breadth and depth Good/fair breadth but very little depth Good /fair depth but very little breadth Limited breadth or depth</p>
<p>6. To what extent does the study privilege the perspectives and experiences of children?</p> <p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • whether there was a balance between open-ended and fixed response options; • whether children were involved in designing the research; • whether there was a balance between the use of an a priori coding framework and induction in the analysis; • the position of the researchers (did they consider it important to listen to the perspectives of children?); • whether steps were taken to assure confidentiality and put young people at ease. 	<p>Not at all A little Somewhat A lot</p>
<p>7. Overall, what weight would you assign to this study in terms of the reliability/trustworthiness of its findings?</p> <p>Guidance: Think about the answers you have given to questions 1 to 4 above. Score low if the study provided little to no detail on three out of the four reliability criteria. Score high if study provided detail on at least three out of the four reliability criteria.</p>	<p>Low Medium High</p>
<p>8. What weight would you assign to this study in terms of the usefulness of its findings for this review? Guidance: Think (mainly) about the answers you have given to questions 5 and 6 above and consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the match between the study aims and findings and the aims and purpose of the synthesis; • its conceptual depth/explanatory power. <p>Score high if study provided both good depth and breadth and if the perspectives of participants were at least somewhat privileged.</p>	<p>Low Medium High</p>
<p>Based on guidance from: <i>Rees R, Oliver K, Woodman J, Thomas J (2009) Children's views about obesity, body size, shape and weight: a systematic review. London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.</i></p>	