

Humane League Labs / 2014 What elements make a vegetarian leaflet more effective?	Support for judgment	Review authors' judgment
Domain		
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	Quote: "Young individuals were approached and asked to fill out a survey on food choices."	Unclear risk of bias.
Allocation concealment	Quote: "Young individuals were approached and asked to fill out a survey on food choices."	Unclear risk of bias.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Participants seemed to be treated in the same fashion apart from the intervention in each group.	Low risk of bias.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Analysts seemed to know which intervention participants received. Participants seemed to also know that the leaflet was associated with the outcome measures which could invoke the social desirability bias.	Unclear risk of bias or high risk of bias.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Large degree of attrition. ~82% of the sample was lost to attrition.	Unclear risk of bias or high risk of bias.
Reporting bias		
Selective reporting	All outcome measures seem to be reported.	Low risk of bias.
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	Funded and completed by THL/HLL. Author is proponent of certain tactics.	Unclear risk of bias.

Animal Charity Evaluators/ 2013 2013 ACE Leafleting Study	Support for judgement	Review authors' judgement
Domain		
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	No information on random sequence generation is provided.	Unclear risk of bias.
Allocation concealment	Subjects not originally assigned to a group at baseline where used in the control group at endline.	High risk of bias.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Participants seemed to be treated in the same fashion apart from the intervention in each group. It is possible that some campuses recieved additional leaflets during the study period.	Unclear risk of bias.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Analysts seemed to know which intervention participants received. Treatment participants seemed somewhat likely to know that the leaflet was associated with the outcome measures, which could invoke the social desirability bias.	Unclear risk of bias or high risk of bias.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Number of leaflets handed out isn't recorded so total amount of attrition is unknown. Also not clear if differential attrition across the groups.	Unclear risk of bias.
Reporting bias		
Selective reporting	All outcome measures seem to be reported.	Low risk of bias.
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	Funded and completed by ACE. Group assignments seems strange.	Low risk of bias or unclear risk of bias.

Humane League Labs / 2015 Which request creates the most diet change?	Support for judgement	Review authors' judgement
Domain		
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	No information on random sequence generation is provided.	Unclear risk of bias.
Allocation concealment	Participants or investigators enrolling participants could possibly foresee assignments and thus introduce selection bias.	Low risk of bias.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Participants seemed to be treated in the same fashion apart from the intervention in each group. It is possible that some campuses recieved additional leaflets during the study period.	Low risk of bias.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Analysts seemed to know which intervention participants received. Treatment participants seemed somewhat likely to know that the leaflet was associated with the outcome measures, which could invoke social desirability bias.	Unclear risk of bias or high risk of bias.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	~62% of the sample lost to attrition. Not clear if differential attrition across the groups.	Unclear risk of bias.
Reporting bias		
Selective reporting	All outcome measures seem to be reported. Results from 16 page leaflet were excluded from this study.	Unclear risk of bias.
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	Funded and completed by HLLs. A key investigator is proponent of certain tactics.	Low risk or unclear risk of bias.

Hennessy / 2016 The Impact of Information on Animal Product Consumption	Support for judgement	Review authors' judgement
Domain		
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	No information on random sequence generation is provided.	Unclear risk of bias.
Allocation concealment	Participants or investigators enrolling participants could possibly foresee assignments and thus introduce selection bias.	Low risk of bias.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Participants seemed to be treated in the same fashion apart from the intervention in each group. It is possible that some campuses recieved additional leaflets during the study period.	Low risk of bias.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Analysts seemed to know which intervention participants received. Treatment participants seemed somewhat likely to know that the leaflet was associated with the outcome measures, which could invoke social desirability bias.	Unclear risk of bias or high risk of bias.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	~54% of the sample lost to attrition. Not clear if differential attrition across the groups.	Unclear risk of bias.
Reporting bias		
Selective reporting	All outcome measures seem to be reported. Results from 16 page leaflet were excluded from this study.	Low risk of bias.
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	Completed by investigator with affiliations to VO.	Low risk or unclear risk of bias.

Flens et al / 2017 The Effectiveness of Leafleting on Reducing the Consumption of Animal Products in Dutch Students	Support for judgement	Review authors' judgement
Domain		
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	No information on random sequence generation is provided.	Unclear risk of bias.
Allocation concealment	Investigators enrolling participants could possibly foresee assignments and thus introduce selection bias.	Low risk of bias.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Participants seemed to be treated in the same fashion apart from the intervention in each group.	Low risk of bias.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Analysts seemed to know which intervention participants received. Treatment participants seemed somewhat likely to know that the leaflet was associated with the outcome measures, which could invoke social desirability bias.	Unclear risk of bias or high risk of bias.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Number of leaflets handed out isn't recorded so total amount of attrition is unknown. Also not clear if differential attrition across the groups.	Unclear risk of bias.
Reporting bias		
Selective reporting	All outcome measures seem to be reported.	Low risk of bias.
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	Funded and completed by animal advocacy organization.	Low risk or unclear risk of bias.

Animal Equality Spain	Support for judgement	Review authors' judgement
Domain		
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	No information on random sequence generation is provided.	Unclear risk of bias.
Allocation concealment	Participants or investigators enrolling participants could possibly foresee assignments and thus introduce selection bias.	Low risk of bias.
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Participants seemed to be treated in the same fashion apart from the intervention in each group.	Low risk of bias.
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Analysts seemed to know which intervention participants received. Treatment participants seemed somewhat likely to know that the leaflet was associated with the outcome measures, which could invoke social desirability bias.	Unclear risk of bias or high risk of bias.
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data. Assessments should be made for each main outcome (or class of outcomes).	Number of leaflets handed out isn't recorded so total amount of attrition is unknown. Also not clear if differential attrition across the groups.	Unclear risk of bias.
Reporting bias		
Selective reporting	All outcome measures seem to be reported.	Low risk of bias.
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	Funded and completed by animal advocacy organization.	Unclear risk of bias.