

Additional file 1. Deviations from the protocol

The [protocol](#) for this process evaluation [1] included four objectives:

1. Explore why the resources did or did not have the effects that were intended, and explain variations in effects
2. Identify potential adverse and beneficial effects that were not measured in the trial
3. Explore ways in which use of the primary school resources could be scaled up, if they are found to be effective
4. Explore the impact of the intervention on teachers and parents

In this paper we address these two objectives:

1. Identify factors affecting the implementation, impact, and scaling up of the intervention
2. Identify potential adverse and beneficial effects of the intervention

The two objectives for this report differ from the four objectives in the protocol for this study as follows.

- Exploring ways in which use of the primary school resources could be scaled up, which was a separate objective in the protocol, is considered together with objective 1.
- Exploring the impact of the intervention on teachers and parents was a separate objective in the protocol. Qualitative data relating to these effects are considered together with objective 2. Quantitative data, which are reported in the trial [2] and the one-year follow-up study [3] are considered in the discussion, but not reported in the results here.
- As in the protocol, we explore possible explanations for variation in effects, when relevant, together with objective 1 using qualitative data. However four quantitative analyses that were planned as part of the process evaluation are reported in the one-year follow-up study. The four factors considered in these analyses are attendance, teachers' scores on the Claim test, reading skills of the children, and end of term examination marks. We consider findings from those analyses in the discussion, but do not report those analyses here.

References

1. Nsangi A, Semakula D, Glenton C, Lewin S, Oxman AD, Oxman M, et al. Resources to teach primary school children in low-income countries to assess claims about treatment effects: protocol for a process evaluation. IHC working paper; 2016. https://www.informedhealthchoices.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/IHC-Process-Evaluation-School-resources_final-1.pdf. Accessed 7 Aug 2018.
2. Nsangi A, Semakula D, Oxman AD, Austvoll-Dahlgren A, Oxman M, Rosenbaum S, et al. Effects of the Informed Health Choices primary school intervention on the ability of children in Uganda to assess the reliability of claims about treatment effects: a cluster-randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2017, 390:374-388.
3. Nsangi A, Semakula D, Oxman AD, Austvoll-Dahlgren A, Oxman MP, Rosenbaum SE, et al. Effects of the Informed Health Choices primary school intervention on the ability of children in Uganda to assess the reliability of claims about treatment effects, one-year follow-up: a cluster-randomised trial. Submitted.