Preventing Skin Cancer: Primary and Middle School-Based Interventions

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Kimlin & Parisi 2001 Title: Usage of real- time ultraviolet radiation data to modify the daily erythemal exposure of primary schoolchildren; Study Design: Greatest (Group RCT) Quality of Execution: Fair Location: Australia, south east Queensland	Target population: 8- year-old school children; Setting (School level): Primary school; Demographics: Gender: NR Age: 8 yrs. Grade: NR Skin type: NR Race/Ethnicity: NR SES: NR	Intervention: UVGUIDE software (provision of information) Intervention implementation period: 3 days (Feb. 28- March, 1) Intervention components: Educational: Provided with education program (computer software- online current UV data and were able to use data to see UV exposure distribution on face) Intervention for Control group: No intervention Setting: At school Intensity: One class/ day for 15 minutes before the recess and PE class x 3 days; Parental involvement: No	Follow-up period: Baseline: Immediately before; FU: After the intervention; Outcomes of Interest <u>Protective behaviors:</u> (observed by teachers) 1.Use of sunscreen 2.Use of hat (Broad brimmed) <u>UV exposure</u> (observed)- Minimal Erythemal Dose by polysulphone badges worn on the left shoulder	Population size(n): I = class of 25 students; C = group of 23 studentsProtective behaviors: (proportion of children)1.Use of sunscreen: Post: Intervention = 90% Control= 40%Absolute pct pt change: 50.0% , 95% CI: (26.8, 73.2)2.Use of hat (Broad brimmed) Post: Intervention = 100% Control= 95%Absolute pct pt change: $5.0, 95\%$ CI(- $3.9, 13.2$)UV exposure (Minimal Erythemal Dose (MED) measured by polysulphone badges worn on the left shoulder)Intervention Intervention ControlL1: Duble: 1.0±0.021.4±0.03 FU1: 1.4±0.03 FU1: 1.4±0.05L1: P<0.05 (FU1: Feb.28; FU2: March1)

Summary Evidence Table for Updated Search Period (June 2000 - May 2011)

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Geller et al., 2002 Title: The Environmental Protection Agency's National SunWise School Program: Sun protection education in US schools (1999- 2000); Study Design: Greatest (Group NRT) Quality of Execution: Fair Location: USA (across the nation)	Target population: K-8 grade students; Setting (School level): Primary and secondary schools; Demographics: Gender: NR Age: median age, 10 years (range 5- 10 years) Grade: K-8 Skin type: NR Race/Ethnicity: NR SES: NR	Intervention: SunWise School Program- National program; Intervention period: September 1999 - June 2000 Intervention components: Educational: Group level EPA's Sunwise School Program for sunsafety included classroom lessons on sun protection education and UV environment/ reporting. Guidelines for policy changes and sunwise toolkit provided to the schools; Intervention for Control group: No intervention Setting: At school by teachers Intensity: ToolKit: 1- to 2-hour core sun safety unit. Classroom lessons: 1 hour core class; Parental involvement: No	Follow-up period: BL: September 1999 FU: Spring of 2000(6-7 months) Outcomes of Interest Protective behaviors: 1. Use of sunscreen 2.Use of Hat 3. Use of clothing (Wear long-sleeved shirt) 4. Use of sunglasses	Population size(n):I: Pre: 1894; Post: 1815C: Pre: 1285; Post: 1001Protective behaviors: (Proportion of children)1.Use of sunscreen: Intervention ControlBL: 29% 22.6%FU: 27.6% 21.3%Absolute pct pt change: -0.1 , 95% CI(-3.4, 3.2)2.Use of Hat Intervention ControlBL: 16.8% 14.8%FU: 19.0% 15.0%Absolute pct pt change: 2.0, 95% CI(-0.9, 4.9)3.Use of clothing (Wear long-sleeved shirt) Intervention ControlBL: 20.4% 20.1%FU: 25.6% 14.7%Absolute pct pt change: 10.6, 95% CI: (7.6, 13.6)4. Use of sunglasses: Intervention ControlBL: 23.8% 19.3%FU: 25.7% 18.5%Absolute pct pt change: 2.7, 95% CI: (-0.4, 5.8)

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Stankeviciute et al., 2004 Title:Skin cancer prevention:	Target population: 5 th -6 th grade students (ages 10-13 yrs.); Setting (School	Intervention: "Let's know the sun better"- a group level school educational program/ intervention;	Follow-up period: Baseline: May,2002 FU: September, 2002; Outcomes of Interest	Population size(n): I:106; C:107 Protective behaviors: (proportion of children) 1. Use of sunscreen:
children's health education on protection from sun exposure and assessment of its efficiency Study Design: Greatest (Group RCT) Quality of Execution: Fair Location: Lithuania	level): Secondary schools; Demographics: Gender: 53% boys Age: 10–13-year- old Grade:5 th grade Skin type:NR Race/Ethnicity: NR SES: NR	Intervention implementation period: 4 weeks(before summer break) Intervention components: Educational: Exercise text books and recommendation for teachers; physical training lessons and practical skills what children learnt theoretically; Intervention for Control group: No intervention Setting: At school by teachers Intensity: 4 weeks - Total 5 classes (theoretical part: 3 classes; interactive activities: 2 classes);	Protective behaviors:1.Use of sunscreen:a)Use of sunscreen morefrequently and correctly(0.5 hours before goingoutside and every 2hours when beingoutside for longer hours)2.Use of hat (ant type –Baseball+ Wide brimmedsunbonnet)3. Use of clothing (closed neck and longsleeved shirt)4. Use of sunglasses5. Use of shade (whilebeing outdoors duringsunny days)Risky behaviors:1.Time spent outdoors(During the period of	 a) Use of sunscreen (constantly) Intervention: 34.6% Control: 30.8% Absolute percentage point change: 3.8, 95% CI (-8.8, 16.4) 2. Use of hat: (any type of hat) Intervention: 45.2% Control: 35.3% Absolute percentage point change: 9.9, 95% CI (-3.2, 2.3) 3. Use of clothing Intervention: 21.0% Control: 7.5% Absolute percentage point change: 13.5, 95% CI (5.0, 22.0) 4. Use of sunglasses Intervention; 61.9% Control: 44.3% Absolute percentage point change: 17.6, 95% CI (6.2, 29.0) 5. Use of shade Intervention: 26.7% Control: 13.2% Absolute percentage point change: 13.5, 95% CI (2.9, 24.1) Risky behaviors:
		Parental involvement: No	highest sun intensity)	1.Time spent outdoors (During the period of highest sun intensity) Intervention: 41.0% Control: 55.7% Absolute percentage point change: -14.7, 95% CI: (-26.2, -3.2)

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Lee et al., 2005 Title: Site-specific protective effect of broad-spectrum sunscreen on nevus development among white schoolchildren in a randomized trial Study Design: Greatest (RCT) Ouality of Execution: Fair Location: Canada, Vancouver, British Columbia	Target population: First(6-7yrs.) and fourth grade (9-10 yrs.) students and their parents; Setting (School level): Elementary schools and home; Demographics: Gender: NR Age: 6-7 years and 9-10 years old Grade: First and fourth Phenotype characteristics: Skin type: Dark (n= 48); Medium (n=47); Light (50) Hair color Dark brown (n= 46); Light brown (n=41); Red (n=10); Blonde (n=48) Freckles on face: Few or none (n=52); Moderate (n=36); Dense (n= 57) Race/Ethnicity: NR SES: NR	Intervention: Sunscreen distribution (a family level intervention) Intervention period: June 1993 to May 1996 Intervention components: Environmental: Parents of the children received two bottles of SPF-30 broad-spectrum sunscreen annually (one near the end of each school year in June 1993, 1994, and 1995 and second at the end of July each year.) with instructions to use it on all sun-exposed sites whenever the enrolled child was expected to be in the sun for 30 minutes or more; Intervention Setting: school and home Parental involvement: Yes	Follow-up period: BL: 1993 FU: 3 years after the intervention(Twice a year questionniare to parents; May 1996) Outcomes of Interest <u>New nevi count:</u> (Whole- body nevus counts from 1993 were subtracted from 1996 counts for each child, giving the number of new nevi) 1.New nevi (all sizes) 2. New nevi (nevi >2 mm in diameter) 3. New nevi (all sizes) for students with more than 10% facial freckling	Population size(n): I = 145; C=164 <u>New nevi count:</u> (mean number of nevi on whole body) 1.New nevi (all sizes) Intervention: 28.8 Control: 34.5 Relative mean change: -16.52 2. New nevi (nevi >2 mm in diameter) Intervention: 2.2 Control: 4.9 Relative mean change: -55.10 3. New nevi (all sizes) for students with more than 10% facial freckling Intervention: 27.1 Control: 35.8 Relative mean change: -24.30

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Manganoni et al., 2005 Title: Study of sunbathing in children: The preliminary evaluation of a prevention program Study Design: Greatest (NRT) Quality of Execution: Fair Location: North Italy (3 towns- Brescia, Bergamo, Trento)	Target population: Children (aged 8-9) from Italian schools and their parents; Setting (School level): Primary schools; Demographics: Gender: NR Age: 8-9 years Grade: NR Skin type: Light (33.4%); Medium (52.8%); Olive (4.7%); Dark (6.1%); Other (1%) Race/Ethnicity: White (74.5%); Yellow (0.8%); Black (0.8%), Not known (23.8%) SES: NR	Intervention: Sun safety educational program Intervention implementation period: 2001-02 (before summer break) Intervention components: Educational:_Tech CD- ROM and video in form of fairy tale; Booklet: For children and parents (same messages as on video); Intervention for Control group: No intervention Setting: At school, teacher presented in presence of dermatologist (e.g., protective habits, consequences of sunbathing during peak hrs.); Parental involvement: Yes	Follow-up period: BL: Before summer FU: After summer Outcomes of Interest Protective behaviors: 1.Use of sunscreen 2.Use of clothing/hat 3. Use of sunglasses 4.Overall sun protection Risky behaviors: 1.Number of excessive sun exposure during past year 2. Use of sun lamps during past year	Population size(n): $I = 1309$; $C = 636$ Intervention group (no data for controlgroup)Protective behaviors: (% of children)1.Use of sunscreen:Pre = 93.1%Post= 94.5%Absolute pct pt change: 1.4, 95% CI (0.9, -0.4)2.Use of clothing/hatPre = 77.6%Post= 75.8%Absolute pct pt change: 1.8, 95% CI (-1.4,5.0)3. Use of sunglassesPre = 23.3%Post= 29.9%Absolute pct pt change: 6.6, 95% CI (1.7,3.2)(No response for almost 50% of the cases)4.Overall sun protectionPre= 92.1%Post= 94.0%Absolute pct pt change: 1.9, 95% CI (0,3.8) Risky Behaviors: (% of children)1.Number of excessive sun exposure duringpast yearPre = 16.9%Post= 13.8%Absolute pct pt change: -3.1, 95% CI (-5.9,-0.3)2. Use of sun lamps during past yearPre= 0.7%Post= 0.4%Absolute pct pt change: 0.3, CI (-0.3, 0.9)

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Milne et al., 2006 (related studies Milne, 2001; Giles- Corti, 2004; English, 2005; English, 2005) Title: The impact of the kidskin sun protection	Target population: 5-6 yrs. old student; Setting (School level): School (elementary) and home; Demographics:	Intervention: KidSkin Intervention implementation period: 4 years (1995– 1998); Intervention components: Educational: Moderate: Specially	Follow-up period: BL: 1995 (late winter) FU1: 1997 (February) FU2: 1999 (February) FU3: 2001 (February); Outcomes of Interest Protective behaviors: in moderate and high	Population size(n): BL(1995): 1465 FU (1997):1223 Protective behaviors: (% of children) 1.Use of sunscreen Moderate High Control BL: 20.0% 16.0% 25.0% FU: 20.0% 23.0 % 22.0% ES(Absolute pct pt change) 1000000000000000000000000000000000000
intervention on summer suntan and reported sun exposure: Was it sustained? Study Design: Group non- randomized	Gender: 65% males Age 5-6 years Grade: NR Parents had tertiary education (67%) Skin type:NR Children with tendency to burn	designed sun protection curriculum (age specific both at school and home-based activities), students were encouraged to stay indoors during peak hrs. and protect themselves when outdoors, written	intervention groups 1.Use of sunscreen (Sunscreen use all the time while outside) 2.Use of hat 3.Use of shade	3.0% 10.0% 2.Use of hat Moderate High Control BL: 17.5% 15.0% 22.0% FU: 16.0% 18.2 % 21.3% ES(Absolute pct pt change) -0.8% 3.9%
trial/greatest Quality of Execution: Fair Location: Perth, Western Australia	(63%) Race/Ethnicity: Southern European grandparents (65%) SES: NR	guidelines for schools to improve SP at schools High: same as above plus program materials from ' Totally Cool Summer Club' sent home during summer break Environmental:	 4. Use of protective clothing (swimwear, and covered back) 5.Use of shade <u>UV exposure:</u> 	3. Use of protective clothing: (covered back) Moderate High Control BL: 52.5% 53.0% 61.2% FU: 72.0% 85.2 % 67.0% ES(Absolute pct pt change) 13.7% 26.4%
		Increased shade provision in playground High: children were offered low-cost swimwear covering trunk, upper arms, and thighs to reduce exposure to nearly zero. <u>Policy:</u> Education and	 Suntan on the back and forearm Mean proportion of ambient exposure <u>New nevi formation:</u> (mean number of nevi formation on back, face, 	(Protective swimwear) Moderate High Control BL: 63.4% 65.0% 58.2% FU: 67.5% 70.6 % 62.0% ES(Absolute pct pt change) 3.7% 5.2% 4.Use of shade Moderate High Control
		Health Departments of Western Australia	and arms)	BL:27.0%29.8%32.5%FU:37.5%44.0%32.5%

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
		developed guidelines- introduction of gold		ES(Absolute pct pt change) 10.0% 9.2%
		standard' No Hat, no		
		Play' policy whereby		UV exposure:
		children were required to		1. Suntan on the back and forearm (Mean
		wear broad brimmed		melanin density)
		hats, also encourage		(Back)
		schools to use available		Moderate High ES
		shade. SunSmart Awards		I: 3.6 3.6 (No significant change)
		were offered annually as		C: 3.7 3.7
		an incentive to adopt SunSmart guidelines		(Forearm)
		Moderate: Schools		Moderate High ES
		receive guidelines on		1: 3.9 4.0 (No significant change)
		how to improve sun		C: 3.9 3.9
		protection at school.		0. 0.7 0.7
		High: also assist high		2.Mean proportion of ambient
		intervention schools in		exposure(MED) by study group for whole
		implementing the		school
		guidelines on sun		Intervention Control ES(Relative
		protection at school;		mean change)
				Moderate 21.0% 24.0% 4.7%
		Intervention for		High 22.0% 24.0% -16.7%
		Control group:		
		Standard health		New nevi formation: (mean number of
		education curriculum		nevi formation)
				(Back)
		Setting: At school by		Moderate High Control
		teachers		BL: 3.0 3.3 3.5 FU: 8.2 8.6 10.1
		Intensity:		ES(Relative mean change)
		Moderate/high:		-5.28 -9.69
		Delivered in 4-6 40		(Face and Arms)
		minutes sessions during		Moderate High Control
		spring of each year over		BL: 15.3 14.2 14.7
		4 consecutive years;		FU: 23.8 22.5 25.2
		, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		ES(Relative mean change)
		Parental involvement:		-9.26 -7.57
		Yes		

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Buller et al., 2006 (related study Reynolds, 2006- Mediation of a middle school skin cancer prevention program) Title: Effects of the Sunny Days, Healthy Ways curriculum on students in grades 6 to 8 Study Design: Greatest (Group- randomized trial) Quality of Execution: Fair Location: USA/ Colorado, New Mexico, and Arizona	Target population: 6-8 graders; Setting (School level): Middle schools; Demographics: Gender: males: 41.8% Age: (%) 11= 4.1 ; 12=25.3; 13=50.7; 14=22.4; 15=0.4 Grade: NR Skin type: NR Race/Ethnicity: Race: White: 78.6%; Black: 6.5% Asian: 5%; Other: 3.1% Hispanic Ethnicity: Hispanic= 25.4; Non- hispanic= 75.8 SES: NR	Intervention: Sunny Days Healthy Ways (SDHW); Intervention implementation period: Mid March (2001) –end of April (6 weeks); Intervention components: Educational: Curriculum: lessons aim at increasing perceived personal risk for skin damage and skin cancer, positive expectation about sun protection in a variety of situations. Interactive activities to help children to set goals, monitor progress, and overcome barriers; Intervention for Control group: No intervention Setting: At school by teachers of health education and science during classes; Intensity: 6, 50 minutes lessons (in 15- 30 minutes segments	Follow-up period: BL:_2001-02 and 02-03 (February-March) FU: Same year in May (End of school year) (Data were collected in Colorado and some of New Maxico in 2001-02 school year; whereas in rest of the NM and Arizona in 2002-03) Outcomes of Interest Protective behaviors: (Proportion of children using protective behaviors for the time they were outside while at school yesterday during lunch, PE, and recess) 1.Use of sunscreen (for all times) 2.Use of clothing: (during lunch, PE, and recess) -Long sleeve shirt -Long pants 3.Use of hat (during lunch) 4.Use of shade (during	Population size (n):BL: I = 1019; C=1019FU: I=884; C=885Protective behaviors:1. Use of sunscreen:(for all times)PrePostI: 77.1%80.4%C: 78.6%73.4%Absolute pct pt change:8.5%;CI(4.6, 12.4)2.Use of clothing:(during lunch, PE, andrecess)Long sleeve shirt (at lunch)PrePostI: 48.7%22.9%C: 51.4%21.2%Absolute pct pt change:4.4%;CI(-0.1, 8.9)Long sleeve shirt (at PE)PrePostAbsolute pct pt change:4.4%;CI(-0.1, 8.9)Long sleeve shirt (at PE)PrePostAbsolute pct pt change:2%,CI(-2.2, 1.8)Long sleeve shirt (at recess)PrePostAbsolute pct pt change: -0.2%,CI(-2.2, 1.8)Long sleeve shirt (at recess)PrePostAbsolute pct pt change:1: 50.5%29.8%C: 57.0%22.8%Absolute pct pt change:1: 50.5%29.8%C: 57.0%22.8%Absolute pct pt change:1: 83.6%46.8%C: 86.2%51.5%Absolute pct pt change: -2.1%,CI(-5.4,1.2)Long pants (at recess)
		over several classes);	lunch, PE, and recess)	Pre Post Absolute percentage point change

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
	-		(Sunburn in the past month)	Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)I: 79.1% 50.2% C: 85.3% 54.1% Absolute pct pt change: 2.3%, CI (-1.0, 5.6)3.Use of hat (during lunch) PrePrePostI: 3.7% 2.3% C: 1.3% 1.4% Absolute pct pt change: -1.5 ,CI(-2.4, -0.6)4.Use of shade (during lunch) Pre(during lunch) PrePost I: 40.3%Absolute pct pt change: 13.0 ,CI: (9.8,16.2)(during PE) PrePost I: 38.1%S0.8% C: 35.0%Absolute pct pt change: 15.2, CI(12.6, 17.8) (during recess) PrePost I: 56.3%
				C: 67.0% 59.1% Absolute pct pt change: 7.2, CI: (3.9, 10.5) Incidence of sunburn (Sunburn in the
				Pre Post 1: 15.1% 25.8% C:14.5% 28.3% Absolute pct pt change: -3.1, CI(-6.0, -0.2)

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Buller et al., 2006 Title: Evaluation of the Sunny Days, Healthy Ways sun safety curriculum for children in kindergarten through fifth grade Study Design: Greatest (Group- randomized trial) Quality of Execution: Fair Location: USA (Arizona)	Target population: K-5 graders; Setting (School level): Elementary schools; Demographics: Gender: 48% males Age: NR Grade: K -5 th grade Skin type: Skin sensitivity (mean) = 0.163 Race/Ethnicity: 75% Caucasian SES: NR	Intervention: Extended version of Sunny Days Healthy Ways Intervention implementation period: First exposure: Spring 1996 Second exposure : Spring 1997 (in late February for 6 weeks); Intervention components: Educational: Arm A: Repeated instruction (4 schools out of 6 schools that had been enrolled) Arm B: (Single instruction) 4 units (Living with sunshine and SP behaviors) were incorporated in other subjects (health, science, reading, math, geography, PE, art, computers and writing); Intervention Setting: At school by teachers Intensity: Arm B (single instruction):	Follow-up period:BL: 1996 February, priorto implementation of theSDHW (both groups)FU:Arm B: April and May,1997Arm A: Both in 1997 and1998 after eachinstructionOutcomes of InterestProtective behaviors:(Overall protectivebehaviors by limiting sunexposure during peakhours, seek shaded area,protective clothing, andsunscreen)UV exposure:(skin tonemeasure by usingchroma meter)	Population size(n):Intervention (n):Group A (repeat) : 208Group B (single): 227Control: 207Protective behaviors:Child solar protection (Mean Pretest and Posttest Scale Scores)Group A (repeated instruction) Year 1 Year 2 Pre/post Pre/postGrades 2-3 2.09/2.17 2.19/2.27Grades 4-5 2.05/2.05 2.02/2.05Repeat-instruction vs. single exposure:t = 2.22, p=0.026(Children in grades 2-5, repeat exposure to SDHW improved children's SR solar protection over a single exposure)Grade 2-3 2.09/2.08 1.99/1.96Grade 4-5 2.00/2.01 1.95/1.89Single exposure vs. no exposure: t=1.52, p=0.129(Grade K-1- No significant differences were found between the two experimental groups in gradeK-1 on changes in skin tone indicative of less sun exposure; students in grade 2-5 showed no improvement in SR solar protection in either grade.)
		4 one hour class periods		

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
		Arm A (repeat instruction): Same above + grade 1,3, and 5 received three 2 hr. booster units; Parental involvement: Yes		UV exposure: Single exposure: Grades K-1: No significant differences Grades 2-5: Minimal change Repeated exposure: Grades K-1: No change Grades 2-5: repeated instruction displayed lighter skin tones, indicating lower exposure toUVR, than children receiving only one (non-significant)
Author, Year: Buller et al., 2008 Title: Randomized trial evaluating computer-based sun safety education for children in elementary school Study Design: Group RCT/ Greatest Quality of Execution: Fair Location: USA (Western United States)	Target population: Children (5-13 years) from K-5 grade; Setting (School level): Public elementary schools; Demographics: Gender: 48.6% female Age: Students: 20.1% age 6 or younger; 46.7% ages 7–9; 31.6% age 10 or older;	Intervention: Tailored computerized programs with age appropriate sun safety education for children in primary schools Intervention implementation period: Over a 4-week period (29 days on average) during March through May (except at 1 year round school that implemented between May and June) following the pretest Intervention components: Educational: 3Arms:	Follow-up period: BL: March to May 2002 FU: May and June of 2002; Outcomes of Interest Protective behaviors: 1. Overall protective behaviors : (Composite scores from the self- reported sun protection behavior items (converted to z scores)	Population size(n):Computer program: 325Teacher led presentation: 387Both: 320Protective behaviors:1.Overall protective behaviors (Compositemean scores- lower score meant better sunprotection)CD-ROM only group (Intervention 1)Grades K-1 (range: 1-15)BL: 10.42FU: 9.52Mean change= -0.90Grades 2-3 (range: 1-15)BL: 10.35FU: 10.08Mean change= -0.27Grades 4-5 (range: 1-18)BL: 12.73FU: 12.61
	Grades: 31.5% grades K–1;	1. SDHW interactive Computer Program (CD- ROM only) on hazards of		Mean change= -0.12 <u>Teacher led presentation (Intervention 2)</u>

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
	32.6% grades 2–3,	sun exposure and sun		Grades K-1 (range: 1-15)
	35.8% grades 4–5	safety measures		BL: 10.66 FU: 10.14
	-	2. Teacher led:		Mean change= -0.52
	Race/Ethnicity:	presentation using		
	52.6% White	similar lesson plans,		Grades 2-3 (range: 1-15)
	(32.6% Hispanic),	grade level activities and		BL:10.09 FU: 9.78
	9.2% African	worksheets.		Mean change= -0.31
	American,	3.Combination of both.		
	and 3.4% Asian			Grades 4-5 (range: 1-18)
		Intervention for		BL: 12.26 FU: 11.94
	Skin Type:	Control group: NA		Mean change= -0.32
	21.6% Type 1	Contrary Attractions have		
	(fair—at highest	Setting: At school by		Both (Intervention 3)
	risk), 30.4% Type 2;	teachers and project staff trained teachers;		Grades K-1 (range: 1-15)
	35.5% Type 3;	stall trained teachers,		BL: 10.44 FU: 8.97
	10.1% Type 4	Intensity: Teacher led		Mean change= -1.5
	(dark)	presentation session:		
	2.4% unknown	each one hour;		Grades 2-3 (range: 1-15)
		Computer program:		BL: 10.18 FU: 9.76
		Total 41.8 total hr		Mean change= -0.42
				Grades 4-5 (range: 1-18)
		Parental involvement:		BL: 12.37 FU: 12.41
		Yes		Mean change= -0.04
Author, Year: Naldi	Target	Intervention: "SoleSi	Follow-up period:	Population size(n):
et al., 2008	population:	SoleNo-GISED project"	BL: 2001–2003(51	I: BL= 5676; FU= 4430
0.000	Students (grade 2-		schools)	C: BL= 5554; FU=4181
Title: Improving	3) and their	Intervention	FU (14–16 months	
sun-protection	parents;	implementation	from baseline): 2002-	Protective behaviors: (% used)
behavior among		period: 3 month period	2004 (71 schools);	
children: results of a	Setting (School	Intervention		1.Sunscreen use :
cluster-randomized	level):	components:		BL FU
trial in Italian	Italian primary	Educational:	Outcomes of Interest	I: 71.5% 74.1%
elementary schools.	schools;	Included distribution of		C: 70.7% 72.4%
The "SoleSi SoleNo-		educational booklets to	Protective behaviors:	Absolute pct pt change: 0.9, CI(-1.0, 2.8)
GISED" Project	Demographics:	parents and their	1. Sunscreen use (Did	
Church Da 1	Gender: 50.34%	children and the	your child regularly use	2. Use of hat :
Study Design:	boys	application of a short	sunscreens while in the	BL FU
Cluster-randomized	Age: mean age = 8	curriculum at school		

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
trial/ Greatest Quality of Execution: Fair Location: Italy	years (SD 0.7) Grade: 2 and 3 Phenotype: 44% of the total baseline sample underwent assessment of phenotype and upper limb nevus count at baseline. <u>Eye color:</u> Black/dark brown (48.5) Light brown/brown green (27.7) Gray/green/hazel (16.3) <u>Hair color:</u> Black/dark brown (43.9) Brown (35.0) Red/blond(13.5) <u>Skin color</u> Light (61.3); Dark (30.9) <u>Freckles</u> <u>on the face</u> Yes (6.6); No (85.3) <u>Number of</u> <u>melanocytic nevi on</u> <u>upper limbs</u> <5 (48.4%) 6–10 (27.6%) 11–15 (13.6%) 16–20 (5.3%) >20 (5.0%) Race/Ethnicity: NR SES: NR	<pre>(policy), based on a resource developed for health teachers; Intervention for Control group: No intervention Setting: At school by trained teachers Intensity: Median time spent by teachers on the educational intervention at school was 6 hours (range 4–19 hours); Parental involvement: Yes</pre>	sun last year?) 2. Use of hat (Did your child usually wear a hat while in the sun last year?) 3. Use of long sleeved shirt (Did your child usually wear a long- sleeved shirt while in the sun last year?) <u>Risky Behaviors:</u> 1. Intense sun exposure (Did your child experience intense sun exposure last year?) <u>Sunburn Incidence:</u> 1. Sunburn episodes (Did your child experience sunburn episodes last year? Yes; No is used as reference) 2.Number of sunburn episodes (Could you specify the number of sunburn episodes experienced by your child during the last year? 1-2; 0 is used as reference)	I: 38.0% 34.4% C: 37.5% 33.6% Absolute pct pt change: 0.3, CI(-1.7, 2.3) 3. Use of long sleeved shirt: BL FU I: 19.8% 20.3% C: 19.6% 18.6% Absolut pct pt change: 1.5,CI(-0.2,3.2) Risky Behaviors: 1. Intense sun exposure (Did your child experience intense sun exposure last year?) BL FU I: 79.0% 80.4% C: 78.4% 78.9% Absolute pct pt change: 0.9, CI(-0.8, 2.6) Sunburn Incidence: 1. Sunburn episodes BL FU I: 13.8% 13.1% C: 13.8% 13.5% Absolute pct pt change: -0.4, CI(-1.8, 1.0) 2.Number of sunburn episodes BL FU I: 10.1% 9.4% C: 10.3% 9.9% Absolute pct pt change: -0.3, CI(-1.5, 0.9)

Author, Year: Gilaberte et al., 2008Target population: Schools pupils (Grades 1-2):Intervention: SolSano programFollow-up period: BL: April 2005Population size(n): BL: April 2005Title: Evaluation of a health promotion programSetting (School leve):Intervention implementation period: Spring 2005, from April to JuneIntervention implementation period: Spring 2005, from April to JuneFollow-up period: BL: April 2005Population size(n): BL: 1522BL= 1522Protective behaviors: 1.Sunscreen use (Do you apply your sunscreen always)Study Design: Before and after/ LeastGender: 49% boys Age: mean age 7: Grade: 82% first skin type: 145.7%Intervention components: educational: and eyes softw free kakin and easy sunburnsIntervention sective advise children and a guide to pacelatricians. Family also received information parphiet and a guide to pacelatricians. Tisk factors 6% four, 12% three, 24% two, and 31% one, Risk of skin cancer risk factors (31.2%): 12 (31.2%): 2 (31.2%): 2 (31.2%): 2 (31.2%): 2 (31.2%): 2 (31.2%): 4 (5.5%): No valid (9.4%)Intervention for control group: NA Setting: Student's regular teacher at school and materials for home, at solutideFor each school and specific poster school and advise active at school and materials for home, advise children and parents;For each school and specific poster school and materials for home, advise children and parents;For each school and specific poster school and materials for home, advise children and parents;For each school and specific poster school and materials for home, advise children a	Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
towns	Gilaberte et al., 2008 Title: Evaluation of a health promotion intervention for skin cancer prevention in Spain: the SolSano program Study Design: Before and after/ Least Quality of Execution: Fair Location: Arago ´n,	population: Schools pupils (Grades 1–2); Setting (School level): Primary Schools and home; Gender: 49% boys Age: mean age 7; Grade: 82% first graders Skin type: [45.7% pale skin and easy sunburns >70% dark hair and eyes 51% with freckles and/ or moles Using above four items – skin cancer risk factors 6% four, 12% three, 24% two, and 31% one. Risk of skin cancer index: 0 (16.9%); 1 (31.2%); 2 (24.4%); 3 (12.2%); 4 (5.8%); No valid (9.40%) Race/Ethnicity: NR SES/Education: 67.1% lived in	program Intervention implementation period: Spring 2005, from April to June Intervention components: Educational: Incluided activity guide for teachers, workbook for each student, several activities to be photocopied, a poster with sun safe recommendations. Family also received informaion pamphlet and a guide to paediatricians at PHC to encourage advise children and parents; Intervention for Control group: NA Setting: Student's regular teacher at school and materials for home, also included pediatricians; Intensity: NR;	 BL: April 2005 FU: September 2005; Outcomes of Interest Protective behaviors: Sunscreen use (Do you apply your sunscreen always) Any protective behaviors At mountains At Beach At sports At park Change in sunburn incidence: (Did you 	BL=1522 $FU=1522$ Protective behaviors: 1. Sunscreen use (Do you apply your sunscreen always) $BL=52.4%$ $FU=55.6%$ Absolute pct pt change = 3.2, CI (0.3 to 6.3)2. Any protective behaviors At mountainsPre= 52.5%Post= 57.4%Absolute pct pt change = 4.9, CI (1.5, 8.3)At Beach Pre= 82.1%Pre= 82.1%Post= 82.4%Absolute pct pt change = 0.3, CI (-2.4, 3.0) At sportsAt park Pre= 31.5Pre= 31.5Post= 37.0Absolute pct pt change: 5.5, CI (2.2, 3.0)At park Pre= 23.6Post= 31.3Absolute pct pt change: 7.7, CI (4.6, 10.7)Change in sunburn incidence: Pre= 35.8Pre= 35.8Post= 23.5Absolute pct pt change: -12.3, CI (-15.5, -

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
Author, Year: Quereux et al., 2009 Title: Prospective trial on a school- based skin cancer prevention project; Study Design: Group non- randomised trial/ Greatest Quality of Execution: Fair Location: Nantes , West of France	Target population: 3 rd graders (8 and 11 years); Setting (School level): Primary school; Demographics: Gender: sex ratio (male/female) 1.1 in intervention and 1.3 in group control Age: children's median age was 10 years in each group Grade: 3rd Skin type: NR Race/Ethnicity: NR SES: NR	Intervention: Educational program Intervention period: June 2006 Intervention components: Educational: Materials and services delivered The lessons focused on four key areas: sun and health, sun and UV radiation, sun and the atmosphere and sun protection Intervention for Control group: No intervention Setting: At school by trained teachers Intensity: 10 1-h sessions; Parental involvement: No	Follow-up period:BL: May,2006FU1: July 2006 (no postin control; group)FU2: Nov 2006(following summerholidays);Outcomes of InterestProtective behaviors:1. Use of sunscreen (atbeach and duringholidays, out in garden,swimming pool)2.Use of hat (at beach,in garden3.Use of T-shirt (garden,at beach)Incidence of sunburn:Sunburn experienceamong children	Population size(n): 1: 120; C:160 Protective behaviors: 1. Use of sunscreen: At beach : BL FU 1: 76% 75% C: 81% 84% Absolute pct pt change: -4.0, CI(-14.3, 6.3) At Garden: BL FU 1: 14% 19% C: 22% 20% Absolute pct pt change: 7.0, CI (-3.0, 17.0) In holidays: BL I: 51% 57% C: 61% 66% Absolute pct pt change: 1.0, CI(-11.3, 13.3) Swimming pool: BL FU I: 34% 44% C: 45% 50% Absolute pct pt change: 5.0, CI (-7.6, 17.6) 2.Use of hat: At beach: BL FU I: 62% 70% C: 71% 66% Absolute pct pt change: 13.0, CI(1.3, 24.7) At Garden: BL FU I: 57% 68% C: 61% 63% Absolute pct pt change: 9.0, CI (-3.0, 21.0) 3.Use of T-shirt: At beach: BL FU I: 47% 41%

Study Details	Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
				C: 51% 51% Absolute pct pt change: -6.0,CI (-18.5, 6.5) At Garden: BL FU I: 86% 91% C: 86% 84% Absolute pct pt change: 7.0, CI (-1.1, 15.1) Incidence of sunburn: BL FU Intervention 70% 79% Control 69% 72%
Author, Year:	Target	Intervention: Sun	Follow-up period:	Absolute pct pt change: 6.0, Cl (-4.7, 16.7) Population size(n):
Hunter et al., 2010 (related study- Roetzheim, 2011)	population: 4 th grade students; Setting (School	Protection of Florida's Children project	For sun protective behaviors: BL(2006): late August - early September	BL: 1115 FU1: 1029 FU2: 1244
Title : Sun Protection at	level): Elementary school	implementation period: August 8, 2006,	FU1(2006-07): Nov. 30- March 15	Protective behaviors: (% of children)
Elementary Schools: A Cluster	and home;	through June 2008	FU2(2007): March 27- May 22	1.Hat use (wide brimmed hats) In school (observed)-
Study Design:	Demographics: Gender: NR	Intervention components:	FU3 (2007) : Fall FU4(2007): Winter	Year 1: BL FU I: 2.0% 40.5%
Cluster randomized	Age: NR	Educational: Classroom	FU5 (2008): Spring	C: 1.7% 1.1%
trial/ Greatest	Grade:4th Skin type:NR	educational sessions on sun protection attitudes,	For new nevi:	Absolute pct pt change: 39.1%
Quality of Execution: Fair	Race/Ethnicity: White: 39%	social norms. FU sessions on benefits of	BL for nevi (2007): Fall FU1(2007-08): Winter	Veen 2 - DL - ELL
	SES:	sun protection (with	FU2(2008): Spring	Year-2 : BL FU I: 2.0% 19.0%
Location: USA,	School location:	emphasis on hat use),		C: 1.7% 1.0%
Florida	Meteropolitan 73% (8/11) Type of school: Public: 81% (9/11)	materials sent to parents at the start of the school year explaining the project	Skin pigmenttion: BL: August 8- Sept. 29, 2006) FU1:Nov. 30- March 15	Absolute pct pt change: 17.7% Outside (self reported) Year-1: BL FU
	Magnet or charter:	Environmental: Two free	FU2: March 27- May 22 ;	I: 24.3 % 22.9 %
	rest Household income:	wide-brimmed hats (one to use at school and one		C: 13.5% 10.5 %
	<\$10 000-\$14 999	to use at home) to each	Outcomes of Interest	Absolute pct pt change: 1.6%

Study Details Population characteristics	Intervention Characteristics	Outcome measures	Results: Effect Estimate (95% CI/ P-value)
20% \$15 000-\$24 999 15% \$35 000-\$49 999 16% \$50 000-\$74 999 17% ≥\$75 000 21%	student attending intervention schoolIntervention for Control group: 3-5 60- minute educational sessions on topics unrelated to sun protection;Setting: At school by community health education organization (MOREHEALTH)Intensity: 45 minutes brief educational - 3, 60 minutes interactive classroom sessionsParental involvement: Yes	 <u>Protective behaviors:</u> 1.Hat use (wide brimmed hats)- at school and outside the school <u>UV exposure:</u> 1.Changes in skin pigmantation (at child's forehead) with Derma Spectrometer (% children with decreased melanin index) <u>Nevi count:</u> Assessment of new nevi count for a 2-year period. 	Year-2 BL FU I: 24.3 % 11.5 % - C: 13.5% 9.9 % Absolute pct pt change: 8.3% UV exposure: (% of children) 1.Changes in skin pigmentation BL (n; I = 178, C=200); FU= (n; I=200, C=239) Post (year 2only) Intervention : 42% ; Control: 45.6% Absolute pct pt change: -3.6, CI (-13.1, 5.9) Nevi count: (mean number of nevi count) BL FU Intervention 9.0 6.8 Control 9.8 9.1 Relative mean change: -18.63; p-value 0.07