

Study	Design	Location	Focus	Potential for bias	Selection effects	Effects of adhering to Intervall	Effects of missing data	Effects from measurement	Effects from selective	Other	RCT bias score	Generalizable?	
				Results									
Chaturvedi et al. 2001	Cluster CRT: 16 communities	Burkina Faso	Family planning	<p>Comparing across geographic area: Relatively low risk of bias. Low risk of bias.</p> <p>Comparing the women in the campaign areas who already had a radio versus the control group: 7.7% increase.</p> <p>Comparing the women in the campaign areas who received a radio through the experiment versus the entire control group: 5.5% increase.</p>							4	They pre-selected for groups that have high contraceptive availability and tend to listen to the radio, which they estimate applies to around 7% of the country's population.	
Babalola et al. 2010	Cluster CRT: testing the in urban Nigeria		HIV	<p>Comparing the women who viewed a radio in the control group versus the entire control group: -5.2 pp (I).</p> <p>There weren't many differences and relatively low, but high low risk of bias.</p> <p>Did not find an effect on condom usage.</p> <p>But likelihood of testing practices for Chlamydia decreased by 55% for women (in test versus controls). Unclear why they only looked at women- I suspect the effect wasn't significant with men.</p>								4	Not very generalizable: In real-world intervention people would not go to specific screenings- their attention would be more distracted, in addition, unclear if HIV behaviors are similar to other mass media intervention targets.
Saccubaini et al. 2013	Cluster CRT: testing rural Burkina Faso		Child mortality	<p>Significant risk of bias. Low risk of bias.</p> <p>Some risk of bias, some do.</p> <p>Some risk of bias for the Significant. Pre-reg in Control group has</p>								5	Somewhat generalizable but mass media program was especially intensive relative to that which you would expect in real-world.