Appendix B: Complete methodology of this systematic review

The methodology that we used to conduct this systematic review is based on the review methods of the Campbell Collaboration (https://www.campbellcollaboration.org). We adopted their definition of a systematic review as "a review of a clearly formulated question that uses systematic and explicit methods to identify, select, and critically appraise relevant research, and to collect and analyze data from the studies that are included in the review" (Moher et al., 2009, p. 1). To develop our review strategy, we used the Methodological Expectations of Campbell Collaboration Intervention Reviews (MECCIR) conduct standards and the PRISMA Statement checklist and flowchart.

B1 OBJECTIVES, RESEARCH QUESTIONS, AND KEY DEFINITIONS

a) Objectives

The overall objective of this systematic review was to inventory all evaluations of programs for prevention of violent extremism (PVE) as reported in publications through December 2019.

In addition to this overall objective, we had the following specific objectives:

1. Identify the methodologies used in evaluations of PVE programs
2. Identify the shortcomings in the literature on evaluation of PVE programs
3. Assess the methodological quality of the existing evaluation studies in this field
4. Make recommendations for evaluation of PVE programs.

b) Research questions

Our main research question was therefore, "On the basis of the literature, what are the main recommendations that can be made regarding evaluation of programs for prevention of violent extremism?" This main question involved sub-questions associated with specific key concepts.

Specific key questions:

1) What primary prevention programs have been evaluated?

2) What secondary prevention programs have been evaluated?

3) What tertiary prevention programs have been evaluated?

4) What other prevention programs, not classified as primary, secondary or tertiary, have been evaluated?

5) What recommendations might be made regarding evaluation of such programs, in light of the opinions expressed by the practitioners and researchers involved in the studies that we reviewed?

For each study that we reviewed, we attempted to answer the following specific sub-questions:

1) What theoretical evaluation approach was used in this study?

2) What evaluation method was used?

3) What strategies, tools and indicators were used to conduct the evaluation?

4) How were the findings for these programs defined and measured?

5) What was the target population of the evaluated program?

6) What method was used to assess the quality of the evaluation?

c) Key definitions

Drawing inspiration from Schmid (2013), in this systematic review we distinguish between radicalization and radicalization to violence. Radicalization is a dynamic process that arises out of the gradual polarization of political, economic, social or religious ideas and that seeks to reject or undermine the status quo. Radicalization can have positive or negative results for individuals and society. It can create opportunities for social change, but it can also aggravate a climate of confrontation between people or groups. When the methods advocated for achieving a radical solution involve legitimizing the use of violence or considering recourse to violent actions, then we can speak of radicalization to violence. Schmid believes that radicalization can in fact serve the cause of democracy, while "extremists can be characterised as political actors

who tend to disregard the rule of law and reject pluralism in society." (Schmid, 2013, p. 8). There is no consensus definition of terrorism (Weinberg, Pedahzur and Hirsch-Hoefler, 2004). For the purposes of this systematic review, we defined "terrorism" as engaging in acts of violence for the purpose of constraining the government and/or frightening the public so as to achieve political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other ends. We used this definition to exclude from our review any evaluations of anti-terrorism programs designed to prevent terrorist attacks.

Radicalization is a process undergone by individuals or groups. When considering society as a whole, we instead use the concept of "social polarization", meaning the gradual division of society and the social environment into different groups and sub-groups whose identity is based on the exacerbation of opposing characteristics related to basic concepts such as sex, race, religion or political opinions (CPN-PREV, 2020).

By "prevention", we mean all efforts to reduce or eliminate risk conditions that may make an individual or group more vulnerable to violent extremism or to recidivism (among individuals who have previously engaged in violence or belonged to extremist groups). As in the field of public health, prevention programs may be aimed at primary prevention (targeting the general population not considered at risk), secondary prevention (targeting individuals or groups that are considered to be at risk or in the initial stages of the process of radicalization to violence), or tertiary prevention (targeting individuals or groups that are already engaged in the final stages of this process, or that belong to extremist groups, or that have committed acts associated with violent extremism). In the case of PVE programs, we make a further distinction between primary prevention programs and targetted primary prevention programs; the latter, though universal, target a specific community.

In the present systematic review, we regard the concepts of "prevention of radicalization to violence" and "prevention of violent extremism" as synonymous but use mainly the latter and its abbreviation, PVE, for convenience. But we do distinguish PVE measures from counterterrorism measures. The former target individuals who are vulnerable to becoming involved in violent extremism, while the latter are designed to address security threats and prevent or deter terrorist attacks. Arce and Sandler (2005) also distinguish between proactive and defensive counterterrorism measures. Proactive counterterrorism measures are often carried out directly by governments or their agents, against terrorists or their sponsors; examples of such measures would include destroying terrorist training camps, taking reprisals against sponsor states and infiltrating terrorist groups. In contrast, defensive counterterrorism measures are aimed at deterring terrorist attacks "by either making success more difficult or increasing the likely

negative consequences to the perpetrator"; examples would include building technological barriers, hardening potential targets, and securing borders (Arce and Sandler, 2005, p. 184).

Lastly, we adopt the definition of "evaluation" given by the United Nations Evaluation Group:

An evaluation is an assessment, conducted as systematically and impartially as possible, of an activity, project, program, strategy, policy, topic, theme, sector, operational area or institutional performance. It analyses the level of achievement of both expected and unexpected results by examining the results chain, processes, contextual factors and causality using appropriate criteria such as relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability. An evaluation should provide credible, useful evidence-based information that enables the timely incorporation of its findings, recommendations and lessons into the decision-making processes of organizations and stakeholders. (UNEG, 2016, p. 10).

B2   INCLUSION AND EXCLUSION CRITERIA

For this systematic review, we adopted maximally inclusive criteria so as to increase the likelihood of finding relevant studies despite variations in their methodological and theoretical frameworks. The following paragraphs summarize the criteria that we applied to determine whether a study was eligible for this review.

Our review targetted all studies published up to and including December 2019 in which primary, evidence-based data were used to evaluate PVE programs.[51] The purpose of such programs is to reduce or eliminate risk conditions that may make an individual or group more vulnerable to becoming involved in violent extremism, or to recidivism.[52] In keeping with the UNEG definition of evaluation, we included all studies whose purpose was to assess or judge a PVE program, project or strategy, even if they did not use the term "evaluation" explicitly. The target populations of the programs evaluated in these studies had to consist of adults. We thus targetted all evaluations of primary, secondary and tertiary PVE programs[53] that attempted to change the attitudes, emotions or behaviours of the target individuals or groups; of their families, friends and acquaintances; and of practitioners who work in this field. We excluded evaluations of programs that work with direct or indirect victims of terrorist actions,[54] evaluations of counterterrorism measures, and studies that evaluated continent-wide strategies or provided overall assessments of a continent-wide approach.

Because one publication can discuss more than one study, the unit of analysis for this review was the individual published study rather than the publication. We regarded a publication as discussing more than one study if it a) discussed more than one sample that had been analyzed independently and b) presented independent results for that sample.

Apart from distinguishing among the three levels of prevention, there were no other criteria that we could use to classify the programs. We therefore described the variables to be considered on the basis of a comparison among these three levels of prevention.

To be included in this review, the studies also had to have been written in English, French or Spanish (the languages read and spoken by the members of the research team).

As long as all of these conditions were met, we did not impose any further restrictions regarding the methodological characteristics of the studies.

---

[51] Secondary data are data collected by someone other than the studies' authors or their teams. Examples of secondary-data sources in the social sciences include population censuses, data collected by government departments, organizational records, and other data that were originally collected for purposes other then the research in question.

[52] See the key definitions in the preceding section.

[53] Ibid.

[54] The families of the individuals who engaged in this process may be regarded as indirect victims of extremist groups. But here we understand "victims" to mean individuals and their families who were the target of attacks, attempted attacks or other violent acts by extremist groups.

B3 VARIABLES CODED

Each study included in this review was coded according to a global coding frame and a tool for appraising methodological quality.

a) Global coding frame

The following table shows the global coding frame that we developed for purposes of coding and then aggregating the data from the studies that we reviewed. The coding was done by a team of research assistants, using this tool.

Dimension	
Variable	**Operational definition**
General description of study	
Author	Author's name
Country	Country where the PVE program was delivered
Peer-reviewed	Whether the study was subjected to a blind peer review, as is typically the case for articles published in scientific journals
Funding sources	Whether the authors mention the sources of funding for their study (if yes, specify these sources)
Conflicts of interest	Whether the authors state their conflicts of interest
	List of stated conflicts of interest
	List of unstated conflicts of interest
Author(s) of study	
Gender	Author's gender
Country of origin	Author's country of origin
Discipline	Author's discipline
Profession	Author's profession
Number of publications as sole author	Number of publications as sole author, in the field of security studies
Number of publications as co-author	Number of publications as co-author, in the field of security studies
Number of publications in the database	Number of publications in the database for this systematic review
Region of first publication	Geographic region of the author's first publication
Prevention level	
Primary	All efforts that seek to reduce or eliminate risk factors or encourage protective factors and that target the general public not identified as being at risk. Primary prevention is a type of universal prevention; awareness campaigns are an example of primary prevention programs.
Targetted primary	All efforts that seek to reduce or eliminate risk factors or encourage protective factors and that target a specific community that is not identified as being at risk. Example: universal prevention programs in Muslim communities.
Secondary	All efforts that seek to reduce or eliminate risk factors or encourage protective factors and that target individuals or groups regarded as at risk and in the initial stages of the process of radicalization to violence.
Tertiary	All efforts that seek to reduce the factors that encourage recidivism among individuals or groups that are in the final stages of the process of radicalization, or who belong to extremist groups or have committed acts associated with violent extremism or with terrorism. Tertiary prevention programs also attempt to reintegrate such individuals and groups into society.
General	Prevention level not clearly indicated in the study

Type of violent extremism targetted

Left-wing (or synonyms)	The study clearly states that the program or project directly targets this type of extremism.
Right-wing (or synonyms)	The study clearly states that the program or project directly targets this type of extremism.
Islamist (or synonyms)	The study clearly states that the program or project directly targets this type of extremism.
Anarchist (or synonyms)	The study clearly states that the program or project directly targets this type of extremism.
Other	The program or project targets any other type of extremism that does not fit the other definitions.
All types	The study clearly states that the program or project targets all types of extremism. This is often the case for

Type of violent extremism targetted

Impact (summative)	An impact evaluation answers the question, "What worked?" In other words, it examines the effects that the intervention had on the participants and whether these effects matched the objectives that had been set. Impact evaluations assess how an intervention contributes to achieving a result or objective. That contribution may be intentional or unintentional, positive or negative, and long-term or short-term. Impact evaluations attempt to identify clear links between causes and effects and to explain how the intervention worked and for whom it worked.
Process (formative)	A process evaluation answers the questions "Why does it work?", "How does it work?" and "How can we improve this process?" A process evaluation thus focuses on the factors that determine or influence the implementation of the program or project activities and provides insight into the changes that happen in the course of them. A process evaluation may start after the intervention begins (formative evaluation), or while it is under way (process evaluation) or in the middle of it (mid-course evaluation).
Output	Evaluation conducted after a program or a phase of a program is over, to determine to what extent the planned activities were carried out.
Audit	A quality-control evaluation, conducted objectively and independently, for the purpose of improving the operations of an organization and increasing their value. An audit helps the organization to achieve its objectives through a rigorous, systematic approach to observing and improving the effectiveness of risk management, control and governance processes.
Monitoring	An ongoing process of using selected indicators to systematically gather data about an action in progress, in order to let managers and stakeholders know what progress and objectives have been achieved and how the allocated funds are being spent.
Other	Any other type of evaluation

Evaluator type

Internal	Evaluation conducted by the people or department responsible for designing and implementing the program or project within the organization delivering it, or by its partner organizations or its funding agency.
Joint	Evaluation conducted by multiple funding agencies and/or their partners, but excluding program participants and practitioners.
Participatory	Evaluation in which all stakeholders (including program participants, practitioners and researchers) collaborate in designing it, conducting it and drawing conclusions from it.
External (independent)	Evaluation conducted by people and/or departments other than those responsible for designing and implementing the program or project, or from outside of the organization delivering it or the agency funding it.

Methodological design: according to overall approach

Quantitative	Studies that use quantifiable variables, gather quantitative data directly (through observations) or indirectly (through surveys), and perform statistical analyses of these quantitative data (numerically encoded observations, survey responses, etc.)
Qualitative	Studies that use qualitative methods for gathering and analyzing data (participants' observations, ethnographies, interviews, focus groups, etc.)
Mixed (or mixed-methods)	Study that uses both quantitative and qualitative methods

Other	Any other overall approach

Methodological design: according to manipulation of variables

Experimental (quantitative randomized controlled trials)	A study that uses an experimental design actively manipulates the independent variable. In other words, the researcher arbitrarily selects the values of the independent variable (the intervention, for example) and applies them to various groups of subjects to test for a cause-and-effect relationship. Measurements are taken at a minimum of two points in time (before and after the intervention) and in more than one group. Normally, a study with an experimental design has a control group and an experimental group, and the subjects are randomly assigned to one group or the other.
Quasi-experimental (quantitative non-randomized controlled trials)	A study with a quasi-experimental design also attempts to test for a cause-and-effect relationship between an intervention and measurements taken before and after it, but unlike in an experimental design, either there is no control group, or the groups tested are natural, intact or already formed, as opposed to being created randomly.
Other	

Methodological design: according to program participants

Control group	A group of subjects who closely resemble the experimental group with regard to several demographic variables but do not receive the intervention and are thus used for purposes of comparison when the results of the intervention are evaluated.

Methodological design: according to whether measurements were taken repeatedly

Repeated measurements	In a program evaluation with repeated-measurement designs, measurements are taken on the same subjects at two or more points in time.
Post-evaluation	In a program evaluation with a post-evaluation design, measurements are taken at only one point in time, after the program ends or one of its cycles has been completed.

Methodological design: according to number of independent variables

Simple	Only one independent variable
Complex or factorial	More than one independent variable

Methodological design or approach: according to number of dependent variables

Simple	Only one dependent variable
Complex or factorial	More than one dependent variable

Data-collection tools

Surveys	A survey is a method in which quantitative data are collected by means of a set of standardized questions that a sample of individuals are asked in order to determine various facts or their opinions on various matters.
Interviews	An interview is a method of collecting qualitative data that is used in the social sciences to determine and examine an individual's opinions and attitudes about a specific subject through a conversational model.
Focus groups	A focus group is a method of collecting qualitative data that is used in the social sciences to determine and examine the opinions and attitudes of a group of individuals with regard to a specific subject.
Observations	Observations are a data-collection method that can be used in both qualitative and quantitative studies. In qualitative studies, researchers conduct observations to familiarize themselves with a particular group of individuals (such as a religious group, or a professional group, or a sub-culture or a particular community) and their practices. To conduct such observations, the researchers engage with the individuals intensively, in their own cultural environment, generally over a long period. In quantitative studies, researchers conduct observations by using a predesigned observation grid to collect data that will be quantified and analyzed statistically.
Other	

Scope of intervention evaluated

Entire national strategy or plan	Evaluation of all actions taken under a national strategy or plan
Part of a national strategy or plan	Evaluation of some of the actions taken under a national strategy or plan, within a specific sample, sector or geographic area
Individual program or project	Evaluation of an individual prevention action designed to achieve specific objectives with predefined resources and a predefined work plan

Sample

Participants in the experimental group	Number of participants in the group receiving the intervention
Participants in the control group	Number of participants in the control group

Target population

Individuals directly involved	Applies when interventions are directed at specific individuals and, in particular, when the goal is secondary or tertiary prevention, meaning that these individuals are already in the process of radicalization to violence or have already committed acts of violent extremism.
Families	Applies when a service is offered to the families of individuals who are already in the process of radicalization to violence or have already committed acts of violent extremism.
Community	Applies when the intervention involves working at the local level with community members other than families of individuals who are already in the process of radicalization to violence or have already committed of acts of violent extremism (this is the case for most primary-prevention programs).
Societal group	Applies when the intervention involves working with a specific societal group (such as youth, Muslims, or women) but not with society as a whole
Society	Applies when the target of the intervention is the entire society, as in a primary or universal prevention program such as an awareness campaign.
Practitioners	Applies when another goal of the intervention is to work with everybody who has direct contact with the participants
Government	Applies when the intervention involves building prevention capacities within a government agency

Target setting

Community	When the intervention involves working with the individual's broader community (excluding family) on the local level
Security	When the intervention targets law enforcement and the armed forces
Primary and secondary	When the intervention targets students, teachers and administrators in the primary and secondary education sector
Post-secondary education	When the intervention targets students, teachers and administrators in the post-secondary education sector
Justice	All agencies of the justice system (such as juvenile justice and the courts), excluding the correctional system and
Government	All institutions of government, excluding education, health and correctional settings
Cultural	
Correctional	When the intervention targets offenders in prisons, intermediate correctional settings and the probation system
Private sector	When the intervention targets employees of not-for-profit organizations
Health	All physical and mental health institutions
Other	

Type of indicators used or results obtained
(quantitative or qualitative factors or variables that constitute simple, reliable means of measuring and reporting changes related to the intervention)

Direct	Indicators that directly measure radicalization, violent extremism or sympathies for these phenomena
Indirect	Indicators not directly related to radicalization, violent extremism or sympathies for these phenomena—for example, self-esteem, leadership, etc.
Indicators used or results obtained	List of reported indicators

Types of effects

List of positive and negative effects reported	Positive
	Negative
	Other

Limitations

Limitations	
Limitations	Do the authors report the limitations of the study?
Types of limitations reported	List of limitations reported

B4 Tool for appraising methodological quality

In addition to coding the preceding variables, we used the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) (Hong et al., 2018; Hong and Pluye, 2019) to appraise the methodological quality of the evaluation studies included in this systematic review. Unlike other evaluation tools, the MMAT can be used to evaluate all of the different kinds of studies that we included in this review (qualitative, quantitative descriptive, experimental, quasi-experimental and mixed designs). Because we wanted to identify all methodologies that have been used to evaluate PVE programs, we did not use the MMAT as a criterion for including studies in this review. We used it only to determine the quality of the methodologies used in the PVE evaluations that we did include.

The MMAT consists of 25 criteria divided into five groups representing the five types of designs just mentioned. This tool is used to assign each study a quality rating on a scale of 0 to 5. However, for studies that use mixed designs, the criteria associated with each design type must be coded. A study that uses mixed methodologies can thus potentially obtain a score of 0 to 25.

B5 Literature search strategies

The following Table shows the English and French keywords that we used to search the literature.

ANGLAIS	(Extremi* OR Radicali* OR "Violent Extrem*" OR Indoctrinat* OR Terrori* OR "Homegrown Terror*" OR "Homegrown Threat*" OR "Radical Islam*" OR "Islamic Extrem*" OR "Religious Extrem*" OR Fundamentalis* OR Jihad* OR Islam* OR Salaf* OR "Lone wol*" OR "lone-wol*" OR "lone actor*" OR "foreign fight*" OR Returne* OR "White Supremacis*" OR "Neo-Nazi" OR "Right Wing" OR "Right-wing Extrem*" OR "far right" OR Fascis* OR "Left-wing Extrem*" OR "Left Wing" OR Anti-Semitis* OR Antifa* OR Anarch* OR "Eco-terror*" OR "Al Qaida-inspired" OR "ISIS-inspired" OR "Anti-Capitalis*"* OR Incel* OR "Al Qaeda" OR ISIS OR ISIL) AND (Prevent* OR interven* OR respon* OR policy OR policies OR program* OR strategy* OR initiative* OR assess* OR eval* OR procedur* OR effect* OR *success* OR reduc* OR treat* OR counterterror* OR "counter-terror*" OR "de-radicali*" OR deradical* OR disengag* OR detect* OR "countering violent extrem*" OR CVE OR PVE OR Reint* OR Rehabilitat*) NOT (Cancer OR Disease OR hematoma OR "heart disease" OR "heart failure" OR cardiovascular OR "vortex generator*" OR "heat transfer" OR "bone" OR "fracture healing" OR "bone density" OR epilepsy OR "multiple sclerosis" OR Femin*)
FRANÇAIS	(Extremi* OR Radicali* OR "Extrem* Violent" OR Endoctrin* OR Terrori* OR " Terror* Domestique" OR "Islam* Radical" OR "Extrem* Islam*" OR "Extrem* Relig*" OR Fundamentalis* OR djihad * OR Islami* OR Salaf* * OR "Loup* solitaire*" OR "acteur solitaire *" OR (combattant* AND (étranger* OR terroriste*)) OR "Extrême droite" OR Suprémac* OR "Néo-Nazi" OR Néonazi* OR Fachis* OR "Extrem* Gauch" OR Antifa* OR Anti-Semitis* OR Anarch* OR "Eco-terror*" OR Incel* OR "Al Qaeda" OR ISIS OR ISIL) AND (Prevent* OR interven* OR repon* OR politique* OR program* OR stratégie* OR initiative* OR eval* OR procedur* OR effet* OR effect* OR succès OR réussi* OR résultat* OR reduc* OR traitem* OR contreterror* OR "contre-terror*" OR "de-radicali*" OR deradical* OR disengage* OR CVE OR PVE OR Reintegr* OR Rehabilitat* OR reinsert*) NOT (Cancer OR Maladi* OR Hématom* OR "Maladi* cardia*" OR "Insuffisan* cardia*" OR Cardiovasculair* OR "Générat* de tourbillon*" OR "Transfer* de chaleur*" OR Os OR "Consolid* de fractur*" OR "Densit* osseu*" OR Épileps* OR "Scléro*" OR femin*)

Using the above inclusion criteria, exclusion criteria and keywords, we:

- searched the scientific literature
- searched the grey literature
- compared our findings with other frequently cited literature reviews, plus applied a "snowball" search strategy.

In addition, we consulted 14 experts by email to find out whether they knew of any other relevant studies.

a) Scientific literature

For the scientific literature, we had a librarian with expertise in the social sciences and humanities apply our search criteria to the following 21 databases.

ABI/Inform Global	International Political Science Abstracts
Academic Search Complete	Medline
ATLA Religion Database	OpenGrey.eu
Canadian Business et Current Affairs Complete	PAIS Index
Communication Abstracts	Political Science Complete
Canadian Public Policy Collection	ProQuest Dissertations et Theses Global
Canadian Research Index	PsycINFO
Education Source	Sociological Abstracts
ERIC	Sociological Index
Erudit / Persee	Web of Knowledge
FRANCIS	

These 21 databases contained not only published scientific articles and academic theses, but also a large volume of grey literature and conference papers. We also obtained access to the database from two recent systematic reviews by the Canadian Practitioners Network for the Prevention of Radicalization and Extremist Violence (CPN-PREV) (Hassan, Brouillette-Alarie, Ousman, Kilinc et al., 2021; Hassan, Brouillette-Alarie, Ousman, Savard et al., 2021) and merged this database with the 21 others.

b) Grey literature

To reduce "publication bias" (Rothstein et al., 2005) in our strategic review, we used Google to conduct an in-depth search of the grey literature. To identify additional documents, we also manually examined 228 websites of organizations involved in PVE. We selected these organizations from the UNESCO-PREV Chair's map of centres of expertise in PVE (https://chaireunesco-prev.ca/en/networ k/map/). We also added other organizations in the course of this search. Table 32 is a complete list of the selected organizations.

Table 32. Organizations whose websites we searched manually

Academy on Human Rights and Humanitarian Law at American University's Washington College of Law

Afghanistan Justice Organization

AfPak programme Afghanistan/Pakistan (PSF)

Againstviolentextremism.org

Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP

Alliance for Peacebuilding – Monitoring and Evaluation of CVE

Alternative espaces citoyens (AEC - Niger)

Alternative to Violence Project

American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative (ABA ROLI)

Amicale université populaire (Tchad)

Amicus Legal Consultants

AML Solutions International

Amnesty International

Anti-Defamation League

APO.org

Asser Institute

Association burkinabé d'action communautaire (ABAC-ONG - Burkina Faso)

Association des jeunes juristes et sympathisants de Sikasso (AJJSS - Mali)

Association for Progressive Communications

Association jeunesse pour la paix et la non-violence (AJPNV - Tchad)

Association of Francophone Supreme Courts (AHJUCAF)

Association pour l'enseignement coranique et la protection des enfants mouhadjirine (AECPEM - Tchad)

Association pour le dialogue entre les jeunes de diverses religions (ADJR - Tchad)

Association rayons de soleil (Cameroun)

Association tchadienne pour la promotion et la défense des droits de l'homme (ATPDH - Tchad)

Attah Sisters Helping Hand Foundation (ASHH - Nigéria)

Baker & McKenzie

Bangladesh Enterprise Institute (BEI)

Bangladesh Institute of Peace and Security Studies (BIPSS)

Better World Campaign

Bipartisan Policy Center

Blumont.org

Brennan Center for justice

Brookings Institution

Burkina Faso CRADHE

Cadre africain de coopération civilo-militaire (CCCM- Niger)

Care Fronting (Nigéria)

Center for Evidence Based Crime Policy CEBCP

Center for prevention of radicalization leading to violence

Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)

Center on Global Counterterrorism cooperation (CGCC)

Center on International Cooperation at New York University

Centre africain d'Etudes Internationales, Diplomatiques, Economiques et Stratégiques, en abrégé (CEIDES)

Centre for Environment, Human Rights and Development (CEHRD - Nigéria)

Centre for Environmental Education and Development (CEED - Nigéria)

Centre for Peace And Advencement (CEPAN - Nigéria)

Centre for Research and Evidence on Security Threat (CREST)

Centre for the Advocacy of Justice and Rights (CAJR)

Centre pour la Gouvernance Democratique

Century Foundation

Charity & Security Network

Children and Young People Living for Peace (Nigéria)

Christian Foundation for Social Justice and Equity (CFSJE - Nigéria)

Civipol

Cleen Foundation (Nigéria)

Clingendael – Netherlands Institute of International Relations

Club UNESCO de l'Université Abdou Moumouni (CUAM - Nigéria)

CODE PAKISTAN

Collectif des organisations de défense des droits de l'homme et de la démocratie (CODDHD - Niger)

Comité Interministériel de prévention de la délinquance et de la radicalisation (CIPDR)

Commission Européenne

Community Motivation and Development Organization (CMDO)

Community Policing Partners for Justice, Security & Democratic Reform (Nigéria)

Conflict Resolution Trainers Network (CROTINN - Nigéria)

Council of Europe

COWI

Danish Ministry of Defence (Broad Peace and Stabilisation Fund)

Danish security and intelligence service

Defence, Australian Government

Design Monitoring and Evaluation for Peacebuilding

Development Initiative of West Africa (DIWA - Nigéria)

Development, Education and Advocacy Resources for Africa (DEAR Africa - Nigéria)

Djamah-Afrik (Tchad)

Dorwood Consultancy

East Africa Judges' and Magistrates' Association (EAJMA)

Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)

Educateagainsthate.com

Education and Community Development

EducommunicAfrik (Burkina Faso)

Emergency Preparedness and Response Team
(JDPC- Nigéria)

Equal Access International

EU Agency for Fundamental Rights

European Counter-Radicalization and de-radicalization

European Judges Training Network (EJTN)

Exit Sweden

Fantsuam Foundation (Nigéria)

Federation burkinabé des associations, centres et clubs
UNESCO (FBACU- Burkina Faso)

Fondation Hirondelle (Niger et Mali)

Ford Foundation

Fourth Freedom Forum

French Ministry of Interior Publications Database

Friedrich Naumann Foundation (South Asia)

Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP)

Georgetown University Center for Security Studies

German National Center for Crime Prevention

Global Center on Cooperative Security GCCS

Global Community Engagement and Resilience Fund
(GCERF)

Global Counter Terrorism Forum (GCTF)

Global Counter Terrorism Forum Violent Extremism
(Hedayah)

Global Initiative against Transnational Organized Crime

Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict

Graduate Institute of International and Development
Studies

GW Program on Extremism

Henry L. Stimson Center

Hope for the Needy Association (HOFNA - Cameroun)

Horn of Africa (HoA) programme (PSF)

Human Rights First

Human Rights Institute at Columbia University Law School

Human security collective

ICF

IDP Goods (Cameroun)

Impact Europe

Inganta Rayuwa Peace Network (Nigéria)

Insan Foundation

Institut national de la statistique et des études
économiques (INSEE)

Institut of Security Studies

Institute for Inclusive Security

Institute for Justice and Reconciliation

Institute for Social Policy and Understanding

Institute for strategic dialogue (ISD)

Integrity research and consultancy

Integrityglobal.com

Interfaith Council of Muslim and Christian Women's
Associations (Nigéria)

Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD)

International Association of Chiefs of Police (IACP)

International Centre for Counter-Terrorism – The Hague
(ICCT)

International Centre for Peace, Charities and Human
Development (INTERCEP - Nigéria)

International Centre for the study of Radicalisation (ICSR)

International Centre of Excellence for Countering Violent
Extremism

International Crisis Group

International Institute for Justice and the Rule of Law (IIJ)

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

International Organization for Judicial Training (IOJT)

International Peace Institute (IPI)

International Republican Institute (IRI -Niger, Mali)

Interpol

Islamabad Policy Research Institute

Islamic Counselling Initiatives of Nigeria (ICIN - Nigéria)

Istituto Affari Internazionali

Kecosce

Kingsfaith Development and Youth Empowerment Initiative
(Nigéria)

Knowledge Platform Security& Rule of Law

Leadership Initiative for Transformation and Empowerment
(LITE- Africa - Nigéria)

Leiden university

Media Women for Peace (Cameroun)

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark

Moonshot

Mouvement des jeunes pour le développement et
l'éducation citoyenne (MOJEDEC - Niger)

Nahdatul Ulama (NU)

National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and
Responses to Terrorism (START)

National Counterterrorism Center

National Endowment for Democracy

NATO Science for Peace and Security Program

Neem Foundation (Nigéria)

New Era Educational and Charitable Support Foundation
(Nigéria)

North East Youth Initiative for Development (Nigéria)

Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Observer Research Foundation (ORF)

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner on Human Rights (OHCHR)

ONG Adkoul (Niger)

ONG Jeunesse-enfance-migration-développement (JMED - Niger)

Open Society Foundation

Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)

Organisation pour la réflexion, la formation et l'éducation à la démocratie et au développement (ORFED - Mali)

OXFAM

PAIMAN Alumni Trust

Pak Institute for Peace Studies Pvt Ltd. (PIPS)

Peace and Stabilisation Fund (Danemark)

Peace Empowerment Foundation (Nigéria)

Peace Initiative Network (PIN) (Nigéria)

Prevention of and Fight against crime programme of the European union European commission

RAND Corporation

Regional Center for Strategic Studies

Réseau de Réflexion Stratégique sur la Sécurité au Sahel

Réseau panafricain pour la paix, la démocratie et le développment (REPPADD)

Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP)

Royal United Services Institute (RUSI)

SaferWorld

Salesforce

Search for common Ground

South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI)

Stop-djihadisme (France)

Stoppingviolentextremism.org

Strong Cities Network (SCN)

Tabara Youth Transformation Initiative (TYTI- Nigéria)

Taimako Community Development Initiative (Nigéria)

Tech Against Terror

The Campbell Collaboration

The Global Observatory

The John Sloan Dickey Center of International Understanding – Dartmouth University

The Prevention Project

The Unity Initiative (TUI)

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

UiO C-REX - Center for Research on Extremism

UK College of Policing

UK Home Office Research Database

UK Ministry of Defence

UN Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force (CTITF)

UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

UN Office of the Special Adviser on Africa

UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

UN Security Council Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive Directorate (CTED)

UN Women

UNESCO

Union Européenne

United Nations

United Nations Association – UK

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

United Nations Foundation

United Nations Office for Drugs and Crime's Terrorism Prevention Branch (UNODC)

United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO), Niger et projet régional

United States Institute of Peace (USIP)

University Of Cambridge (institute of criminology)

US Department of Homeland Security

US National Criminal Justice Reference Service

Violence Prevention Network (Germany)

West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)

Women Against Violent Extremism (WAVE - Nigéria)

Women and Girl Child Rescue and Development Initiative (Nigéria)

Women in International Security (WIIS)

World Affairs Council

World Bank

World Organization for Resource Development and Education (WORDE)

Youth Initiative Against Violence and Human Rights Abuse (YIAVHA - Nigéria)

Youth Justice Board

Youth Progressive Association in Taraba (TYPA - Nigéria)

Youths for Peace Building and Development in Africa (YOUPEDA - Nigéria)

c) Other frequently cited literature reviews

In addition to identifying documents by searching the scientific and grey literature as just described, we compared our findings with other frequently cited literature reviews (see Table 33).

Table 33. Systematic reviews and inventories of the literature on evaluating programs for preventing violent extremism

Literature review	Studies included	Studies excluded			
		CT*	NPD*	NE*	M*
Bellasio et al., 2018	28/48	7	3	2	8
Carthy et al., 2020	0/14	14			
Feddes et Gallucci, 2015	11/55	6	19	2	17
Gielen, 2017	25/73	4	38	3	3
Hassan, Brouillette-Alarie, Ousman, Kilinc et al., 2021 ; Hassan, Brouillette-Alarie, Ousman, Savard et al., 2021	44/48	2	1		1
Madriaza et al., 2017 ; Madriaza et Ponsot, 2015	12/23	6	3		2
Mastroe et Szmania, 2016	16/43	7	14	1	5
Pistone et al., 2019	17/38	5	12	2	2
Pratchett et al., 2010	1/18	4	6		7
Taylor et Soni, 2017	1/7	5		1	

CT: Studies classified as dealing with counterterrorism measures, not directly related to prevention or not dealing with any specific program
NPD: Studies with no primary data or with anecdotal data
NE: Non-evaluation studies
M: Publications inaccessible or merged with other publications that used the same sample and analysis

Every study that we thus found, that had been published in one of our three included languages, and that we had not previously identified, we added to our database. In addition to these reviews, we applied a snowball strategy using the bibliographies of the included studies.

d) Communications with experts

We also consulted 14 experts by email to find out whether they knew of any other relevant studies.

B6　PROCEDURE

Before starting this systematic review, we trained the five research assistants who were working with us, to clarify the concepts and work methodology. To search the scientific literature, we then used two bibliographic databases. One of them came from a similar systematic review done recently by the CPN-PREV team (Hassan, Brouillette-Alarie, Ousman, Kilinc et al., 2021; Hassan, Brouillette-Alarie, Ousman, Savard et al., 2021), with which our review had certain keywords in common. This database covered all existing publications to January 2018. Our librarian searched this database using the criteria previously mentioned and compiled a selection of scientific documents from it. Meanwhile, the research assistants reviewed the grey literature on the websites of the organizations mentioned above. Once collection of data from the grey literature had been completed, the databases were merged and any duplicates were eliminated. Also, the 14 experts were contacted during this period.

To eliminate any ineligible studies, the principal investigator and the research assistants screened the titles and abstracts of all of the documents identified in the above searches. During this first phase, to ensure consistency, all team members coded the first 700 documents, analyzing and resolving any disagreements about how to code them. This phase also served as training for the team. Next, two coders reviewed each document. To ensure that there was sufficient agreement between the two coders, a Cohen's kappa coefficient was calculated. During this initial coding, we worked iteratively: each pair of coders worked on a limited number of items. Then Cohen's kappa was calculated. If its value fell below the minimum acceptable threshold of 0.6, the two coders reviewed their points of disagreement; if it was 0.6 or higher, they continued coding the next set of documents. The final kappa was 0.86.

The total number of publications selected was 211, but some publications discussed more than one study, so the total number of studies included in our systematic review was 219. (We regarded a publication as discussing more than one study if it discussed more than one sample that had been analyzed independently.)

We used the PRISMA model (http://www.prisma-statement.org) to record the results of our searches in the flow chart shown in Figure 1.