

1 Community mobilisation approaches to preventing and reducing
2 adolescent multiple risk behaviour: a realist review protocol

3 Tinner, Laura. laura.tinner@bristol.ac.uk (corresponding author).¹

4 Caldwell, Deborah. d.m.caldwell@bristol.ac.uk¹

5 Campbell, Rona. rona.campbell@bristol.ac.uk¹

6

7 ¹Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, Canynge Hall, University of Bristol,
8 Bristol, UK, BS8 2PL.

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

44

45 [Abstract](#)

46

47 **Background:** Adolescent multiple risk behaviour (MRB) continues to be a global health issue,
48 contributing to the burden of non-communicable diseases. Most interventions have focused
49 on the proximal causes of adolescent MRB such as peer or family influence, rather than
50 targeting the wider environmental or structural context. There is increasing recognition that
51 community mobilisation approaches that extend beyond individually-focused educational
52 programmes could be beneficial for adolescent health. Despite this, there are gaps in the
53 current literature, theory and implementation that would benefit from a realist approach due
54 to the suitability of this methodology to analysing complex interventions. In this protocol, we
55 outline our study that aims to understand ‘how, why, for whom and in what circumstances
56 and time periods do community mobilisation interventions work to prevent and/or reduce
57 adolescent multiple risk behaviour?’

58

59 **Methods:** A realist review was chosen as the most suitable review method as it is theory-
60 driven and seeks to understand how, why and for whom interventions work to produce
61 intended and unintended outcomes. A six-stage iterative process is outlined, which includes
62 initial development of a programme theory, systematic searching, study selection and
63 appraisal, data extraction and data synthesis. We will engage with stakeholders at different
64 stages in this process to aid the development of the programme theory.

65

66 **Discussion:** The goal of this realist review is to identify and refine a programme theory for
67 community mobilisation approaches to the prevention and/or reduction of adolescent
68 multiple risk behaviour. Our aim is that the findings surrounding the programme theory

69 refinement can be used to develop and implement adolescent multiple risk behaviour
70 interventions and maintain collaboration between local policy makers, researchers and
71 community members.

72

73 **Registration:** This realist review is registered on the PROSPERO database (registration
74 number: CRD42020205342).

75

76 **Keywords:** Community mobilisation; adolescence; risk behaviour; realist review; complex
77 interventions; inequalities.

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91 Background

92 Adolescent health risk behaviours

93 Health risk behaviours such as tobacco smoking, hazardous alcohol consumption, antisocial
94 behaviour, physical inactivity and unprotected sexual intercourse are global health issues,
95 which are commonly initiated and become habitual in adolescence (1, 2). Adolescents who
96 engage in one risk behaviour are likely to engage in others (3, 4), leading to increased public
97 health interest in multiple risk behaviour (MRB), which refers to the occurrence of two or
98 more risk behaviours directly or indirectly related to health (5, 6). MRB has been found to be
99 associated with a number of adverse health and social outcomes such as poor educational
100 attainment (7), obesity, depression and anxiety in adulthood (8), cancers and premature
101 mortality (7, 9). This has, in turn, led to public health interventions that address multiple as
102 opposed to single behaviours (10).

103

104 Most interventions addressing adolescent MRB have focused on the proximal causes such as
105 peer or family influence, rather than targeting the wider environmental, social or structural
106 context (11). For instance, two Cochrane systematic reviews have assessed the impact of
107 individual, family and school-level interventions on adolescent multiple risk behaviour (10,
108 12). One of those reviews found mixed evidence, concluding that school-based universal
109 interventions are potentially effective in 'preventing engagement in tobacco use, alcohol use,
110 illicit drug use, and antisocial behaviour, and in improving physical activity among young
111 people, but not in preventing other risk behaviours' (12). The authors highlighted that there
112 was no strong evidence of benefit for family-level or individual-level interventions across the
113 risk behaviour outcomes investigated (12). The interventions included in this review were
114 predominantly educational programmes. The effectiveness and equity of these

115 “downstream” interventions has been questioned (13) because health risk behaviours rarely
116 have a single cause and occur in complex socio-cultural contexts (14). As such, there is
117 increasing recognition that structural changes that extend beyond individually-focused
118 educational programmes could be beneficial for adolescent health (14, 15).

119

120 [Community mobilisation interventions](#)

121 Recognition that decisions about health risk behaviours are made within a broad social
122 context has led to the development and implementation of community-engagement
123 interventions (16). There is an extensive range of types of community-engagement public
124 health interventions, varying in the extent to which they emphasise community involvement
125 in determining and delivering the programmes (16). ‘Community mobilisation’ interventions
126 are one such type that work to engage community members to ‘take action towards achieving
127 a common goal’ (17) and have gained traction as a strategy for addressing complex and
128 multifaceted problems (18). Community mobilisation is a collaborative public health effort
129 that is defined by the inclusion of a community coalition made up of diverse stakeholders
130 (such as schools, businesses, residents, youth groups, emergency services and religious
131 leaders) (11). These stakeholders critically analyse the root causes of local problems, identify
132 an array of potential solutions, develop multi-sector partnerships, and implement multi-
133 component strategies for creating local change and more health-promoting environments
134 (14).

135

136 Community mobilisation efforts explicitly seek to affect community-level influences through
137 changes of policies, practices, organisations and other features of the social or physical
138 environment that may impact on the health outcome or behaviour (19), signifying a shift away

139 from individual behaviour change to a focus on the social determinants of health (20).
140 However, these approaches may still include components which address individual
141 behaviours (e.g. health promotion programmes within schools), but they seek to combine
142 these with other structural factors as part of a package of measures that are chosen and
143 monitored from community stakeholders.

144

145 There is systematic review evidence suggesting that higher levels of community involvement
146 within an public health intervention is linked to more beneficial effects and positive trends
147 across a range of outcomes (21). There is also some evidence to support the role of
148 community mobilisation efforts in preventing health risk behaviours. For instance, such
149 interventions have resulted in reductions in high risk alcohol consumption and alcohol-related
150 injuries (22); alcohol impaired driving (23); uptake of smoking in young people (16) and youth
151 violence (24). Researchers have highlighted that with adequate resources and training,
152 support from within the community and adoption of evidence-based strategies, community
153 mobilisation approaches have promise as an effective vehicle for addressing adolescent
154 multiple risk behaviour (19). Further, community-mobilisation efforts are also thought to be
155 well suited to achieving health equity (25), due to ‘shared decision making’ (26) and the
156 incorporation of ‘upstream’ or structural elements (27), but this has yet to be explored in
157 relation to adolescent multiple risk behaviour interventions.

158

159 There are also significant challenges in implementing and evaluating such approaches, which
160 is unsurprising given the dynamic set of social interactions and relational complexity one
161 might expect in community-centred interventions (28). These implementation challenges
162 include lack of community interest and long-term engagement, design inadequacies, inflated

163 expectations, and weakness in planning and implementation of the interventions (19, 29, 30).
164 Tensions and different expectations between scientists and community members as well as
165 the practical difficulty in managing multiple components and stakeholder interests have also
166 been cited as issues (11).

167

168 Evaluation is equally challenging (31), which is reflected in the lack of empirical evaluations
169 of structural interventions such as community mobilisation compared to those focused at the
170 individual level (14). There is uncertainty around how long it might take to see an impact on
171 behaviours, although it is expected to be a lengthy process. Even if effects are identified, the
172 chain linking any changes in health risk behaviours to the mobilisation efforts is so long and
173 complex that causal attributions become complicated (14). The challenges in evaluating and
174 implementing community mobilisation interventions has meant they are often evaluated
175 through methods such as quasi-experimental studies in addition to randomised controlled
176 trials (RCTs), meaning that they have been missing from systematic reviews such as the
177 aforementioned adolescent MRB review (12). Consequently, the evidence base for
178 community mobilisation efforts is mixed in terms of producing desirable outcomes on a
179 community and individual level.

180

181 We aim to address the gap in the literature through investigating community mobilisation
182 interventions aimed at preventing and/or reducing adolescent multiple risk behaviour. There
183 is a strong rationale for an alternative review approach that speaks to the complexities and
184 challenges surrounding the delivery and evaluation of community mobilisation efforts.
185 Further, we are concerned with moving beyond assessing effectiveness of public health
186 interventions to synthesise existing knowledge and articulate *how* community mobilisation

187 interventions work for adolescent health. Therefore, a realist review was chosen as the most
188 appropriate methodological approach. Realist reviews are theory-driven approaches to
189 evidence synthesis, incorporating diverse data sources to provide insight into the underlying
190 mechanisms and contexts in which the interventions work (32). Realist reviews are ideal for
191 examining social interventions, particularly those in community settings as it is recognised
192 that programmes are rarely delivered in the same way or have exactly the same outcomes,
193 due to contextual factors that can never be fully controlled (33).

194

195 Realist inquiry is thus ‘increasingly recognised as an effective process for consolidating
196 evidence and learning from complex social processes and interventions’ (34), with successes
197 in public health and community development (35, 36). Therefore, our realist review aims to
198 contribute to the current adolescent multiple risk behaviour evidence base, which has largely
199 focused on effectiveness of interventions through traditional systematic reviews. Further
200 support for our intended approach comes from a recent PhD thesis which used an adapted
201 realist approach to assessing adolescent multiple risk behaviour programmes, combining
202 realist evaluation with primary data collection (37) (38). The authors did not specifically focus
203 on community mobilisation as an intervention and included fewer health risk behaviours than
204 we do here. This protocol describes our realist methodological approach and intended
205 procedures in the sections that follow.

206

207 This realist systematic review is registered on the PROSPERO database (registration number:
208 CRD42020205342). A PRISMA-P check list is included as a supplementary file.

209

210 [Methods](#)

211 [Review aim](#)

212 Our aim is to use a theory-driven evidence synthesis to assess how and why community
213 mobilisation interventions work/do not work to prevent or reduce adolescent multiple risk
214 behaviour and in what contexts. We are additionally interested in the question of ‘who’ these
215 interventions work for, in order to understand the impact of these types of interventions
216 upon existing health inequalities through investigating whether the interventions are
217 beneficial to disadvantaged communities. Although the focus of the review is adolescent
218 multiple risk behaviour, we may draw on wider literature to understand the goals of
219 community mobilisation approaches and the mechanisms by which it is hoped these are
220 achieved. An additional objective of our review is to develop transferable learning about
221 community mobilisation approaches in public health research and adolescent health
222 interventions. The realist review will be guided by the following sub-questions:

- 223 1. What are the outcomes of community mobilisation interventions targeting adolescent
224 multiple risk behaviour?
- 225 2. What are the mechanisms, acting at the individual, community and societal levels
226 through which community mobilisation interventions produce outcomes?
- 227 3. What are the key contextual influences that determine whether the mechanisms
228 produce both intended and unintended outcomes?

229

230 [Realist review methodology](#)

231

232 Realist review methodology is a theory-driven, interpretive approach to evidence synthesis
233 (38) developed by the work of Pawson et al (39-41). It has gained increasing popularity in
234 addressing the challenge of ‘what works, for whom, under what circumstances and in what

235 time period’ and is considered especially salient when data are complex, multi-layered and
236 there is a need to understand complex relationships, interdependence, and mechanisms (42).
237 A core component of realist reviews is to develop ‘middle-range realist programme theory’
238 (43) that explains how an intervention ‘works’ within what contexts. Realist reviews allow for
239 exploration of complex topics and the inclusion of a wide body of quantitative, qualitative
240 and mixed methods evidence to develop and refine theory (38). Therefore, it is suited to
241 multi-component community-based interventions, for which evaluations may include a range
242 of different data and be published in grey literature.

243

244 Realist reviewers view ‘causation’ as generative, which means that the manifested world is
245 generated (i.e. caused) via underpinning mechanisms (32). They identify where an
246 intervention, under certain contextual conditions (C), triggers a mechanism (M) to achieve a
247 given outcome (O) (38). This CMO configuration is central to analysis and theory
248 development, viewing mechanisms as the integral link between contexts and outcomes. The
249 aim of realist review methodology to move beyond measuring effectiveness of interventions,
250 toward explanation of how and why an intervention works is a key strength that separates it
251 from traditional systematic reviews. Dalkin et al (44) conceptualise a mechanism as a resource
252 or reasoning, which triggers an outcome, but may only be active in certain contexts. Under
253 certain contextual conditions, the mechanisms are triggered, while in others they ‘fire’ to a
254 lesser degree or not at all (44). Realist review methodology is highly applicable to complex
255 public health interventions and is an approach that can build ‘common ground’ between
256 researchers and policy makers through providing accessible recommendations on how
257 interventions might be delivered in different contexts (41).

258

259 We have conceptualised multi-component community mobilisation approaches as complex
260 interventions in which outcomes and mechanisms will be context sensitive (39). Therefore,
261 the realist review approach will allow us to investigate in what contexts community
262 mobilisation interventions are effective. This realist review will follow the practice guidelines
263 outlined by the Realist and Meta-narrative Evidence Synthesis: Evolving Standards (RAMESES)
264 framework (40, 41).

265 266 Study design

267 This review is structured around the five review stages outlined by Pawson et al (39) and has
268 been informed by other realist review protocols in the field (38, 45). Figure 1 is a diagram of
269 the review process adapted from Power et al (38).

270
271 *Figure 1 to go here.*

272 *Figure 1: Summary of stages of realist review adapted from Power et al (38). This depicts the*
273 *steps for developing the initial programme theory, searching for evidence and synthesising*
274 *the data with the input of key stakeholders. Retroduction refers to inferences made through*
275 *interpreting the data about the underlying causal mechanisms.*

276 277 Stages of realist review 278 (1) Locating existing theories

279 The first step in a realist review is to conduct scoping searches that begin to identify theories
280 that might explain how community mobilisation interventions may work to address
281 adolescent multiple risk behaviour. The search will include academic databases (MEDLINE,
282 PubMed, Web of Science), UK health websites and grey literature databases (OpenGrey, the
283 King's Fund, The Health Foundation) as well as Google Scholar. Broad search terms will be

284 used at this initial stage (e.g. “community mobilisation”, “community coalition”, “youth”,
285 “adolescence”, “health risk behaviour”, “substance use”, “antisocial behaviour”) and back
286 and forth citation tracking will be utilised until we develop a core set of empirical studies to
287 help build the initial programme theory framework (40). This initial search is not designed to
288 be exhaustive: this stage in the theory development is expected to be a ‘rough starting point’
289 that will be refined throughout the realist review process (43).

290

291 It is advisable to include the expertise of those delivering or evaluating the interventions. At
292 this stage we will engage with key stakeholders identified through the literature to provide
293 guidance on the development of the programme theory. For example, they may provide
294 insight into the different contexts and mechanisms that impact on adolescent risk behaviour
295 outcomes from their experience in the field. These stakeholders may also highlight other
296 relevant studies or individuals we should engage with to further develop the programme
297 theory. When we have developed an initial programme theory, we will move onto stage 2
298 and the more structured and systematic searching.

299

300 (2) Search strategy

301

302 In Stage 2 we will conduct more formal searches, which will be informed by the initial
303 programme theory development in stage 1. The objective in this stage will be to identify
304 literature and evidence capable of informing the refinement of a more detailed programme
305 theory (45). We will develop search terms from the initial background search in Stage 1 and
306 discussions with a subject librarian, leading to systematic searches being undertaken to
307 collect evidence to refine the programme theory. We will include the following databases:

308 PubMed; MEDLINE; PsycINFO; Web of Science; CINAHL; Sociological Abstracts. Grey literature
309 will also be searched on OpenGrey and on external expert organisations and charity websites.
310 ProQuest will be searched for unpublished theses and dissertations. Google Scholar will be
311 used for citation searching as well as reference lists of relevant papers.

312

313 Search terminology and syntax will be informed by the initial programme theory
314 identification, known literature and collaboration between the research team and a subject
315 librarian. We will draw on the search terms used in previous systematic reviews on individual-
316 level adolescent multiple risk behaviour interventions. Search terms will include MeSH terms
317 and free text related to “community mobilisation”, “adolescence” and a range of multiple
318 health risk behaviours. No date restrictions will be used and only studies in the English
319 Language will be assessed for eligibility.

320

321 While formalised and systematic, the sampling approach in realist reviews remains purposive
322 to answer specific questions and develop theories (39). Therefore, the process will likely be
323 iterative and need to be repeated (39), with back and forth citation tracking remaining a key
324 part of the iterative search strategy (46). Corresponding authors of selected articles may also
325 be contacted for further examples that may be relevant to the question. The search terms
326 and strategies will be documented in a log-book as the review progresses.

327

328 (3) Study selection

329 We will use the following inclusion criteria to determine if a document is likely to contribute
330 to the programme theory development:

- 331 • Type of intervention: Community mobilisation must form a core part of the
332 intervention, most commonly identified by the development of a community coalition
333 group involving a diverse range of community stakeholders as identified above. In
334 many cases, the community coalition will select intervention components from a
335 ‘menu’ of strategies and adapt them to fit local needs. As mentioned, although these
336 types of interventions derive from the desire to move away from individual behaviour
337 change, they are also likely to include a range of “upstream” and “downstream”
338 components, which may include education delivery. The key criterion remains that
339 the intervention should include community mobilisation at its core, and should
340 include at least two components (e.g. an educational programme and local policy
341 enforcement).
- 342 • A range of document types, study designs and data types may be relevant to the
343 development of the initial programme theory. All intervention evaluation study
344 designs and data types, from all time periods, may be included in the review to test
345 and refine the programme theory (e.g. randomised controlled trials (RCTs), quasi-
346 experimental studies, case studies).
- 347 • Participants: the community mobilisation efforts should be targeted (at least
348 predominately) at young people age 10-19 years, although this age range remains
349 flexible¹. Adult stakeholders (such as parents, community members, school staff) will
350 likely be included in the community coalition but should not be the focus of the
351 intervention. All sampling decisions will be transparently reported.

¹ For instance, a ‘pre-teen’ intervention targeting children age 9-12 would be included as the population are only one year out of our pre-specified age range of 10-19 years. However, an older adolescent/young adult intervention targeting individuals aged 18-25 would not be included as only two years (18 and 19) of the eight year range addressed by the intervention falls within our age banding.

- 352 • Aim of intervention: the intervention should have a primary focus on prevention and
353 reduction of adolescent multiple risk behaviour and include at least two health risk
354 behaviours from a wide range including: regular tobacco smoking; regular alcohol
355 drinking; binge drinking (alcohol); cannabis use; recent or regular illicit drug use; risky
356 sexual behaviours; anti-social behaviour and offending; vehicle-related risk
357 behaviours (e.g. cycling without a helmet; not using a car seatbelt, joy riding); self-
358 harm; gambling; unhealthy diet; and physical inactivity.
- 359 • Outcome measures: Primary outcomes of interest include reduction and/or
360 prevention of the wide range of multiple risk behaviours mentioned above. A range of
361 additional medium- and long-term outcomes within health and social domains are
362 expected given the number of health risk behaviours the interventions can cover as
363 well as the multi-component nature of these types of interventions. Secondary
364 outcomes of interest in this review include: Education and employment: educational
365 qualifications; truancy and school exclusion; employment; not being in education,
366 employment or training (NEET); Crime: Criminal record/offending; long-term addictive
367 behaviours; Gambling; Teenage pregnancy or parenthood; Sexually transmitted
368 infections; Injuries; Morbidity (e.g. Hepatitis C, HIV, anxiety and depression, obesity,
369 type II diabetes, fatty liver disease, liver cirrhosis); Suicide/self-harm; and Premature
370 mortality. Realist reviews are interested in intended and unintended outcomes
371 related to the context, mechanism, and outcomes of the intervention therefore other
372 unknown outcomes may become relevant to the programme theory development.
- 373
- 374 Studies will be excluded if they relate to any of the following:

- 375 • A single component intervention (such as an educational programme) that is delivered
376 in the community but does not incorporate community mobilisation as we have
377 defined it.
- 378 • Interventions targeted at participants outside of the age range. Some interventions
379 may include other populations, but youth should be the primary focus.
- 380 • Interventions aimed at preventing and reducing a single adolescent health risk
381 behaviour (e.g. alcohol misuse).
- 382 • Clinical and pharmaceutical interventions including ‘community outreach’ services
383 such as the provision of mobile clinics.
- 384 • Studies not described in the English language.

385

386 We will use Raayan (QCRI) software for screening and management of the studies at this stage
387 in the review. The RAMESES guidelines will be used to appraise the studies (41). The selection
388 of evidence will be made based on judgements around their *relevance* (contribution to the
389 programme theory development and refinement) and *rigour* (credibility and trustworthiness
390 of methods) (45, 47). Any exclusions based on these appraisals will be documented.

391

392 (4) Data extraction

393 Study characteristics will be extracted into a table to provide a descriptive overview of the
394 types of community mobilisation interventions included, based on a ‘bespoke’ set of data
395 extraction forms informed by the relevant literature (39). Realist reviews are structured
396 through Context-Mechanisms-Outcome (CMO), comparable to PICO for traditional
397 systematic reviews (42). Context, mechanisms and outcomes are extracted during the realist

398 review and can be conceptualised as the ‘data’ that support evidence to support, reject or
399 refine the programme theory (33). However, this process is not as rigid as with traditional
400 systematic reviews and different sources may provide different information that contributes
401 to the programme theory development. We will extract the following information:

- 402 • Study details: authors, year of publication, country of intervention delivery, study
403 aims, study design, participant characteristics, quality appraisal.
- 404 • Context: background of the intervention, aims of the intervention, type of
405 intervention, setting (e.g. type and size of community), age range, number of
406 components, policy context for the area, historical context.
- 407 • Mechanism: descriptions of the processes through which the intervention influenced
408 outcomes, who the intervention worked for and who it did not, author-identified
409 mechanisms.
- 410 • Outcomes: adolescent multiple health risk behaviour outcomes but also a range of
411 health and social outcomes mentioned previously.
- 412 • Additional study information and researcher comments.

413

414 The above is not an exhaustive list and information on the mechanisms and context will be
415 expected to change through experience with the studies and input from expert stakeholders.
416 Any disagreements on extracted data will be resolved through discussion with the research
417 team. Realist reviews assimilate information more through note taking and documents are
418 scoured for ideas about how the intervention might work (39). To approach the more complex
419 and iterative process of examining study sources, we will follow the guidance from Pawson
420 et al (39) and will also upload the documents to NVivo for organising and coding to aid
421 development of the programme theory and to keep a record of our procedures (45).

422

423 (5) Data synthesis

424 The goal of data synthesis in a realist review is to consolidate the data from the previous steps
425 to refine the initial programme theory (45). Analysis will involve interpretation of the
426 researchers and judgement of the data. Coding the data will involve deductive (informed by
427 the initial programme theory), inductive (emerging from the data within the identified
428 interventions) and retroductive approaches (inferences made through interpreting the data
429 about the underlying causal mechanisms) (45). These approaches will guide the review to
430 interpret and explain the findings and outline the contextual conditions and mechanisms that
431 may need to be present for outcomes to occur. Data to inform our interpretation of the
432 relationships between the contexts, mechanisms and outcomes will be analysed within and
433 across the documents. For example, mechanisms inferred from one document will be applied
434 to other documents to test if they can explain the way contexts influence outcomes in another
435 intervention (45). This interpretive process will lead to programme theory development of
436 community mobilisation approaches to preventing and reducing adolescent multiple risk
437 behaviour.

438

439 (5) Refine programme theories

440 The final product of a realist theory is not a statement of effectiveness, but a refinement of
441 middle-range theory that answers the questions of what works, for whom, under what
442 circumstances, in what time period, why and how? (48). Evidence may include primary
443 outcome data, but also rich description that conveys the contextual elements and
444 interpretation of the interactions between the context, mechanisms and outcomes by the
445 researchers (48). Stakeholders involved in stage one will be contacted again, with the
446 potential for the inclusion of newly identified individuals, for input into the final programme

447 theory(ies). The aim of this process is to confirm that the programme theory makes sense to
448 those involved, in order to enhance our ability to make practice recommendations from our
449 findings (39). If needed, we will re-scrutinise elements of the review based on the stakeholder
450 involvement. We intend to develop a final logic model that will visually present the
451 programme theory/theories and the relationships between the CMO.

452

453 Discussion

454

455 The realist review approach will allow us to explore the relationships between contexts,
456 mechanisms and outcomes and synthesise evidence surrounding adolescent multiple risk
457 behaviour interventions that incorporate community mobilisation. We seek to gain a greater
458 understanding of ‘what works, for whom, in what circumstances, in what time period and
459 why’, in terms of preventive interventions to improve adolescent health and reduce
460 inequalities. Our aim is that the findings surrounding the programme theory refinement can
461 be used to develop and implement adolescent multiple risk behaviour interventions and
462 maintain collaboration between local policy makers, researchers and community members.
463 We will recognise any limitations to our study and the realist review approach in the final
464 synthesis. The dissemination of the findings of this review will follow the RAMESES reporting
465 guidelines (40, 41).

466

467

468

469

470

471

472

473 [Abbreviations](#)

474 MRB: Multiple risk behaviour

475

476 NEET: not being in education, employment or training

477

478 HIV: human immunodeficiency virus

479

480 RCTs: Randomised Controlled Trials

481

482 CMO: Context, Mechanism, Outcome

483

484 RAMESES: Realist and meta-narrative evidence syntheses: evolving standards

485

486 [Declarations](#)

487 [Ethics approval and consent to participate](#)

488 Not applicable.

489

490 [Consent for publication](#)

491 Not applicable.

492

493 [Availability of data and materials](#)

494 Not application.

495

496 [Competing interests](#)

497 The authors declare no competing interests.

498

499 [Funding](#)

500 This work is funded through LT's post-doctoral post, which is funded by Bristol, North

501 Somerset and South Gloucestershire Clinical Commission Group (CCG) Research Capacity

502 Funding via RC's Senior Investigator Award. The funder had no involvement with the

503 development of the protocol.

504

505 [Authors' contributions](#)

506 LT, DC and RC developed the project idea, chose the realist review approach and developed

507 the inclusion criteria. LT wrote the first draft of the protocol. All authors contributed to writing

508 and refining the protocol and will be involved in the review. LT is the corresponding author.

509 Acknowledgements

510 Not applicable.

511

512

513 References

514

- 515 1. Jackson CA, Henderson M, Frank JW, Haw SJ. An overview of prevention of multiple
516 risk behaviour in adolescence and young adulthood. *Journal of Public Health*.
517 2012;34(suppl_1):i31-i40.
- 518 2. Patton GC, Sawyer SM, Santelli JS, Ross DA, Afifi R, Allen NB, et al. Our future: a
519 Lancet commission on adolescent health and wellbeing. *The Lancet*. 2016;387(10036):2423-
520 78.
- 521 3. Kipping RR, Campbell RM, MacArthur GJ, Gunnell DJ, Hickman M. Multiple risk
522 behaviour in adolescence. *Journal of Public Health*. 2012;34(suppl_1):i1-i2.
- 523 4. Brooks FM, Magnusson J, Spencer N, Morgan A. Adolescent multiple risk behaviour:
524 an asset approach to the role of family, school and community. *Journal of Public Health*.
525 2012;34(suppl_1):i48-i56.
- 526 5. Hurrelmann K, Richter M. Risk behaviour in adolescence: the relationship between
527 developmental and health problems. *Journal of Public Health*. 2006;14(1):20-8.
- 528 6. Tinner L, Caldwell D, Hickman M, MacArthur GJ, Gottfredson D, Perez AL, et al.
529 Examining subgroup effects by socioeconomic status of public health interventions targeting
530 multiple risk behaviour in adolescence. *BMC Public Health*. 2018;18(1):1180.
- 531 7. Wright C, Kipping R, Hickman M, Campbell R, Heron J. Effect of multiple risk
532 behaviours in adolescence on educational attainment at age 16 years: a UK birth cohort
533 study. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(7):e020182.
- 534 8. Campbell R, Wright C, Hickman M, Kipping RR, Smith M, Pouliou T, et al. Multiple risk
535 behaviour in adolescence is associated with substantial adverse health and social outcomes
536 in early adulthood: Findings from a prospective birth cohort study. *Preventive Medicine*.
537 2020:106157.
- 538 9. Hausdorf K, Eakin E, Whiteman D, Rogers C, Aitken J, Newman B. Prevalence and
539 correlates of multiple cancer risk behaviors in an Australian population-based survey: results
540 from the Queensland Cancer Risk Study. *Cancer Causes & Control*. 2008;19(10):1339-47.
- 541 10. Hickman M, Caldwell DM, Busse H, MacArthur G, Faggiano F, Foxcroft DR, et al.
542 Individual-, family-, and school-level interventions for preventing multiple risk behaviours
543 relating to alcohol, tobacco and drug use in individuals aged 8 to 25 years. *Cochrane*
544 *Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2014(11).
- 545 11. Fagan AA, Hawkins JD, Catalano RF. *Interventions For Addiction: Chapter 90.*
546 *Mobilizing Communities for Alcohol, Drug, and Tobacco Prevention: Elsevier Inc. Chapters;*
547 2013.
- 548 12. MacArthur G, Caldwell DM, Redmore J, Watkins SH, Kipping R, White J, et al.
549 Individual-, family-, and school-level interventions targeting multiple risk behaviours in
550 young people. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2018(10).
- 551 13. Adams J, Mytton O, White M, Monsivais P. Why are some population interventions
552 for diet and obesity more equitable and effective than others? The role of individual agency.
553 *PLoS Medicine*. 2016;13(4).

- 554 14. Miller RL, Janulis PF, Reed SJ, Harper GW, Ellen J, Boyer CB, et al. Creating youth-
555 supportive communities: outcomes from the Connect-to-Protect® (C2P) structural change
556 approach to youth HIV prevention. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 2016;45(2):301-15.
- 557 15. Aguirre-Molina M, Gorman DM. Community-based approaches for the prevention of
558 alcohol, tobacco, and other drug use. *Annual review of public health*. 1996;17(1):337-58.
- 559 16. Carson KV, Brinn MP, Labiszewski NA, Esterman AJ, Chang AB, Smith BJ. Community
560 interventions for preventing smoking in young people. *Cochrane Database of Systematic
561 Reviews*. 2011(7).
- 562 17. Lippman SA, Neilands TB, Leslie HH, Maman S, MacPhail C, Twine R, et al.
563 Development, validation, and performance of a scale to measure community mobilization.
564 *Social Science & Medicine*. 2016;157:127-37.
- 565 18. Watson-Thompson J, Fawcett SB, Schultz JA. A framework for community
566 mobilization to promote healthy youth development. *American Journal of Preventive
567 Medicine*. 2008;34(3):S72-S81.
- 568 19. Flewelling RL, Austin D, Hale K, LaPlante M, Liebig M, Piasecki L, et al. Implementing
569 research-based substance abuse prevention in communities: Effects of a coalition-based
570 prevention initiative in Vermont. *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2005;33(3):333-53.
- 571 20. Kim-Ju G, Mark GY, Cohen R, Garcia-Santiago O, Nguyen P. Community mobilization
572 and its application to youth violence prevention. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*.
573 2008;34(3):S5-S12.
- 574 21. Brunton G, Caird J, Stokes G, Stansfield C, Kneale D, Richardson M, et al. Review 1:
575 Community engagement for health via coalitions, collaborations and partnerships: a
576 systematic review. 2015.
- 577 22. Holder HD, Gruenewald PJ, Ponicki WR, Treno AJ, Grube JW, Saltz RF, et al. Effect of
578 community-based interventions on high-risk drinking and alcohol-related injuries. *Jama*.
579 2000;284(18):2341-7.
- 580 23. Shults RA, Elder RW, Nichols JL, Sleet DA, Compton R, Chattopadhyay SK, et al.
581 Effectiveness of multicomponent programs with community mobilization for reducing
582 alcohol-impaired driving. *American journal of preventive medicine*. 2009;37(4):360-71.
- 583 24. Massetti GM. Preventing violence among high-risk youth and communities with
584 economic, policy, and structural strategies. *MMWR supplements*. 2016;65.
- 585 25. Trickett EJ, Beehler S. The ecology of multilevel interventions to reduce social
586 inequalities in health. *American Behavioral Scientist*. 2013;57(8):1227-46.
- 587 26. Durand M-A, Carpenter L, Dolan H, Bravo P, Mann M, Bunn F, et al. Do interventions
588 designed to support shared decision-making reduce health inequalities? A systematic review
589 and meta-analysis. *PloS one*. 2014;9(4):e94670.
- 590 27. Nickel S, von dem Knesebeck O. Do multiple community-based interventions on
591 health promotion tackle health inequalities? *International Journal for Equity in Health*.
592 2020;19(1):1-13.
- 593 28. Adhikari B, Vincent R, Wong G, Duddy C, Richardson E, Lavery JV, et al. A realist
594 review of community engagement with health research. *Wellcome open research*. 2019;4.
- 595 29. Wandersman A, Florin P. Community interventions and effective prevention.
596 *American Psychologist*. 2003;58(6-7):441.
- 597 30. Gabriel RM. Methodological challenges in evaluating community partnerships &
598 coalitions: Still crazy after all these years. *Journal of Community Psychology*.
599 2000;28(3):339-52.

- 600 31. Bonell C, Hargreaves J, Strange V, Pronyk P, Porter J. Should structural interventions
601 be evaluated using RCTs? The case of HIV prevention. *Social Science & Medicine*.
602 2006;63(5):1135-42.
- 603 32. Jagosh J. Realist synthesis for public health: building an ontologically deep
604 understanding of how programs work, for whom, and in which contexts. *Annual Review of*
605 *Public Health*. 2019.
- 606 33. Usher AM, McShane KE, Dwyer C. A realist review of family-based interventions for
607 children of substance abusing parents. *Systematic Reviews*. 2015;4(1):1-12.
- 608 34. Richardson EZL, Bandewar SVS, Boulanger RF, Mehta R, Lin T, Vincent R, et al.
609 Addressing diversity and complexity in the community engagement literature: The rationale
610 for a realist review. *Wellcome Open Research*. 2020;5(1):1.
- 611 35. Wong G, Pawson R, Owen L. Policy guidance on threats to legislative interventions in
612 public health: a realist synthesis. *BMC Public Health*. 2011;11(1):222.
- 613 36. Jagosh J, Macaulay AC, Pluye P, Salsberg J, Bush PL, Henderson JIM, et al. Uncovering
614 the benefits of participatory research: implications of a realist review for health research
615 and practice. *The Milbank Quarterly*. 2012;90(2):311-46.
- 616 37. Cooper C, Lhussier M, Shucksmith J, Carr SM. Protocol for a realist review of complex
617 interventions to prevent adolescents from engaging in multiple risk behaviours. *BMJ open*.
618 2017;7(9):e015477.
- 619 38. Power J, Gilmore B, Vallières F, Toomey E, Mannan H, McAuliffe E. Adapting health
620 interventions for local fit when scaling-up: a realist review protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9(1).
- 621 39. Pawson R, Greenhalgh T, Harvey G, Walshe K. Realist review-a new method of
622 systematic review designed for complex policy interventions. *Journal of Health Services*
623 *Research & Policy*. 2005;10(1_suppl):21-34.
- 624 40. Greenhalgh T, Wong G, Westhorp G, Pawson R. Protocol-realist and meta-narrative
625 evidence synthesis: evolving standards (RAMESES). *BMC Medical Research Methodology*.
626 2011;11(1):115.
- 627 41. Wong G, Greenhalgh T, Westhorp G, Pawson R. Development of methodological
628 guidance, publication standards and training materials for realist and meta-narrative
629 reviews: the RAMESES (Realist And Meta-narrative Evidence Syntheses–Evolving Standards)
630 project. 2014.
- 631 42. Booth A, Briscoe S, Wright JM. The “realist search”: A systematic scoping review of
632 current practice and reporting. *Research Synthesis Methods*. 2020;11(1):14-35.
- 633 43. Weetman K, Wong G, Scott E, Schnurr S, Dale J. Improving best practice for patients
634 receiving hospital discharge letters: a realist review protocol. *BMJ Open*.
635 2017;7(11):e018353.
- 636 44. Dalkin SM, Greenhalgh J, Jones D, Cunningham B, Lhussier M. What’s in a
637 mechanism? Development of a key concept in realist evaluation. *Implementation Science*.
638 2015;10(1):1-7.
- 639 45. Abrams R, Wong G, Mahtani KR, Tierney S, Boylan A-M, Roberts N, et al.
640 Understanding the impact of delegated home visiting services accessed via general practice
641 by community-dwelling patients: a realist review protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(11).
- 642 46. GRADE Working Group. Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development,
643 and Evaluation. Available from: <https://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/>.
- 644 47. Pawson R. Digging for nuggets: how ‘bad’ research can yield ‘good’ evidence.
645 *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*. 2006;9(2):127-42.

- 646 48. Jagosh J, Bush PL, Salsberg J, Macaulay AC, Greenhalgh T, Wong G, et al. A realist
647 evaluation of community-based participatory research: partnership synergy, trust building
648 and related ripple effects. BMC Public Health. 2015;15(1):725.
649