

Studies	Study design	Finding	Methodological limitations	Relevance	Coherence	Adequacy	Confidence
<b>Acceptability</b>							
2 (Rockliffe 2018, Rockliffe 2020)	Semi-structured interviews, focus groups and questionnaires	Many of the students and parents liked the incentive idea and thought it encouraged consent form return. However, some students reported negative emotions when they heard about the draw or when they didn't win. Some also felt guilty about winning when there were so few prizes available. Some said that not winning might discourage consent form return in future	Serious <sup>1</sup>	High	High	Moderate <sup>3</sup>	Moderate
2 (Rockliffe 2018, Rockliffe 2020)	Semi-structured interviews, focus groups and questionnaires	Some girls thought the prize was relevant to their age group but others were not impressed by the type of voucher, or the value of the voucher. Some girls suggested that it would be more fair if there were more prizes of lower value, or everyone was given a small amount of money for consent form return.	Serious <sup>1</sup>	High	High	Moderate <sup>3</sup>	Low
2 (Rockliffe 2018, Rockliffe 2020)	Semi-structured interviews, focus groups and questionnaires	Some students and parents thought the incentive was unnecessary and should focus on health education instead.	Serious <sup>1</sup>	High	High	Moderate <sup>3</sup>	Low

Studies	Study design	Finding	Methodological limitations	Relevance	Coherence	Adequacy	Confidence
<b>Decision making</b>							
2 (Rockliffe 2018, Rockliffe 2020)	Semi-structured interviews, focus groups and questionnaires	Some parents thought that vaccination choice should be the parents' decision and so the intervention should not be targeted at students	Serious <sup>1</sup>	High	High	Moderate <sup>3</sup>	Low
2 (Rockliffe 2018, Rockliffe 2020)	Semi-structured interviews, focus groups and questionnaires	However, some of the students liked the incentive as it meant they felt more involved in decision making, even though the final decision was the parents' choice	Serious <sup>1</sup>	High	High	Low <sup>2</sup>	Very low
<b>Misconceptions</b>							
2 (Rockliffe 2018, Rockliffe 2020)	Semi-structured interviews, focus groups and questionnaires	Some parents and students mistakenly thought that entry into the prize draw was fake or based on receiving the vaccine, rather than consent form return. Others mistook the nature of the draw, thinking that it was a competition, where the people who did best or were most brave during the vaccination won the prize	Serious <sup>1</sup>	High	High	Moderate <sup>3</sup>	Low
<b>Perceptions</b>							
1 (Rockliffe 2018)	Semi-structured interviews and questionnaires	Staff members and students thought that the intervention would encourage consent form return and reduce negative feelings associated with vaccination. Staff believed that girls responded positively to the prize draw incentive, and this positivity was increased by the relatively high value of the prize	Very serious <sup>4</sup>	High	High	Moderate <sup>3</sup>	Very low
1. Finding was downgraded once because some of the findings were from a study at moderate risk of bias							

Studies	Study design	Finding	Methodological limitations	Relevance	Coherence	Adequacy	Confidence
2.		Finding was downgraded twice for adequacy because it was supported by few studies that were not particularly detailed or rich in the results that fed into this finding					
3.		Finding was only downgraded once for adequacy because it was supported by few studies that provided some detail or richness in the results that fed into this finding					
4.		Finding was downgraded twice because it was from a single study at high risk of bias					