

1 Potential adverse effects of an educational intervention: Development of a framework

2

3 Matt Oxman<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Faith Chelagat Chesire<sup>3,4</sup>, Michael Mugisha<sup>4,5</sup>, Ronald Ssenyonga<sup>4,6</sup>, Benson

4 Ngatia<sup>3</sup>, Allen Nsangi<sup>6</sup>, Simon Lewin<sup>1,7,8</sup>, Jenny Moberg<sup>1</sup>, Nelson Sewankambo<sup>6</sup>, Margaret

5 Kaseje<sup>3</sup>, Monica Melby-Lervåg<sup>9</sup>, Atle Fretheim<sup>1,2</sup>, Andrew David Oxman<sup>1</sup>, Sarah Rosenbaum<sup>1</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup>Centre for Epidemic Interventions Research, Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Oslo,

8 Norway

9 <sup>2</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, Oslo Metropolitan University, Oslo, Norway

10 <sup>3</sup>Tropical Institute of Community Health and Development, Kisumu, Kenya

11 <sup>4</sup>Institute of Health and Society, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

12 <sup>5</sup>School of Public Health, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Rwanda,

13 Kigali, Rwanda

14 <sup>6</sup>College of Health Sciences, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda

15 <sup>7</sup>Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Norwegian University of Science and Technology,

16 Ålesund, Norway

17 <sup>8</sup>Health Systems Research Unit, South African Medical Research Council, Cape Town, South

18 Africa

19 <sup>9</sup>Centre for Research on Special Needs Education and Inclusion, University of Oslo, Oslo,

20 Norway

21 \* Corresponding author

22 E-mail: [matt@mattoxman.com](mailto:matt@mattoxman.com) (MO)

## 23 Abstract

## 24 Background

25 Researchers often overlook potential adverse effects of educational and public health  
26 interventions (increases in adverse outcomes, or decreases in beneficial outcomes,  
27 attributed to the intervention). To help us identify potential adverse effects of an  
28 educational intervention intended to improve critical thinking about health choices, we  
29 developed a framework. We also did a preliminary prioritisation of outcomes in the  
30 framework for randomised trials of the intervention, and associated process evaluations.

31

## 32 Methods

33 Based on relevant evidence and theory, we developed an initial framework. For feedback on  
34 the initial framework, we sent a survey to 70 external experts. We conducted a thematic  
35 analysis of the qualitative survey data. After revising the framework based on the survey  
36 findings, we interviewed teachers in the context where we are evaluating the intervention,  
37 to help identify any effects still missing from the framework, and preliminarily prioritise  
38 potential outcomes for the evaluation.

39

## 40 Results

41 We received responses from 38 of the 70 external experts (54%), including researchers and  
42 others with a variety of expertise within health, education, and design. Overall, the

43 responses were positive. However, they also included critical feedback that led to  
44 substantial revisions of the framework’s content and presentation. The revised framework  
45 has six categories of potential adverse effects: decision-making harms, psychological harms,  
46 equity harms, group and social harms, waste, and other harms. We interviewed three  
47 teachers, who did not suggest any missing outcomes. Based on the interview findings, we  
48 prioritised three outcomes for the evaluation of the intervention: work-related stress;  
49 wasted time or resources; and conflict, in particular between students and family.

50

## 51 Discussion

52 As far as we are aware, the framework presented in this article is the first tool of its kind in  
53 education research. The framework is a “living” tool, which can be improved upon, as well  
54 as adapted. We have used it to inform the development of interview and observation  
55 guides, and we are using it to inform the development of outcome measures. Important  
56 limitations of the framework include limits to its comprehensiveness, and the use of  
57 terminology with different meanings or interpretations depending on the context. Our  
58 approach to identifying and evaluating potential adverse effects of an educational  
59 intervention can have value to other researchers.

60

## 61 Conclusion

62 Rigorous evaluations of potential adverse effects of educational and public health  
63 interventions can be time and resource-intensive. However, that cost might be small  
64 compared to the cost of implementing harmful interventions.

65

## 66 Background

### 67 Adverse effects in education and public health

68 Educational and public health interventions warrant rigorous development and evaluation,  
69 especially prior to large-scale implementation—not only because the intervention might be  
70 ineffective and wasteful, but because it might cause adverse effects (increases in adverse  
71 outcomes or decreases in beneficial outcomes). However, researchers often overlook  
72 potential adverse effects of educational and public health interventions [1–4]. When they  
73 evaluate intended effects, this might reveal a lack of effect or paradoxical effect, but not  
74 other adverse effects (“side effects”) [1–4].

75

76 To help evaluate potential adverse effects of public health interventions, Lorenc and Oliver  
77 have developed a framework with categories and examples [3]. Building on said framework,  
78 Bonell et al. have proposed strategies for theorising how such effects might happen and  
79 creating “Dark logic” models [4]. While Zhao provides examples of adverse effects of

80 educational interventions [1,2], there does not appear to be a tool for education like the  
81 framework developed by Lorenc and Oliver for public health.

82

### 83 Informed Health Choices project

84 As part of the Informed Health Choices (IHC) project ([www.informedhealthchoices.org](http://www.informedhealthchoices.org)), we  
85 have developed and are evaluating an intervention to help secondary school students learn  
86 how to think critically about health information and choices. We are building on findings  
87 and experiences from developing and evaluating a corresponding intervention targeted at  
88 primary school children [5–7]. In .

89

90 Box 1, we describe the aim, development and evaluation of the IHC secondary school

91 intervention in more detail.

92

93 **Box 1. Aim, development, and evaluation of the IHC secondary school intervention.**

The IHC secondary school intervention is primarily aimed at improving students' ability to apply a prioritised set of concepts [8]. The concepts come from the "Key Concepts for Informed Health Choices" framework [9], also known as the IHC Key Concepts framework. The ability to apply the IHC Key Concepts is part of "health literacy", more specifically "critical health literacy" [10]. We developed the intervention in Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda [11]. To inform the development, we first studied the contexts for teaching critical thinking about health using digital resources in those countries [12–14]. The final intervention has two components: training teachers and providing them with digital resources. After the training, teachers are intended to deliver 10 lessons to students. The lessons are introduced in the training and outlined in the resources. Each lesson focuses on one or more of the prioritised concepts. The intervention is both an educational and public health intervention in that we intend for it to improve educational outcomes, but also—in the long term, as part of a potential series of interventions—public health outcomes. We are evaluating the intervention in respective randomised trials in Kenya, Rwanda, and Uganda [15–17], and process evaluations associated with the trials.

94

95 In the trial of the IHC primary school intervention, participants did not report any adverse  
96 outcomes, although we asked the teachers to record and report any they experienced or  
97 observed [5,18]. In the process evaluation associated with that trial, we did not observe any  
98 adverse outcomes, but some teachers reported an increase in stress due to the added  
99 workload, as well as teaching something new [6]. Furthermore, a majority of teachers and

100 parents expressed concern that the intervention might cause conflict between themselves  
101 and the children, by causing children to challenge authority. There were reports of children  
102 challenging authority, but not of conflicts.

103

104 Like with the primary school intervention, we have employed an iterative, human-centred  
105 design approach to develop the secondary school intervention, involving cycles of  
106 prototyping, user-testing, and piloting. This approach is helpful for finding and addressing  
107 problems during the development stage that could potentially lead to adverse effects [7,11].  
108 Moreover, findings about potential adverse effects from the development and evaluation of  
109 the primary school intervention have informed the development of the secondary school  
110 intervention.

111

112 Given 1) the findings from the evaluation of the primary school intervention, 2) our  
113 approach to developing the secondary school intervention, and 3) use of what we have  
114 learned from the development and evaluation of the primary school intervention, we do not  
115 anticipate adverse effects of the secondary school intervention.

116

117 However, there were limitations to the evaluation of potential adverse effects of the  
118 primary school intervention. For example, we did not consult external experts about  
119 outcomes to measure or explore.

120

121 Despite our approach and using what we have learned, the secondary school intervention  
122 might have adverse effects that we have failed to identify or address, for example because  
123 of differences between schools that have participated in its development versus other  
124 schools. The bottom line: adverse effects are always possible.

125

## 126 This study

127 To help prevent and evaluate potential adverse effects of any intervention, it is key to first  
128 identify potential adverse effects that are logical and likely to be important to participants  
129 or other stakeholders. Therefore, we developed a framework of potential adverse effects of  
130 the IHC secondary school intervention. We preliminarily prioritised outcomes in the  
131 framework to measure and explore in the trials and process evaluations. Fig 1 is an overview  
132 of the development and evaluation of the intervention, including this study.

133

134 **Fig 1. Development and evaluation of IHC secondary school intervention.**

135

## 136 Objectives

137 *Primary:* To identify potential adverse effects of the IHC secondary school intervention, by  
138 developing a framework of such effects

139 *Secondary:* To prioritise potential adverse outcomes included in the framework, for the  
140 evaluation of the intervention

141

## 142 Methods

### 143 Development of initial framework and criteria

144 We first developed an initial framework of potential adverse effects of the IHC secondary  
145 school intervention, including descriptions of their potential mechanisms and corresponding  
146 beneficial effects, as well as criteria for a sensible framework (S1 File).

147

148 We described the potential mechanisms to help identify potential adverse effects, as  
149 suggested by Bonell et al. [4], but also to help identify corresponding beneficial effects, and  
150 inform the development of the intervention towards preventing the potential adverse  
151 effects and achieving the corresponding beneficial effects. We based the first version of the  
152 framework on relevant evidence and theory, in particular: the framework of potential  
153 adverse effects of public health interventions developed by Lorenc and Oliver [3], and the  
154 process evaluation associated with the trial of the IHC primary school intervention [6].

155

156 We developed the criteria for a sensible framework to inform our judgements about what  
157 to include in the framework and how, for example whether to specify a potential effect or  
158 include it implicitly. Such judgements are subjective and involve trade-offs. The criteria help  
159 make those judgements explicit, transparent, and systematic. We based the initial criteria  
160 for a sensible framework on relevant criteria for sensible health indexes developed by  
161 Feinstein [19], since in previous work, we and others have found them to be a helpful  
162 starting point for developing various tools [20,21].

163

## 164 Survey of experts, and revision of the criteria and framework

165 We developed a survey (S2 File) for collecting expert feedback on the first version of the  
166 framework and criteria for a sensible framework, using Nettskjema, an online survey tool  
167 developed and hosted by the University of Oslo [22]. The survey included both Likert-scale  
168 items, for collecting broad, quantitative data, and open-ended questions, for collecting  
169 more nuanced, qualitative data.

170

171 MO emailed a request for feedback to 70 external experts, as well as the research team. He  
172 attached the initial framework and criteria (S1 File) and included a link to the survey (S2  
173 File). The external experts included health and education researchers; other non-researcher  
174 educationalists, including teachers and curriculum developers; and information researchers  
175 and designers, based in low-, middle-, and high-income countries. They included all 51  
176 members of our international advisory network, and 19 other external experts with  
177 particularly relevant expertise. The latter were recommended by members of the research  
178 team or advisory network, or early respondents to the survey.

179

180 MO conducted a thematic analysis of the qualitative survey data [23]. The analysis included  
181 five steps:

- 182 1. Reviewing all the qualitative data and tagging each data point with an initial theme,  
183 in a spreadsheet
- 184 2. Reviewing and revising the tags and themes

- 185 3. Organising the data by theme, in a document
- 186 4. For each theme, suggesting what changes to make to the criteria or framework, if
- 187 any
- 188 5. Revising the analysis based on feedback from co-investigators

189

190 MO then made the agreed-upon revisions to the criteria and framework.

191

## 192 Interviews with teachers, and prioritisation of outcomes

193 We conducted individual interviews with teachers to identify any potential adverse effects  
194 missing from the revised framework and preliminarily prioritise potential adverse outcomes  
195 in the framework to explore in the process evaluations and measure in the one-year-follow-  
196 up assessments of the trials (Box 1) (Fig 1). We recruited one teacher each from Rwanda,  
197 Kenya, and Uganda.

198

199 We included teachers familiar with the project through participation in the IHC teacher  
200 network in their country [24] and piloting prototypes of the digital resources [11]. We  
201 excluded teachers unfamiliar with the project since they were unlikely to have experience  
202 teaching critical thinking based on findings from the context analyses (Box 1) [12–14],  
203 consistent with findings from similar studies in Norway and Australia [25–27].

204

205 We developed an interview guide that we revised after each interview. S3 File is the final  
206 version of the guide. We expected the interview topic—potential adverse effects

207 (“disadvantages”) of teaching critical thinking—would be unfamiliar or strange to teachers,  
208 given that adverse effects of educational interventions are often overlooked [1]. Moreover,  
209 we expected that they might find the topic uncomfortable, since they might experience it as  
210 being asked to criticise themselves, their colleagues, or education authorities. Therefore, we  
211 first asked about potential beneficial effects (“advantages”) of teaching critical thinking.  
212 Furthermore, we opted for individual interviews, rather than group interviews, since  
213 individual interviews are logically more appropriate for exploring knowledge that is taken  
214 for granted and not readily articulated [28].

215

216 MO led the interviews via video chat, using Zoom. In two of the three interviews, at least  
217 one of the IHC team members in the relevant country joined in-person (RS in Uganda) or via  
218 video chat (FC and BN in Kenya), to observe and take additional notes. We video-recorded  
219 all the interviews.

220

221 MO entered all notes into a spreadsheet, adding transcriptions of the participants’  
222 responses to questions about potential adverse effects of teaching critical thinking. We  
223 linked those responses (data points) to relevant outcomes in the framework. If the teacher  
224 reported experiencing or observing a specific adverse outcome during a pilot of the  
225 prototype resources or—explicitly or implicitly—suggested a specific adverse effect of the  
226 intervention was possible, we preliminarily prioritised the outcome for evaluation.

227

## 228 Ethical considerations

229 Participation in this study was voluntary and did not involve likely or serious risks to  
230 participants.

231

232 Before publishing the article, we sent the manuscript to the survey respondents who  
233 provided feedback on the initial framework. We asked them to contact us if they had any  
234 concerns. We have not published data that could be used to individually identify them, and  
235 we have removed the names of colleagues mentioned in their responses. We did not obtain  
236 consent from the survey respondents because the data were analysed anonymously. We  
237 obtained written consent from the interview participants for the entire development stage  
238 of the project, including being recorded.

239

240 The Norwegian Institute of health (NIPH) is the project's lead partner. As required by NIPH—  
241 to comply with the European General Data Protection Regulation—we have completed a  
242 data privacy impact assessment (DPIA) for the entire development stage of the project,  
243 including this study. The Data Protection and Chief Information Security Officers at the  
244 Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPH) provided feedback on the DPIA, and the  
245 relevant senior advisor at NIPH approved it. Furthermore, as required by RCN, we have  
246 created a data management plan for the entire project, which we are updating continuously  
247 and will submit to RCN at the end of the project. Since the project will not generate new  
248 knowledge about health and disease, it falls outside the remit of the Regional Committee for

249 Medical Research Ethics [29], in Norway, which the committee has confirmed (reference  
250 number 30713).

251

252 In Kenya, we obtained ethics approval from Masinde Muliro University of Science and  
253 Technology Institutional Ethics Review Committee and the Kenya National Commission of  
254 Science and Technology Institute (licence number NACOSTI/P/19/1986), as well as approval  
255 from the Ministry of Education and the Teachers Service Commission, nationally and at the  
256 county-level. In Rwanda, we obtained ethics approval from the Rwandan National Ethics  
257 Committee. In Uganda, we obtained ethics approval from the School of Medicine research  
258 ethics committee at the Makerere University College of Health Sciences, and from the  
259 Uganda National Council for Science and Technology.

260

## 261 Results

262 The results of this study include the following, in order: findings from the survey of experts;  
263 the revised criteria for a sensible framework; the revised framework, including an overview  
264 (a series of six tables) and descriptions of the potential mechanisms; findings from the  
265 interviews with teachers; and the prioritised outcomes.

266

### 267 Survey of experts, and revision of the criteria and framework

268 We received 42 survey responses from experts in:

- 269 • Developing and evaluating educational interventions, in general and specifically
- 270 within critical thinking
- 271 • Developing and evaluating health interventions, including public health interventions
- 272 • Teaching critical thinking, in general and specifically about health

273

274 Four of the survey respondents (10%) were members of our team. In other words, just over  
275 half of the external recipients responded to the survey (38/70, 54%). All but one of those  
276 respondents were members of our advisory network. A few of the experts we contacted  
277 chose to send qualitative feedback via email, in addition to the survey (3) or instead (4). The  
278 four who provided feedback via email instead of the survey were external and not members  
279 of the advisory network. Five of the survey respondents also provided feedback in copies of  
280 the circulated document (S1 File).

281

282 Most of the survey respondents were researchers (33 of 42, 79%). Many of those  
283 respondents were also practitioners, i.e., educators or health professionals. Six were non-  
284 researcher educationalists, including teachers and curriculum developers. In total, twenty-  
285 four (57%) of the respondents worked primarily in health—including public health, health  
286 literacy, and evidence-based health care—and 15 (36%) in education. The remaining three  
287 respondents were primarily information researchers and designers.

288

289 Thirty-one (74%) of the survey respondents were based in high-income countries, 7 (17%) in  
290 middle-income countries, and 4 (10%) in low-income countries. Twenty-four (57%) were

291 based in Europe, 8 (19%) in Africa, 5 (12%) in North America, 2 (5%) in Australia, 2 (5%) in  
292 Central- or South-America, and 1 (2%) in Asia.

293

294 Responses to the Likert-scale items suggested respondents overall approved of the initial  
295 framework and criteria (S4 File). However, based on the analysis of the qualitative survey  
296 data, we substantially revised both. S5 File is the qualitative data organised by theme,  
297 together with our responses, including the specific revisions we made. Broadly speaking,  
298 those changes included:

- 299 • Adjusting the objectives
- 300 • Adjusting, removing, and adding criteria for a sensible framework
- 301 • Dividing the overview of the framework into a series of tables
- 302 • Adjusting outcome categories
- 303 • Adjusting or removing outcomes
- 304 • Adjusting the potential mechanisms
- 305 • Replacing problematic terms and adding definitions

306

## 307 Revised criteria for a sensible framework

308

309

310 Box 2 shows the revised criteria for a sensible framework.

311

312 **Box 2. Revised criteria for a sensible framework of potential adverse effects of the IHC**

313 **secondary school intervention.**

- Each category of potential adverse effects is clear and logical.
- Each potential adverse effect is clear, logical, and likely to be important to participants or other stakeholders.
- Each corresponding beneficial effect is clear and logical.
- The amount of content in the framework is manageable.
- The organisation of the framework is clear and logical.
- The presentation of the framework is clear and logical.

314

315 **Revised framework**

316 The revised framework has two parts. The first part is an overview: a series of six tables

317 presenting the categories of adverse outcomes with definitions (

318

319 Table 1), outcomes within those categories (

320 Table 2), definitions of those outcomes (.  
321

322 Table 3), sub-outcomes (  
323 Table 4), potentially affected individuals, groups, and populations (  
324 Table 5), and corresponding beneficial outcomes (Table 6). The second part of the  
325 framework is descriptions of the potential mechanisms for the effects, with examples, which  
326 follow the overview.

327

328

329 **Table 1. Categories of adverse outcomes.**

<b>Category</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<i>Decision-making harms</i>	Behaviours and beliefs that might contribute to poor choices
<i>Psychological harms</i>	Uncomfortable thoughts and feelings
<i>Equity harms</i>	Inequities in the distribution or size of effects
<i>Group and social harms</i>	Harmful interactions between individuals, groups, populations, and systems
<i>Waste</i>	Waste of time and resources
<i>Other harms</i>	Other adverse outcomes than those in the categories above

330

331 **Table 2. Adverse outcomes by category.**

332

<b>Category</b>	<b>Adverse outcome</b>
<i>Decision-making harms</i>	Misunderstanding
	Misapplication of learning
<i>Psychological harms</i>	Distrust <sup>1</sup>
	Pessimism <sup>2</sup>
	Cognitive dissonance
	Work/Schoolwork-related stress
<i>Equity harms</i>	Benefit-based inequity
	Harm-based inequity
<i>Group and social harms</i>	Conflict
<i>Waste</i>	Wasted time or resources
<i>Any category</i>	Other harms than those above

333 <sup>1</sup>Distrust might also be a decision-making harm, or group or social harm.

334 <sup>2</sup>Pessimism might also be a decision-making harm.

335

336 **Table 3. Definitions of adverse outcomes.**

<b>Adverse outcome</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<i>Misunderstanding</i>	Incorrect understanding of a concept or example explained in the intervention
<i>Misapplication of learning</i>	Incorrect or unnecessary application of a skill or knowledge learned from the intervention
<i>Distrust</i>	Feeling that a person or organisation cannot be relied upon
<i>Pessimism</i>	Inclination to believe that the application of skills or knowledge learned from the intervention is impossible or useless
<i>Cognitive dissonance</i>	Experience of inconsistent beliefs
<i>Work/Schoolwork-related stress</i>	Mental or emotional strain from work or schoolwork
<i>Benefit-based inequity</i>	Inequity due to the distribution or size of a beneficial effect of the intervention
<i>Harm-based inequity</i>	Inequity due to the distribution or size of an adverse effect of the intervention
<i>Conflict</i>	Unconstructive argument between two or more parties
<i>Wasted time or resources</i>	Use of time or resources on the intervention that would be better spent on other activity
<i>Other harms</i>	Other adverse outcomes than those specified above

338 **Table 4. Sub-outcomes.**

Adverse outcome	Sub-outcomes	
<i>Distrust</i>	towards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health professional</li> <li>• Health researcher</li> <li>• Family</li> <li>• Teacher</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>
<i>Conflict</i>	involving	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participant<sup>1</sup></li> <li>• School</li> <li>• Family</li> <li>• Social networks<sup>2</sup></li> <li>• Health services<sup>3</sup></li> <li>• Researcher</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>
<i>Benefit-based inequity</i>	between	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High and low-achieving students</li> <li>• High and low-resourced students</li> <li>• High and low-resourced schools</li> <li>• Other</li> </ul>

339 <sup>1</sup>Student or teacher

340 <sup>2</sup>Friends, peers, colleagues, religious leaders, and others

341 <sup>3</sup>Health professionals and others

342

343 **Table 5. Affected individuals, groups, and populations, by adverse outcome.**

<b>Adverse outcome</b>	<b>Directly affected</b>	<b>Indirectly affected</b>
<i>Misunderstanding</i>	Participant <sup>1</sup>	Family, social networks <sup>2</sup> , and health services <sup>3</sup>
<i>Misapplication of learning</i>	Participant <sup>1</sup>	Family, social networks <sup>2</sup> , and health services <sup>3</sup>
<i>Distrust</i>	Participant <sup>1</sup>	Family, social networks <sup>2</sup> , and health services <sup>3</sup>
<i>Pessimism</i>	Participant <sup>1</sup>	Family, social networks <sup>2</sup> , and health services <sup>3</sup>
<i>Cognitive dissonance</i>	Participant <sup>1</sup>	Family and social networks <sup>2</sup>
<i>Work/Schoolwork-related stress</i>	Participant <sup>1</sup>	Family and social networks <sup>2</sup>
<i>Benefit-based inequity</i>	Participants <sup>1</sup> or schools	Families and social networks <sup>2</sup>
<i>Harm-based inequity</i>	Participants <sup>1</sup> or schools	Families and social networks <sup>2</sup>
<i>Conflict</i>	Participant <sup>1</sup> /school and second party	Family, social networks <sup>2</sup> , health services <sup>3</sup> , and researchers
<i>Wasted time or resources</i>	Participants <sup>1</sup> or schools	Families and social networks <sup>2</sup>
<i>Other</i>	Any	Any

344 <sup>1</sup>Student or teacher

345 <sup>2</sup>Friends, peers, colleagues, religious leaders, and others

346 <sup>3</sup>Health professionals and others

347

348 **Table 6. Corresponding beneficial outcomes.**

<b>Adverse outcome</b>	<b>Corresponding beneficial outcome<sup>1</sup></b>
<i>Misunderstanding</i>	Understanding
<i>Misapplication of learning</i>	Correct and necessary application of learning
<i>Distrust</i>	Healthy scepticism
<i>Pessimism</i>	Optimism
<i>Cognitive dissonance</i>	Cognitive coherence
<i>Work/Schoolwork-related stress</i>	None
<i>Benefit-based inequity</i>	Benefit-based equity
<i>Harm-based inequity</i>	None
<i>Conflict</i>	Constructive discussion
<i>Wasted time or resources</i>	Worthwhile use of time and resources

349 <sup>1</sup>The corresponding beneficial effect (and increase in the corresponding beneficial outcome)

350 is not necessarily the converse of the adverse effect, but a potential beneficial effect in

351 place of the potential adverse effect.

352

353 **Misunderstanding**

354 The IHC secondary school intervention might cause misunderstandings of concepts or  
355 examples, which participants might then “transfer” [30] to their daily lives. Such effects are  
356 possible if the concepts or examples are unclear to participants due to a problem with how  
357 they are explained or used in the intervention (Box 3). In particular, examples of health  
358 claims might be misunderstood as advice if it is unclear how the IHC secondary school  
359 intervention is different from typical public health interventions, which encourage particular  
360 choices, such as getting screened for a disease [31], as opposed to helping people learn  
361 general decision-making skills.

362

363 **Box 3. Examples of potential misunderstandings caused by the intervention.**

**Misunderstanding a concept**

In terms of the IHC Key concepts about the reliability of claims and research evidence, a participant might misunderstand “unreliable” as meaning the same as “false” or “incorrect”. This is possible if the meaning of “unreliable” is unclear due to a problem with its explanation or use in the training or resources. In their daily life, when faced with an unreliable claim about the effects of a health intervention, the participant might then assume the claim is simply false and the intervention does not have the claimed effects. In fact, the intervention might have the claimed effects, despite the claim being unreliable. Moreover, there might be an alternate, reliable basis for the claim. For example, when faced with a claim about the helpful effects of a vaccine based on anecdotal evidence, the

participant might assume the claim is false and the vaccine is wasteful, if not harmful.

However, the vaccine might still be helpful, and there might be reliable evidence showing it is helpful.

### **Misunderstanding an example**

It is possible that participants will interpret examples of reliable claims as advice. This is possible if the explanation or use of an example is unclear. For example, a participant might interpret an example about evidence showing helpful effects of painkillers as advice that they should always use painkillers when in pain.

364

### 365 **Misapplication of learning**

366 The intervention might improve skills in the learning context (i.e. the training or lessons),

367 but cause misapplication of those skills in other contexts, most importantly participants'

368 daily lives. Such "mis-transfer" of learning—as opposed to transfer of mislearning (see

369 "Misunderstanding")—is possible if limitations of the intervention are not addressed clearly,

370 in the intervention. Those limitations include that the IHC secondary school intervention

371 focuses on a limited number of IHC Key Concepts (.  
372

373 Box 1), and that it does not focus on other relevant and important skill sets, such as the  
374 ability to search for relevant and reliable information.

375

376 For example, in the learning context, a participant might understand the concept that  
377 randomisation is the only way to control for unknown confounding. However, the  
378 intervention does not focus concepts about blinding. If this limitation of the intervention is  
379 unclear, when in daily life the participant is faced with evidence from a randomised, but  
380 unblind trial, with a high risk of bias, they might then assume the evidence is more reliable  
381 than it really is.

382

383 Misapplication of learning here includes “overtransfer” [30]: technically correct, but  
384 unnecessary application of learning. For example, a participant might spend time and  
385 energy assessing the basis for a health claim that could simply be ignored because the  
386 intervention in the claim is unavailable.

387

### 388 **Distrust**

389 The IHC secondary school intervention might cause participants to become distrustful of  
390 certain groups or individuals. Such effects are possible if the difference between the basis  
391 for a claim and its source is unclear to participants, as well as why the basis, not the source,  
392 determines the reliability of the claim.

393

394 For example, the intervention might cause distrust towards health professionals or  
395 researchers. This is because when explaining ways in which research can be unreliable, such  
396 as random error, we disproportionately use examples of unreliable research evaluating the  
397 effects of “Western”, “modern”, or “academic” medicine, as opposed to “traditional” or  
398 “herbal” medicine. This research typically suggests the intervention is helpful, when really it  
399 is or might be ineffective or harmful.

400

401 There are two reasons for this disproportion. First, participants might be deeply invested in  
402 beliefs about traditional and herbal care. If so, they might become defensive if we use an  
403 example suggesting such beliefs are unreliable, and their defensiveness might prevent  
404 learning. Moreover, they might assume the intervention is on the side of “Western”  
405 medicine and the pharmaceutical industry of which they might already be distrustful for  
406 understandable reasons, starting with colonialism [32].

407

408 Second, to effectively explain concepts, our findings and experiences from the development  
409 of the IHC primary and secondary school interventions suggest it is important to use real,  
410 familiar, and relevant examples, showing that the concepts are important to participants’  
411 daily lives. However, there often is no research evaluating the effects of traditional and  
412 herbal interventions that are common in the participants’ contexts.

413

414 Increased distrust might lead to poor decisions, by causing participants to dismiss reliable  
415 and relevant advice or evidence, making it a potential decision-making harm as well as a

416 potential psychological harm. Moreover, it might lead to conflict, making it a potential  
417 group or social harm.

418

419 In some cases, distrust might be a decision-making benefit. However, any source might  
420 provide reliable or unreliable information about the effects of a health intervention.

421 Furthermore, aiming to increase trust or distrust in particular sources might backfire. For  
422 example, aiming to increase trust in health authorities or decrease trust in practitioners of  
423 “traditional” medicine could make the IHC secondary school intervention seem like  
424 propaganda for “Western” medicine.

425

426 Therefore, the IHC secondary school intervention is not intended to increase or decrease  
427 trust in information about particular types of interventions, nor information from particular  
428 sources. Rather, it is intended to increase “healthy” scepticism towards all claims and  
429 research evidence. If the intervention is effective, students should be more likely to seek  
430 advice from health authorities, assuming those authorities provide reliable information. And  
431 they should be less likely to seek information from sources that more often provide  
432 unreliable information.

433

#### 434 **Pessimism**

435 The IHC secondary school intervention might cause participants to feel pessimistic. Such  
436 effects are possible if it is unclear to participants how the intervention can help them make

437 better choices in many cases, even though there are relevant and important problems that  
438 the intervention cannot solve. Those problems include:

- 439 • Many common health interventions are harmful or wasteful, or have highly  
440 uncertain effects [33,34].
- 441 • Many health claims are unreliable [35].
- 442 • Many people are limited in their ability to think critically about health information  
443 and choices, including health professionals [36–40].
- 444 • Many health research studies are unreliable or wasteful [41,42].
- 445 • Citizens have limited influence over decisions about health policies that affect them  
446 [43].
- 447 • Free sources of reliable health information in plain language are limited in number  
448 and quality [44].
- 449 • In school, outside of the intervention, participants have limited opportunities to  
450 learn about how to think critically about health [12–14].

451

452 We address some of these problems explicitly in the intervention, and participants might  
453 recognise others. They might believe that because of these problems, applying the skills  
454 they have learned from the intervention is impossible or useless. This might be more likely  
455 in students than teachers, given that students have less experience making independent  
456 choices.

457

458 Increased pessimism might lead to poor decisions, by causing participants to mistakenly  
459 assume an informed choice is impossible or useless, making it a potential decision-making  
460 harm as well.

461

## 462 Cognitive dissonance

463 The IHC secondary school intervention might lead to uncomfortable cognitive dissonance.

464 This effect is possible if the intervention causes participants to have new beliefs that are

465 inconsistent with prior, deep-rooted beliefs, such as beliefs about the effects of “traditional”

466 medicine (see “Distrust”). In other words, the intervention might help participants apply a

467 concept to some beliefs about the effects of health interventions, but not others, depending

468 on the participant’s level of emotional, social, or cultural investment in the belief.

469 Recognising this inconsistency might be uncomfortable.

470

## 471 Work/Schoolwork-related stress

472 The IHC secondary school intervention might cause work-related stress in participating

473 teachers, and schoolwork-related stress in participating students. Such effects are possible if

474 the intervention is ineffective, inefficient, or inessential, or experienced as such, or if it is too

475 demanding. In the process evaluation for the trial of the IHC primary school intervention,

476 some teachers reported an increase in stress due to the added workload, and teaching

477 something new [6].

478

479 It might be time-consuming for participants to familiarise themselves with the content of  
480 the intervention—including terminology, concepts, and teaching and learning strategies—  
481 and the design and functionality of the digital resources. Meanwhile, there is substantial  
482 pressure on students, teachers, and schools to prepare as much as possible for official  
483 exams, which do not test the ability to apply IHC Key Concepts [12–14].

484

485 Moreover, the intervention is intended to increase students’ questioning of claims,  
486 evidence, and choices. If students more often question claims or evidence from teachers,  
487 this might lead to teachers feeling stressed.

488

#### 489 **Inequity**

490 The IHC secondary school intervention might cause or increase inequity. Such effects are  
491 possible if there is an unequal size or distribution of a beneficial or harmful effect across  
492 subgroups. In particular, the intervention might increase inequity amongst students  
493 depending on their baseline academic ability, or their socioeconomic background and  
494 resources. For example, some language might be suitable for some students, but too  
495 advanced for others, or some students might receive academic support at home that others  
496 do not.

497

498 Similarly, the intervention might increase inequity amongst schools depending on available  
499 resources. For example, the intervention might have a larger beneficial effect on learning in  
500 participants at highly resourced schools with projectors or printers available. Or it might

501 cause more work-related stress in teachers at low-resource schools who have relatively little  
502 training or support.

503

#### 504 Conflict

505 The IHC secondary school intervention might cause conflicts between different individuals  
506 and groups. Such effects are possible if the intervention causes participants to question  
507 other people’s claims, beliefs, or choices, and those people become irritated or defensive.

508

509 In particular, the intervention might cause conflict between students and authorities, such  
510 as teachers or parents. For example, a parent might be deeply invested in beliefs about the  
511 effects of “traditional” care (see “Distrust”). If the child questions any of those beliefs—  
512 especially in a way that is experienced as disrespectful—this might lead to conflict.

513

#### 514 Wasted time or resources

515 With any intervention, there is an opportunity cost. The IHC secondary school intervention  
516 might cause participants and schools to waste time and resources. Such effects are possible  
517 if the intervention is ineffective or inessential, or experienced as such.

518

519 As mentioned under “Work/Schoolwork-related stress”, there is substantial pressure on  
520 students, teachers, and schools to prepare as much as possible for official exams [12–14].

521 This is especially important in terms of waste as well, since any time spent on an ineffective  
522 or inessential intervention could have been spent on said preparation for exams.

523

## 524 Other potential adverse outcomes

525 The IHC secondary school intervention might have adverse effects that are not specified in  
526 the framework. This includes effects that we have considered and chosen not to specify,  
527 because they seem illogical, such as an increase in bullying (S5 File), as well as any effects  
528 that we have failed to consider.

529

## 530 Interviews with teachers, and prioritisation

531 We interviewed one teacher in each of the three countries where we are initially evaluating  
532 the IHC secondary school intervention (

533

534 Table 7). We organised the interview data in five main themes (S6 File). Within the theme  
535 about potential adverse effects (“Disadvantages”), which was the focus of the analysis, we  
536 organised the data into 11 sub-themes. Each sub-theme is a potential adverse outcome, or a  
537 factor in the potential mechanism of an adverse effect (S6 File).

538

### 539 **Table 7. Interview participants.**

	<b>Teacher 1</b>	<b>Teacher 2</b>	<b>Teacher 3</b>
<i>Country</i>	Uganda	Kenya	Rwanda
<i>Years of teaching experience</i>	10	4	10

<i>Subjects</i>	Biology, chemistry	Biology, agriculture	Physics
<i>Forms (grades or years)</i>	1-4 (entire lower secondary)	1-4 (entire lower secondary)	4-6 (entire upper secondary)
<i>School location</i>	Urban	Semi-urban	Urban
<i>School type</i>	Private	Public	Semi-public ("government-aided")

540

541 If a teacher reported observing the outcome in the pilot, or suggested the effect is possible  
542 in the trial, we marked the outcome as a priority for evaluation, preliminarily. In the end,  
543 this led us to prioritising three outcomes: work-related stress; wasted time or resources;  
544 and conflict, particularly conflict between students and family. None of the teachers  
545 reported or suggested any potential adverse outcomes or effects that we had not already  
546 included in the framework.

547

548 Teacher 1 reported two "worries" or "challenges" for teaching critical thinking, which we  
549 linked to the outcomes "Wasted time or resources" and "Work-related stress". Teacher 2  
550 reported experiencing stress and wasted time in the pilot, and suggested conflict was  
551 another potential adverse effect was possible, although he had not experienced or observed  
552 it. Teacher 3 initially said there were no potential adverse effects of teaching critical  
553 thinking: *"When you think critically, you can go far, but when you don't think critically, I*  
554 *think you can go nowhere. So, [there is] no disadvantage."* When we asked him about the

555 potential adverse effects suggested by Teachers 1 and 2, he suggested those effects were  
556 not possible, or—if possible—acceptable or easily addressed.

557

## 558 Conflict

559 Teacher 1 did not raise conflict as an adverse outcome potentially caused by the  
560 intervention. Although he had not observed or experienced it in the pilot, Teacher 2  
561 suggested the intervention could cause it, specifically between students and family.

562

563 *"These parents may be illiterate. They never went to school. And then the students maybe,*  
564 *they are... There is something that they do out of their personal experience in their family.*  
565 *And then you realise that if we now tell the students about health actions and health*  
566 *choices, and then now they stop doing what they used to do in their family, this maybe*  
567 *sometimes might start bringing wrangles between the parent and the family, and the*  
568 *students, because of maybe now, they are educated and they know what is to be done."*

569

570 Teacher 3 said an increase in “debate” was possible, but not conflict.

571

572 *"I think [conflict] is not [...] a disadvantage. It's again considered a debate. It's a debate,*  
573 *and... and a debate can end up with some decisions. I think... Among those decisions, it's not*  
574 *developing hatred or any... any kind of that. So, for me, it's not a disadvantage. It's a debate.*  
575 *In a debate, you can up... end up with the... the solutions. You take the good one, but not the*  
576 *bad one. But it's not disadvantage for me."*

577

578 **Wasted time or resources**

579

580 Teacher 1 expressed concern that students might be unable to transfer critical thinking skills

581 to other contexts, specifically from lessons to daily life, and from health care to other fields.

582 If transfer of learning from the intervention is limited, the value of the intervention is

583 limited. Therefore, we linked this finding to “Wasted time or resources”.

584

585 *“In fact, I have a question in mind: can this be taught? Can it be taught, teaching someone*

586 *how to think critically? Yes, you put up so many scenarios [in the lessons] where one would*

587 *think critically, and maybe the solution is there, but there are different situations [in daily*

588 *life].”*

589

590 *“[Because] we are saying critical thinking may not only be about health [...] Critical thinking*

591 *is going to help someone solve a problem in general. [...] But again, you find that this will*

592 *again involve someone's ability to what? Understand these are things that are variable.”*

593

594 Her second “worry” was that critical thinking might be down-prioritised as long as it is not

595 on an official exam. We linked this finding to “Wasted time or resources” too, since the

596 intervention might be ineffective or inessential, in which case time spent on the

597 intervention might be better spent preparing for such exams.

598

599 *“You find that the respect it is given, it is not the same respect that is given to something*  
600 *that is to be examined [sic] at the end of the day. And this starts from the administration.*  
601 *[Because] you find that in Uganda today, the curriculum—whether or old or new—that we*  
602 *are having... You find that we have a challenge that people are exam-oriented. Anything that*  
603 *is not to do with them having academic excellency would be wasting time. You realise that*  
604 *some schools don't even do their sports, the what, and what, because they think that it*  
605 *would waste time, since at the end of the day, we don't have an exam on sports, we don't*  
606 *have an exam on [Music, Dance and Drama], we don't have... You know?”*

607

608 Teacher 2 reported experiencing work-related stress during the pilot due to students  
609 questioning claims and becoming distracted, as well as the teacher feeling unprepared for  
610 questions from students about “traditional claims” and “taboos”.

611

612 *“Yeah, [the students] became so inquisitive, and they also [started] 'doing their own*  
613 *research' [...] So this maybe take [sic] time, and again sometimes they also divert the*  
614 *attention of the others. Instead of them... all of them concentrating [on the same thing],*  
615 *they have divided attention, because somebody maybe brought something that was so*  
616 *interesting, out of his own critical thinking.”*

617

618 *“So, they brought in traditional culture and some traditions, and even taboos, as claims. So,*  
619 *if they ask for you... ask you to clarify the claim, maybe sometimes you don't even know...*  
620 *You are... You are hearing about it for the first time. So, it became challenging for us.*

621 *Because some of the... the... the taboos that were said by so many old people, long, long*  
622 *time ago, [the students] bring them today as claims about health actions, and it was*  
623 *challenging for us even to answer such questions or respond to such questions."*

624

625 When asked for an example, he said students had asked whether visiting a witchdoctor was  
626 a "health action", which is the term used as a plain-language alternative to "health  
627 intervention" in the digital resources, defined as "something that someone does to care for  
628 their health or the health of others." The teacher said he did not want to say that visiting a  
629 witchdoctor is a "health action"—even though it is by the definition in the resources—  
630 because he feared students would interpret it as him saying that visiting a witchdoctor is  
631 good for your health.

632

633 *"There was a question like... We can talk about visiting a witchdoctor; is it a health claim or*  
634 *an [sic] health action? So, we were in between there. 'Can we talk about... Is it a health*  
635 *action or a health claim?' [...] We were stuck, whether to... Because visiting witchdoctors for*  
636 *us [teachers], it is wrong. And we did not... We cannot... We cannot say that that is an [sic]*  
637 *health action. [...] We just said it was a claim [...] [The students were] not satisfied, but we*  
638 *had to move on."*

639

640 Teacher 3 agreed that the pilot lessons were "time-consuming", but worthwhile, assuming  
641 they are effective.

642

643 *"Teaching these... these lessons or critical thinking, it's time-consuming. But when you spend*  
644 *time to teach, think critically, and then you come up with the good result, whatever the time*  
645 *it will take, I think it's good, even if it's time-consuming."*

646

## 647 **Work-related stress**

648 In addition to “Waste of time or resources”, we linked the first concern expressed by  
649 Teacher 1—that students might be unable to transfer critical thinking skills to other  
650 contexts—to “Work-related stress”, since it might be stressful for teachers to balance the  
651 importance of teaching students to think critically with pressure to spend as much time as  
652 possible preparing for official exams. Similarly, we also linked the experience described by  
653 Teacher 2—students questioning claims and becoming distracted, and him feeling  
654 unprepared for questions from students about “traditional claims” and “taboos”—to “Work-  
655 related stress”.

656

657 Teacher 3 agreed that work-related stress was a possible effect of teaching critical thinking,  
658 because teaching critical thinking is “time-consuming” (see interview findings regarding  
659 “Wasted time or resources”) and because it might cause students to ask difficult questions  
660 to which teachers do not have the answer. However, he said teaching critical thinking was  
661 worth the time, and that a teacher could search for answers to students’ questions, possibly  
662 together with students, or consult an expert.

663

664 *"Yeah, it's possible. It's possible. But when the... When the student, or a learner, ask... the...*  
665 *the question, or brings a claim that you don't know... So, it's better to do a research [sic], or*  
666 *even consult the expert. [...] Or we can do the research together, can come up with a*  
667 *solution."*

668

## 669 Discussion

### 670 Strengths

671 As far as we are aware, the framework presented in this article is the first tool of its kind in  
672 education research. It is informed by a substantial amount of quantitative and qualitative  
673 feedback from researchers and other experts, and interviews with teachers who have rare  
674 experience teaching critical thinking in their contexts, as well as evidence and theory from  
675 previous studies, and other tools. Moreover, it is the result of interdisciplinary collaboration,  
676 which is important when trying to help people learn how to think critically [45–47]. By  
677 developing the framework, we identified potential adverse effects that are logical and likely  
678 to be important, if they occur. Our preliminary prioritisation of outcomes is consistent with  
679 findings from the process evaluation for the trial of the IHC primary school intervention [6].

680

681 The framework highlights that there might be other adverse effects of the IHC secondary  
682 school intervention and other interventions intended to improve critical thinking, which we  
683 either considered and chose not to specify in the framework or failed to consider (see

684 “Other potential adverse outcomes”). Moreover, the framework is a “living” tool, which can  
685 be improved upon, as well as adapted.

686

687 The framework is primarily a tool for researchers. However, it can be used as the basis for  
688 developing tools for other groups, for example evaluation forms for teachers. This would be  
689 similar to how the IHC Key Concepts framework has been used as the basis for developing  
690 the IHC primary and secondary school interventions [7,11,48,49].

691

## 692 **Limitations**

693 Important limitations of the framework include limits to its comprehensiveness, and the use  
694 of terminology with different meanings or interpretations depending on the context. A  
695 limitation of this study is the limited number of interviews. Also, the generic value of the  
696 framework is uncertain, granted developing a generic framework was not our objective.

697

698 In the evaluation of the IHC secondary school intervention, we will address the limitations of  
699 the framework and this study by using complementary mixed methods (S7 File), being  
700 transparent, and showing appropriate caution in the interpretation of results. As mentioned  
701 in the background section, the prioritisation of outcomes is preliminary, and we will  
702 consider re-prioritisation during the process evaluations.

703

## 704    Comprehensiveness

705    Adverse effects can be complex, and we have made trade-offs between making the  
706    framework manageable versus comprehensive. We have not presented relationships  
707    between potential mechanisms in the overview (Tables 1-6) or a model, such as the  
708    potential for distrust to lead to conflict (see “Distrust”). Further, we have limited the  
709    number of specified outcomes (

710 Table 2) and sub-outcomes (Table 4). On the other hand, in the evaluation of the IHC  
711 secondary school intervention, we do not have enough time or resources for in-depth  
712 evaluation of every outcome that is specified, which is why we are prioritising outcomes,  
713 initially based on the interviews with teachers in this study.

714

## 715 Terminology

716 Some of the terminology we have used will have different meanings or interpretations in  
717 other contexts. For example, “distrust”, “pessimism”, and “cognitive dissonance” are not  
718 necessarily defined, understood, or experienced as uncomfortable—they might even be  
719 beneficial, in some cases. Similarly—as mentioned by one of the survey respondents (S5  
720 File)—misunderstandings and misapplication of learning, if effectively addressed, might  
721 ultimately aid learning, without causing harm.

722

## 723 Interview participants

724 It is possible that additional interviews with teachers or other stakeholders would have  
725 changed our interpretation of the data from the three interviews we did conduct, or  
726 provided additional findings. It is also possible that the three teachers who participated in  
727 this study felt invested in the project from their previous participation, and therefore were  
728 unrepresentatively positive towards teaching critical thinking and specifically our  
729 intervention. Moreover, it is possible that data were misinterpreted due to language  
730 barriers.

731

## 732 Generic value

733 We specifically developed the framework to inform the development and evaluation of the  
734 IHC secondary school intervention. Based in part on the survey feedback, we believe the  
735 framework can be helpfully used to develop and evaluate other interventions intended to  
736 improve critical thinking, particularly about health, but also within other fields. A majority of  
737 the IHC Key Concepts are relevant to at least 13 other fields, besides health care [46].

738

739 However, the evidence that informed the framework is mostly from IHC studies [5,6,12–14],  
740 and limited to East-African contexts. Unfortunately, there was limited evidence about  
741 adverse effects of other educational interventions to test against the framework [1,2].

742 Therefore, we cannot be certain about the generic value of the framework until it is used in  
743 other projects. However, the general approach to evaluating potential adverse effects of an  
744 educational intervention can have value to other researchers regardless.

745

## 746 Conclusion

747 In this study, we have identified potential adverse effects of the IHC secondary school  
748 intervention, by developing a framework, and we have preliminarily prioritised outcomes in  
749 the framework for the evaluation of the intervention. Overall, survey responses from  
750 researchers and others with a variety of relevant expertise were positive to an initial version  
751 of the framework. However, responses also included critical feedback that led to substantial  
752 revision. Teachers interviewed about potential adverse effects of teaching critical thinking

753 did not report or suggest any potential adverse outcomes or effects that were missing from  
754 the framework. Based on the interview findings, we prioritised three outcomes for the  
755 evaluation of the IHC secondary school intervention: work-related stress; wasted time or  
756 resources; and conflict, especially between students and family.

757

758 In S7 File, we describe how we have used and plan to use the framework in the  
759 development and evaluation of the IHC secondary school intervention, exemplifying how it  
760 can be used in other projects. In short, we have used it to inform the development of  
761 interview and observation guides being used in the process evaluations, and we are using it  
762 to inform the development of outcome measures for the 1-year-follow-up assessments of  
763 the trials.

764

765 Rigorous evaluations of potential adverse effects of educational and public health  
766 interventions, as well as efforts to prevent those effects, can be time and resource-  
767 intensive. However, these evaluations might come at a small cost compared to the cost of  
768 implementing harmful interventions. We hope the framework developed in this study will  
769 make more efficient the prevention and evaluation of potential adverse effects of other  
770 educational interventions.

771

772

## 773 Contributions

774 MO planned the study, drafted the initial framework, survey, and interview guide. He  
775 collected, managed, and analysed the survey data, led the interviews, and managed and  
776 analysed the interview data. He suggested changes to the framework based on the survey  
777 and interview findings. He also drafted this article. The other authors provided feedback on  
778 at least one of the following: the initial framework, the survey, the interview guide, the  
779 analysis of survey data, the suggested revision of the framework, the final framework, the  
780 analysis of interview findings, and the prioritisation of outcomes. All co-authors provided  
781 feedback on the article.

782

## 783 Acknowledgements

784 We are grateful to the survey respondents and interview participants for their time and  
785 important insight.

786

## 787 Supporting information

788 S1 File. Initial framework and criteria.

789 S2 File. Survey.

790 S3 File. Interview guide.

791 S4 File. Quantitative survey data.

792 S5 File. Qualitative survey data.

793 S6 File. Interview data.

794 S7 File. Use of framework.

795

## 796 References

797 1. Zhao Y. What works may hurt: Side effects in education. *J Educ Chang*. 2017;18: 1–19.

798 doi:10.1007/s10833-016-9294-4

799 2. Zhao Y. What works may hurt: side effects in education. New York: Teachers College  
800 Press; 2018.

801 3. Lorenc T, Oliver K. Adverse effects of public health interventions: A conceptual

802 framework. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2014;68: 288–290. doi:10.1136/jech-

803 2013-203118

804 4. Bonell C, Jamal F, Melendez-Torres GJ, Cummins S. “Dark logic”: Theorising the

805 harmful consequences of public health interventions. *J Epidemiol Community Health*.

806 2015;69: 95–98. doi:10.1136/jech-2014-204671

807 5. Nsangi A, Semakula D, Oxman AD, Austvoll-Dahlgren A, Oxman M, Rosenbaum S, et

808 al. Effects of the Informed Health Choices primary school intervention on the ability

809 of children in Uganda to assess the reliability of claims about treatment effects, 1-

810 year follow-up: A cluster-randomised trial. *Trials*. 2020;21. doi:10.1186/s13063-019-

811 3960-9

812 6. Nsangi A, Semakula D, Glenton C, Lewin S, Oxman AD, Oxman M, et al. Informed

813 health choices intervention to teach primary school children in low-income countries

- 814 to assess claims about treatment effects: Process evaluation. *BMJ Open*. 2019;9:  
815 e030787. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-030787
- 816 7. Nsangi A, Semakula D, Rosenbaum SE, Oxman AD, Oxman M, Morelli A, et al.  
817 Development of the informed health choices resources in four countries to teach  
818 primary school children to assess claims about treatment effects: A qualitative study  
819 employing a user-centred approach. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*. 2020;6: 18.  
820 doi:10.1186/s40814-020-00565-6
- 821 8. Agaba JJ, Chesire F, Michael M, Nandi P, Njue J, Nsangi A, et al. Prioritisation of  
822 Informed Health Choices (IHC) Key Concepts to be included in lower-secondary school  
823 resources: a consensus study. *medRxiv*. 2022; 2022.04.11.22273708.  
824 doi:10.1101/2022.04.11.22273708
- 825 9. Oxman AD, Chalmers I, Dahlgren A. Key Concepts for assessing claims about  
826 treatment effects and making well-informed treatment choices (Version 2022). 2022  
827 Jun. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.6611932
- 828 10. Sørensen K, Van den Broucke S, Fullam J, Doyle G, Pelikan J, Slonska Z, et al. Health  
829 literacy and public health: A systematic review and integration of definitions and  
830 models. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-12-80
- 831 11. Rosenbaum S, Oxman M, Oxman A, Chelagat F, Mugisha M, Ssenyonga R, et al.  
832 Human-centred design development of Informed Health Choices (IHC) learning  
833 resources for secondary school students: Protocol. 2019. Available:  
834 <https://www.informedhealthchoices.org/publications>
- 835 12. Ssenyonga R, Sewankambo NK, Mugagga SK, Nakyejwe E, Chesire F, Mugisha M, et al.

- 836 Learning to think critically about health using digital technology in Ugandan lower  
837 secondary schools: A contextual analysis. PLoS One. 2022;17: e0260367. Available:  
838 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0260367>
- 839 13. Mugisha M, Uwitonze AM, Chesire F, Senyonga R, Oxman M, Nsangi A, et al. Teaching  
840 critical thinking about health using digital technology in lower secondary schools in  
841 Rwanda: A qualitative context analysis. PLoS One. 2021;16: e0248773. Available:  
842 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0248773>
- 843 14. Chesire F chelagat, Ochieng MA, Mugisha M, Senyonga R, Oxman M, Nsangi A, et al.  
844 Contextualizing critical thinking about health using digital technology in secondary  
845 schools in Kenya: a qualitative analysis. Pilot Feasibility Stud. 2022.  
846 [doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-1345080/v1](https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-1345080/v1)
- 847 15. Mugisha M, Nyirazinyoye L, Simbi CMC, Chesire F, Ssenyonga R, Oxman M, et al.  
848 Effects of using the Informed Health Choices digital secondary school resources on  
849 the ability of Rwandan students to think critically about health: protocol for a cluster-  
850 randomised trial. 2022 May. [doi:10.5281/ZENODO.6562788](https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.6562788)
- 851 16. Chesire F, Kaseje M, Ochieng M, Mugisha M, Ssenyonga R, Oxman M, et al. Effects of  
852 the Informed Health Choices secondary school intervention on the ability of lower  
853 secondary students in Kenya to think critically about health information and choices:  
854 Protocol for a cluster-randomized trial. 2022 May. [doi:10.5281/ZENODO.6562940](https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.6562940)
- 855 17. Ssenyonga R, Oxman AD, Nakyejwe E, Mugagga SK, Nsangi A, Semakula D, et al. Does  
856 the use of the Informed Health Choices teaching resources improve the secondary  
857 students' ability to critically think about health in Uganda? A cluster randomised trial


- 858 protocol. 2022 May. doi:10.5281/ZENODO.6560218
- 859 18. Nsangi A, Semakula D, Oxman AD, Austvoll-Dahlgren A, Oxman M, Rosenbaum S, et  
860 al. Effects of the Informed Health Choices primary school intervention on the ability  
861 of children in Uganda to assess the reliability of claims about treatment effects: a  
862 cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2017;390: 374–388. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
863 6736(17)31226-6
- 864 19. Feinstein A. *Clinimetrics*. New Haven: Yale University Press; 1987.
- 865 20. Oxman AD, Guyatt GH. Validation of an index of the quality of review articles. *J Clin*  
866 *Epidemiol*. 1991;44: 1271–1278. doi:10.1016/0895-4356(91)90160-B
- 867 21. Oxman AD, Guyatt GH, Cook DJ, Jaeschke R, Heddle N, Keller J. An index of scientific  
868 quality for health reports in the lay press. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1993;46: 987–1001.  
869 doi:10.1016/0895-4356(93)90166-X
- 870 22. University of Oslo. Nettskjema. [cited 7 Jun 2022]. Available: [www.nettskjema.no](http://www.nettskjema.no)
- 871 23. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qual Res Psychol*. 2006;3:  
872 77–101. doi:10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- 873 24. Nsangi A, Oxman AD, Oxman M, Rosenbaum SE, Semakula D, Ssenyonga R, et al.  
874 Protocol for assessing stakeholder engagement in the development and evaluation of  
875 the Informed Health Choices resources teaching secondary school students to think  
876 critically about health claims and choices. *PLoS One*. 2020;15.  
877 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0239985
- 878 25. Nordheim L, Pettersen KS, Flottorp S, Hjälmhult E. Critical appraisal of health claims:  
879 science teachers' perceptions and practices. *Health Educ*. 2016;116: 449–466.

- 880 doi:10.1108/HE-04-2015-0016
- 881 26. Cusack L, Desha LN, Del Mar CB, Hoffmann TC. A qualitative study exploring high  
882 school students' understanding of, and attitudes towards, health information and  
883 claims. *Heal Expect.* 2017; 1–9. doi:10.1111/hex.12562
- 884 27. Lund HM, Mathisen PE, Rekkavik ME, Voll E. Teaching critical thinking about health  
885 claims: market analysis for Norwegian primary and lower secondary school. 2018.
- 886 28. Johnson JM. In-Depth Interview Research. In: Gubrium JF, Holstein JA, editors.  
887 *Handbook of Interview Research.* SAGE Publications, Inc.; 2001. pp. 103–119.  
888 doi:10.4135/9781412973588.n8
- 889 29. Helse- og omsorgsdepartementet. Lov om medisinsk og helsefaglig forskning  
890 (helseforskningsloven). In: Lovdata [Internet]. 2008 [cited 21 Mar 2022]. Available:  
891 <https://lovdata.no/dokument/NL/lov/2008-06-20-44>
- 892 30. Barnett SM, Ceci SJ. When and where do we apply what we learn? A taxonomy for far  
893 transfer. *Psychol Bull.* 2002;128: 612–637. doi:10.1037//0033-2909.128.4.612
- 894 31. Grilli R, Ramsay C, Minozzi S. Mass media interventions: effects on health services  
895 utilisation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2002. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD000389
- 896 32. Tilley H. Medicine, Empires, and Ethics in Colonial Africa. *AMA J Ethics.* 2016;18: 743–  
897 753. doi:10.1001/journalofethics.2016.18.7.mhst1-1607
- 898 33. Brownlee S, Chalkidou K, Doust J, Elshaug AG, Glasziou P, Heath I, et al. Evidence for  
899 overuse of medical services around the world. *Lancet.* 2017;390: 156–168.  
900 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)32585-5
- 901 34. Glasziou P, Straus S, Brownlee S, Trevena L, Dans L, Guyatt G, et al. Evidence for

- 902 underuse of effective medical services around the world. *Lancet*. 2017;390: 169–177.
- 903 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)30946-1
- 904 35. Oxman M, Larun L, Pérez Gaxiola G, Alsaid D, Qasim A, Rose CJ, et al. Quality of  
905 information in news media reports about the effects of health interventions:  
906 Systematic review and meta-analyses [version 2; peer review: 3 approved, 1  
907 approved with reservations]. *F1000Research*. 2022;10.  
908 doi:10.12688/f1000research.52894.2
- 909 36. Austvoll-Dahlgren A, Furuseth-Olsen K, Rose CJ, Oxman AD. The Norwegian public’s  
910 ability to assess treatment claims: results of a cross-sectional study of critical health  
911 literacy [version 1; peer review: awaiting peer review]. *F1000Research*. 2020;9.  
912 doi:10.12688/f1000research.21902.1
- 913 37. Hoffmann T, Del Mar C. Clinicians’ expectations of the benefits and harms of  
914 treatments, screening, and tests: A systematic review. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017.  
915 Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2016.8254>
- 916 38. Hoffmann TC, Del Mar C. Patients’ Expectations of the Benefits and Harms of  
917 Treatments, Screening, and Tests. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2015;175: 274–286.  
918 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2014.6016
- 919 39. Boutron I, Haneef R, Yavchitz A, Baron G, Novack J, Oransky I, et al. Three randomized  
920 controlled trials evaluating the impact of “spin” in health news stories reporting  
921 studies of pharmacologic treatments on patients’/caregivers’ interpretation of  
922 treatment benefit. *BMC Med*. 2019;17. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1330-9
- 923 40. Nordheim LV, Pettersen KS, Espehaug B, Flottorp SA, Gutterud Ø. Lower secondary

- 924 school students ' scientific literacy and their proficiency in identifying and appraising  
925 health claims in news media : a secondary analysis using large-scale survey data.  
926 2019; 1–10. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-028781
- 927 41. Glasziou P, Chalmers I. Research waste is still a scandal-an essay by Paul Glasziou and  
928 Iain Chalmers. 2018;4645: 10–12. doi:10.1136/bmj.k4645
- 929 42. Ioannidis JPA. Why Most Published Research Findings Are False. PLOS Med. 2005;2.  
930 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124
- 931 43. Macaulay B, Reinap M, Wilson MG, Kuchenmüller T. Integrating citizen engagement  
932 into evidence-informed health policy-making in eastern Europe and central Asia:  
933 scoping study and future research priorities. Heal Res Policy Syst. 2022;20: 11.  
934 doi:10.1186/s12961-021-00808-9
- 935 44. Oxman AD, Paulsen EJ. Who can you trust? A review of free online sources of  
936 “trustworthy” information about treatment effects for patients and the public. BMC  
937 Med Inform Decis Mak. 2019;19.
- 938 45. Sharples JM, Oxman AD, Mahtani KR, Chalmers I, Oliver S, Collins K, et al. Critical  
939 thinking in healthcare and education. BMJ. 2017;357: j2234. doi:10.1136/bmj.j2234
- 940 46. Aronson JK, Barends E, Boruch R, Brennan M, Chalmers I, Chislett J, et al. Key  
941 concepts for making informed choices. Nature. 2019;572: 303–306.  
942 doi:10.1038/d41586-019-02407-9
- 943 47. Stewart R, Aronson JK, Barends E, Boruch R, Brennan M, Chislett J, et al. Lessons from  
944 working across fields to develop a framework for informed choices. Res All. 2022;6.  
945 doi:10.14324/RFA.06.1.05

- 946 48. Oxman A, Oxman M, Semakula D, Chalmers I, Chelagat F, Kaseje M, et al. Prioritising  
947 and ordering Informed Health Choices (IHC) Key Concepts to be included in a  
948 secondary school resources: Protocol. 2019 Dec. Available:  
949 [https://www.informedhealthchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/CHOICE-Key-](https://www.informedhealthchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/CHOICE-Key-Concepts-prioritisation-protocol.pdf)  
950 [Concepts-prioritisation-protocol.pdf](https://www.informedhealthchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/CHOICE-Key-Concepts-prioritisation-protocol.pdf)
- 951 49. Oxman A, Chalmers I, Dahlgren A, The Informed Health Choices Group. Key Concepts  
952 for Informed Health Choices: A framework for enabling people to think critically  
953 about health claims. 2019. Available: [https://www.informedhealthchoices.org/wp-](https://www.informedhealthchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/IHC-Key-Concepts_Health_2019.pdf)  
954 [content/uploads/2019/12/IHC-Key-Concepts\\_Health\\_2019.pdf](https://www.informedhealthchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/IHC-Key-Concepts_Health_2019.pdf)  
955



Figure