



**Cochrane
Library**

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Criminal justice interventions for preventing terrorism and radicalisation: An evidence and gap map (Protocol)

Sydes M, Hine L, Higginson A, Dugan L, Mazerolle L

Sydes M, Hine L, Higginson A, Dugan L, Mazerolle L.
Criminal justice interventions for preventing terrorism and radicalisation: An evidence and gap map (Protocol).
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews TBD, Issue TBD. Art. No.: CA000289.
DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CA000289.

www.cochranelibrary.com

Criminal justice interventions for preventing terrorism and radicalisation: An evidence and gap map (Protocol)
Copyright © 2022 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

WILEY

DHS-001-01721-002696

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	1
BACKGROUND	2
OBJECTIVES	3
METHODS	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	8
REFERENCES	9
ADDITIONAL TABLES	11
APPENDICES	17
CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS	29
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	30
SOURCES OF SUPPORT	30

[Prognosis Protocol]

Criminal justice interventions for preventing terrorism and radicalisation: An evidence and gap map

Michelle Sydes¹, Lorelei Hine², Angela Higginson³, Laura Dugan⁴, Lorraine Mazerolle⁵

¹School of Criminology and Criminal Justice, Griffith University, Brisbane, Australia. ²School of Social Science, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia. ³School of Justice, Faculty of Law, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Australia. ⁴Department of Sociology, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA. ⁵School of Social Science, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Contact: Michelle Sydes, m.sydes@griffith.edu.au.**Editorial group:** Cochrane [Unknown].**Publication status and date:** New, published in Issue , .

Citation: Sydes M, Hine L, Higginson A, Dugan L, Mazerolle L. Criminal justice interventions for preventing terrorism and radicalisation: An evidence and gap map (Protocol). *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. TBD, Issue TBD. Art. No.: CA000289. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CA000289.

Copyright © 2022 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ABSTRACT

Objectives

This is a protocol for a Cochrane Review (prognosis). The objectives are as follows:

This EGM aims to provide a comprehensive and systematic update of the existing evidence on criminal justice interventions which aim to prevent and reduce terrorism and radicalisation. It will map the extant evaluation evidence across the policing, courts, and corrections arms of the criminal justice system including multi-agency responses. The key objectives of this EGM are as follows:

1. To identify the existing evidence that considers the effectiveness of criminal justice interventions in preventing terrorism and radicalisation.
2. To identify existing gaps in the evidence where new primary research could be undertaken and where future synthesis could be conducted.

BACKGROUND

The problem, condition or issue

Violent radicalisation and terrorism continues to represent an ongoing threat to global security, with 44 countries experiencing at least one death from terrorism in the past year (IEP 2022). While definitions vary (Borum 2015; Desmarais 2017; Horgan 2008; Kruglanski 2019; Sarma 2017) violent radicalisation is broadly defined as the process by “which a person adopts extremist views and moves towards committing a violent act” (Hardy 2018, p. 76; see also Irwin 2015; Jensen 2018). Once radicalised, individuals and groups may go on to carry out terrorist attacks against innocent civilians, key infrastructure, symbolic targets or specific groups (Wilner 2010) or travel to conflict zones to engage in violence with extremist groups (Lindekilde 2016). Preventing radicalisation has thus become a key focus of counterterrorism agendas globally (Elshimi 2017; Dudenhofer 2018; Heath-Kelly 2013).

The harms associated with violent radicalisation and terrorism are far reaching. Between 2009 and 2019, violent radicalisation and terrorism were listed as the cause of 21,000 deaths on average per year, with the majority occurring in the Middle East, Africa or South Asia (Ritchie 2019). The estimated economic impact of terrorism is similarly staggering. According to Bardwell 2020, the cost of terrorism to the world economy between 2000 and 2018 was 855 billion USD. Beyond the human casualties and economic consequences, violent radicalisation and terrorism are linked to a broad range of psychological, social and political impacts. Studies find experiences of terrorism can have negative mental health implications particularly amongst first responders and victims who face high levels of trauma and depression in the aftermath (Razik 2013; Salguero 2011). Violent radicalisation and terrorism can also antagonise public attitudes towards immigration, and groups perceived as a terrorist threat (Williamson 2020). Right-wing political parties frequently manipulate fear of terrorism and radicalisation to garner support for hard-line and discriminatory counterterrorism policies (Haner 2019; Haner 2021; Williamson 2019). Such policies often result in the over surveillance of ‘suspect communities’ (Breen-Smyth 2014; Cherney 2017) further isolating groups at risk of radicalisation and in turn, providing motivation for retaliatory attacks (Fisher 2018; Jacob 2021).

Research suggests that individual pathways to radicalisation can be influenced by a broad range of factors including social networks, affiliation with certain political organisations, places of worship, familial relationships or exposure to radical individuals during incarceration. These predictors can also interact with personal factors such as psychological disorders or traumatic experiences, further heightening risk of radicalisation (Jensen 2018; Kruglanski 2019). Effectively intervening to prevent and reduce the likelihood of violent radicalisation and terrorism is therefore often difficult due to the significant variation in the predictors of violent radicalisation amongst individuals and extremist groups (Desmarais 2017; Wolfowicz 2019).

The intervention

Criminal justice agencies (i.e., police, courts and corrections) are well positioned to help prevent the radicalisation of individuals and groups, stop those radicalised from engaging in violence, and reduce the likelihood of terrorist attacks. Following September 11, police became more actively involved in countering terrorism -

disrupting terrorist activity through intelligence gathering, covert investigations, information sharing and enforcement activities (Ortiz 2007). As frontline practitioners, police are also instrumental in identifying, reducing, and preventing both radicalisation and violent extremism (Mazerolle 2021). Police approaches for preventing radicalisation and violent extremism involve a range of different interventions and strategies. These include police facilitating training programs to improve officer recognition and responses to radicalisation or police delivering awareness programs to educate others on how to identify and report radicalised individuals (Carter 2014; Davis 2016). Some police agencies also work with communities to build resilience to protect against the influence of extremist messages and recruiters (Cherney 2017; Mazerolle 2020; Schanzer 2016). Such initiatives focus on bolstering community engagement, trust and connectedness while reducing feelings of social isolation (Mazerolle 2020).

The courts and correctional agencies also play a critical role in preventing terrorism and radicalisation. Court officials may direct radicalised individuals or individuals who have engaged in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity to various support services or mandatory participation in rehabilitation programs designed to counter violent extremism (Cherney 2021c). Prisons are widely believed to provide a prime opportunity for radicalisation to flourish, threatening the safety and security of both inmates and the community more broadly (van der Heide 2020). Training initiatives and awareness programs with corrective services staff may assist in the detection and prevention of both radicalisation and violent extremism (Vejvodová 2020). In an attempt to prevent the spread of radicalised ideologies behind bars, corrective services agencies often segregate radicalised individuals from the general prison population (Jones 2018). Indeed some jurisdictions operate specialised terrorist units to house extremist offenders (van der Heide 2020), with the aim to prevent radicalised inmates from influencing other prisoners and allow staff interacting with radicalised inmates to be upskilled in best practice approaches. Corrective services agencies may also design and deliver deradicalisation programs to radicalised inmates or inmates convicted of terror-related offences (Cherney 2021b). Upon release, community corrections staff may provide radicalised offenders with the support necessary for successful reintegration back into the community (Cherney 2021a).

Recognising the complexities surrounding radicalisation and terrorism, many criminal justice agencies are increasingly taking an intersectoral and multi-agency approach. Such approaches acknowledge the difficulties a single agency or organisation may face in trying to combat the problem in isolation (Mazerolle 2021). These initiatives include promoting information sharing between agencies (Knight 2009), community outreach activities (Lamb 2013; Schanzer 2016), intelligence gathering (Lewandowski 2012) and training programs (Davis 2016; Kerry 2007). By partnering with other agencies and community groups, these interventions aim to tackle the problem in a multi-faceted manner (Beutel 2016; Mazerolle 2021).

Why it is important to develop the EGM

There are currently no existing EGMs that focus on criminal justice responses to radicalisation, violent extremism, and/or terrorism. Several systematic reviews have synthesised the effectiveness literature. However, these reviews have either had a broad scope including criminal justice agencies amongst other agencies (Lum

2006) or a more targeted scope focusing on just a particular branch of the criminal justice system (see for example Mazerolle 2021 for multi-agency responses to radicalisation with police as a partner). Other reviews have focused on a particular type of program. For example, Mazerolle 2020 reviewed police programs that seek to increase community connectedness for reducing violent extremism behaviour, attitudes and beliefs. Our systematic search will include all types of criminal justice interventions that prevent or respond to radicalisation, violent extremism and/or terrorism. Synthesising the available evidence in an accessible way for practitioners, policymakers and researchers will help better allocate finite resources and identify areas for future research. It is expected that this EGM will help promote the translation of evidence into practice by providing practitioners and policymakers with easy access to high-quality evaluation evidence. This EGM will be used to demonstrate gaps in the evaluation research, allowing key stakeholders to identify future funding priorities for research and development.

OBJECTIVES

This EGM aims to provide a comprehensive and systematic display of the existing evidence on criminal justice interventions which aim to prevent and reduce terrorism and radicalisation. It will map the extant evaluation evidence across the policing, courts, and corrections arms of the criminal justice system including multi-agency responses. The key objectives of this EGM are as follows:

1. To identify the existing evidence that considers the effectiveness of criminal justice interventions in preventing terrorism and radicalisation.
2. To identify existing gaps in the evidence where new primary research could be undertaken and where future synthesis could be conducted.

METHODS

Evidence and gap map: definition and purpose

EGMs provide an interactive and graphical representation of the available evidence concerning a particular topic area (Snijlsveit 2016). EGMs are usually presented as a matrix with interventions displayed in rows and outcomes presented in columns (White 2020). Like systematic reviews, EGMs use rigorous systematic search methods (White 2020). However, EGMs are usually broader in scope than systematic reviews. EGMs are often viewed as 'public goods' as they improve accessibility to high quality evidence for policymakers, practitioners and the wider public (Snijlsveit 2016). Our EGM will help to highlight both the density and paucity of existing research by including both primary studies and systematic reviews related to criminal justice interventions for preventing and responding to terrorism and radicalisation.

Framework development and scope

The framework used in the EGM will be both theoretically and empirically informed. The initial framework to design inclusion and exclusion criteria and search strategies is based on an a priori schema, described below, and will be informed by the practical experiences and academic knowledge of the Advisory Group. Building on this framework, we will conduct a thematic cluster analysis of the included studies to develop an empirical classification schema for the final EGM categories and domains.

Stakeholder engagement

Initial stakeholder consultation took place with the Department of Homeland Security in July 2021 to determine the outcome categories of interest and EGM scope. We will further consult an Advisory Group comprised of key experts in the field and government stakeholders across the United States (Department of Homeland Security), the United Kingdom (Home Office), Australia, Canada and Europe, drawing on stakeholder relationships developed in past reviews (see Mazerolle 2020; Mazerolle 2021). Members of the Advisory Group will be contacted via email and asked to provide feedback.

Dimensions

Our EGM will be presented as a matrix of interventions (rows) and outcomes (columns). The number of primary studies will be shown by the size of the bubble. The proposed dimensions of the map are as follows:

- Row headings: Intervention - two layers for intervention agency and intervention category
 - Intervention agency (police, courts, corrections, multi-agency with one or more criminal justice partner) and
 - Intervention category (e.g., training, community awareness, cognitive behavioural therapy, prisoner isolation, etc.)
- Column headings: Outcome category
 - Extremism, radicalisation indicators (e.g., Violent Extremist Risk Assessment-2, Extremist Risk Guidance Factors, IAT-8, RADAR assessments, Terrorist Radicalisation Assessment Protocol)
 - Crime or recidivism (e.g., arrests, sentences, calls-for-service, re-offending)
 - Psychosocial (e.g., mental health, fear of crime)
 - Other (e.g., perceptions of trust, perceptions of legitimacy)

Types of study design

Systematic reviews and randomised controlled trials (RCTs) are considered the gold standard for ascertaining intervention effectiveness. Eligible comparison conditions/groups for inclusion in the EGM will include no treatment, placebo, "business as usual," waitlist control, or an alternative treatment. While other designs are less causally robust, they may be appropriate to include due to the difficulties associated with conducting RCTs in criminal justice settings, particularly when targeting radicalisation, violent extremism, and/or terrorism. The strong quasi-experimental designs eligible for this EGM include:

- Matched control group designs with or without preintervention baseline measures (propensity or statistically matched)
- Matched control group designs without preintervention baseline measures where the control group has face validity
- Unmatched control group designs with pre-post intervention measures that allow for difference-in-difference analysis
- Unmatched control group designs without pre-post intervention measures that allow for difference-in-difference analysis
- Regression discontinuity designs
- Cross-over designs
- Designs using multivariate controls (e.g., multiple regression)

- Short interrupted time series designs with control group (< 25 preintervention and 25 postintervention observations (Glass 1997)
- Long interrupted time series designs with or without a control (≥25 preintervention and postintervention observations (Glass 1997)

To provide the most up-to-date synthesis of literature, only studies that are published from or report on impact evaluations conducted between January 2000 and December 2020 will be included in the EGM. We will not include qualitative research. Ongoing studies will be included.

Types of intervention/problem

Our EGM will capture criminal justice interventions that aim to prevent or respond to radicalisation, violent extremism, and/or terrorism.

A *criminal justice intervention* is defined as a strategy, technique, approach, activity, campaign, training, directive, funding, or organisational change that involves the criminal justice system (police, courts, corrections or a multi-agency group involving at least one of these) in some way (Eggins 2021; Mazerolle 2018). For example, this may include:

- Criminal justice system initiation, development, or leadership of the intervention.
- Criminal justice system staff or populations as recipients of the intervention.
- Criminal justice system practices as the focus or target of the intervention.
- The criminal justice system delivers or implements the intervention.

Radicalisation is defined as the process of an individual or group adopting extreme political, social, or religious beliefs (Hardy 2018; Jensen 2020). Analogous concepts are *disengagement* and/or *deradicalisation*, which are often encompassed within conceptualizations of violent extremism. *Disengagement* refers to reducing or ceasing physical involvement in violent or radical activities, while *deradicalisation* is defined as the psychological shift in attitudes or beliefs (Windisch 2016).

Violent extremism is defined as “advocating, engaging in, preparing, or otherwise supporting ideologically motivated or justified violence to further social, economic, and political objectives” (US Agency for International Development 2016).

Terrorism is defined as “the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives” (Shanahan 2016:108).

Eligible interventions may include but are not limited to:

- Police training programs to improve officer recognition and responses to radicalisation and terrorism (Davis 2021).
- Police working with communities to build resilience to protect against the influence of extremist messages and recruiters (Cherney 2017; Mazerolle 2020; Schanzer 2016).

- Court officials mandating participation in rehabilitation programs designed to counter violent extremism (Cherney 2021c).
- Corrections agencies installing terrorist wings within prisons to separate radicalised prisoners or prisoners convicted of terrorist acts from the general prison population (van der Heide 2020).
- Corrections agencies delivering specialised and individualised rehabilitation programs designed to challenge radicalised views (Cherney 2021b).
- Training initiatives and awareness programs with corrective services staff focused on the detection and prevention of both radicalisation and violent extremism (Vejvodová 2020).
- Re-entry programs focused on building pro-social networks and access to support services to assist with prisoner release (Cherney 2021a).
- Multi-agency initiatives that promote information sharing and intelligence gathering between agencies (Knight 2009; Lewandowski 2012).
- Multi-agency initiatives such as community outreach activities (Lamb 2013; Schanzer 2016).
- Multi-agency initiatives focused on delivering training to various stakeholders on how to identify and report radicalised individuals (Carter 2014; Davis 2016; Kerry 2007).

Eligible comparison conditions/groups for inclusion in the EGM will include no treatment, placebo, “business as usual,” waitlist control, or an alternative treatment. If a study reports on multiple interventions whereby only a subset meet the eligibility criteria, only the eligible interventions will be included in the map.

Types of population

The following populations will be included in the EGM:

- Criminal justice practitioners
- Victims
- Communities
- Individuals or groups who have been identified as at-risk of becoming radicalised or engaging in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
- Radicalised individuals or groups (including pre-criminal justice involved radicalised individuals)
- Individuals or groups who have engaged in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
- Family members of radicalised individuals or individuals who have engaged in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
- Micro places (e.g., street corners, buildings, police beats, street segments)
- Macro places (neighbourhoods or larger geographies)

Types of outcome measures

No restrictions will be placed on the types of outcomes used to evaluate criminal justice responses to radicalisation, violent extremism and/or terrorism. Depending on the studies identified, we tentatively plan to group outcomes under four domains: (1) extremism, radicalisation indicators; (2) crime and recidivism; (3) psychosocial; or (4) other. Should a pattern emerge in the outcomes initially categorised as 'other', we may group these together under an appropriate label (e.g., perceptions of police). Unintended or adverse outcomes will be included.

Types of Location/Situation

We will place no limits on the geographical region reported in the study. No restrictions will be placed on the language a document is written in. Similar to other reviews (e.g., Mazerolle 2020, Davis 2021), titles/abstracts written in a language other than English will be translated using Google Translate to determine if they are potentially eligible for the EGM. We will likewise translate portions of full-text documents in a language other than English using Google Translate to ascertain eligibility. If we cannot determine eligibility through this approach, we will contact study authors to determine eligibility.

Types of settings

No restrictions will be placed on the settings used in eligible studies.

Search methods and sources

Global Policing Database

The search for this review will be led by the Global Policing Database (GPD) research team at the University of Queensland (Lorraine Mazerolle and Lorelei Hine), Queensland University of Technology (Angela Higginson) and Griffith University (Elizabeth Eggers). The University of Queensland is home to the GPD (see <http://www.gpd.uq.edu.au>), which will serve as a key search location for this review. The GPD is a web-based and searchable database designed to capture all published and unpublished experimental and quasi-experimental evaluations of policing interventions conducted since 1950. There are no restrictions on the type of policing technique, type of outcome measure or language of the research. The GPD is compiled using systematic search and screening techniques, which are reported in Higginson 2015 and summarised in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. Broadly, the GPD search protocol includes an extensive range of search locations to ensure that both published and unpublished research is captured across criminology and allied disciplines.

To capture studies for this review, we will use terms related to terrorism and radicalisation to search the GPD corpus of full-text documents that have been screened and reported on a quantitative impact evaluation of a policing intervention. Specifically, we will use the following terms to search the title and abstract fields of the corpus of documents published between January 2000 and December 2020:

extremis* OR "far#left*" OR "far#right*" OR "foreign#fight*" OR "freedom#fight*" OR guerrilla OR "homeland#security" OR "ideological violence*" OR "ideologically#motivat*" OR indoctrinat* OR "left#wing*" OR "lone#wol*" OR militant* OR "national#security" OR "political violence*" OR "politically#motivat*" OR radicali* OR rebel* OR "religious violence*" OR "religiously#motivat*" OR "right#wing*" OR "single#issue*" OR supremacis OR terror* OR vigilante* OR vigilantism OR deradicali* OR "de-radicali*" OR "counter-terror*" OR counterterror* OR "counter-extremis*" OR counterextremis* OR separatist* OR militia* OR jihad*

Other Database Searches

To capture interventions in the courts, corrections and multi-agency spheres not encapsulated within the GPD, we will conduct searches of key academic sources in criminology and criminal

justice. These include EBSCO (e.g., Criminal Justice Abstracts), ProQuest (e.g., Criminal Justice, Dissertations & Theses Global, Sociological Abstracts), PsycINFO, HeinOnline (e.g., Law Journal Library), and Informit (e.g., Australian Criminology Database), with the full search plan in Table 1. We will search these databases on three sets of terms. Terms within each set will be combined with Boolean OR operators, and the three sets will then be combined with Boolean AND operators. These terms aim to capture literature on (1) terrorism within the (2) criminal justice system that uses a term indicative of an (3) evaluation of an intervention. The search terms relating to terrorism are the same as those used in the GPD search. This search approach has been informed by Eggers 2021 systematic review of criminal justice system responses to child sexual abuse material offending.

(1) extremism* OR "far#left*" OR "far#right*" OR "foreign#fight*" OR "freedom#fight*" OR guerrilla OR "homeland#security" OR "ideological violence*" OR "ideologically#motivat*" OR indoctrinat* OR "left#wing*" OR "lone#wol*" OR militant* OR "national#security" OR "political violence*" OR "politically#motivat*" OR radicali* OR rebel* OR "religious violence*" OR "religiously#motivat*" OR "right#wing*" OR "single#issue*" OR supremacis OR terror* OR vigilante* OR vigilantism OR deradicali* OR "de-radicali*" OR "counter-terror*" OR counterterror* OR "counter-extremis*" OR counterextremis* OR separatist* OR militia* OR jihad*

AND

(2) accused OR acquit* OR adjourn* OR adjudicat* OR *admiss* OR *fida* OR appeal* OR appellate OR apprehend* OR arbitrat* OR arraign* OR *arrest* OR attorney* OR authorit* OR bail* OR barrister* OR breach* OR "case#manage*" OR caution* OR charge* OR clerk* OR confinement* OR convict* OR coroner* OR correction* OR court* OR crime* OR criminal* OR "cross#examin*" OR custod* OR defendant* OR defense OR defence OR detain* OR detention* OR deter* OR divert* OR diversion* OR enforc* OR execut* OR felon* OR forensic* OR gaol* OR guilt* OR "high#security" OR "halfway#house" OR *imprison* OR incarcerat* OR indict* OR infract* OR infringe* OR injunct* OR inquest* OR innocent* OR inmate* OR juris* OR jail* OR judge* OR judic* OR juror* OR juries OR jury OR justice OR law* OR legal* OR legislat* OR litigat* OR "low#security" OR magistrate* OR mandat* OR mitigat* OR marshal* OR misdem* OR "medium#security*" OR offend* OR offence* OR officer* OR official* OR ordinance OR parole* OR pardon* OR penal* OR plea* OR precedent* OR prevent* OR prison* OR probat* OR prohibit* OR prosecut* OR punish* OR recidivis* OR rehab* OR reintegrat* OR remand* OR reoffend* OR "re-offend*" OR ruling* OR sanction* OR sentenc* OR solicitor* OR statut* OR subpoena* OR supervis* OR surveil* OR suspect* OR testif* OR testimon* OR *trial* OR tribunal* OR verdict* OR victim* OR witness*

AND

(3) "comparison#condition*" OR "comparison#group*" OR "control#condition*" OR "control#group*" OR effective OR efficac* OR evaluat* OR experiment* OR intervent* OR "matched#group" OR program* OR "quasi#experiment*" OR random* OR RCT OR treatment* OR trial*

Searching other resources

In addition to the database searches, we will use the following search strategies:

- Searching government and non-government websites related to terrorism and radicalisation research (see Table 1)
- Searching government and non-government websites related to courts and corrections for research related to terrorism and radicalisation interventions (see Table 1)
- Searching journals categorised by Web of Science as related to terrorism and radicalisation (see Table 1)
- Reference harvesting eligible documents
- Forward citation searching eligible documents
- Contacting our advisory group and identified experts in the field (see Stakeholder Engagement) to identify any potentially eligible studies that are not yet published

Analysis and presentation

Report structure

The EGM will comprise the following sections: (1) executive summary; (2) background; (3) objectives (4) methods (5) results and (6) discussion. The executive summary will provide an overview of the EGM findings, detailing the number of studies captured in the review across the criminal justice system (police, courts, corrections and multi-agency). The background section will detail the problem of radicalisation, violent extremism and terrorism, outlining why and how the criminal justice system provides a prime opportunity for intervention to reduce and prevent its occurrence.

The methods will provide information on the systematic search, including key search terms and search locations. The methods will also describe the screening and data extraction processes and software programs utilised. The results will provide an overview of the number of eligible studies captured by the systematic search, detailed in a PRISMA figure. Our results will also include our interactive EGM, providing a graphical representation of the available evidence. The discussion will reflect on both the paucity and density of research across different intervention and outcome domains. We will recommend areas for future research and synthesis, and implications for policy and practice.

Planned Tables and Figures:

- Figure: PRISMA
- Table: Search locations
- Table: EGM - primary studies (non-interactive)
- Table: EGM - systematic reviews (non-interactive)
- Table: online interactive EGM - with filters

Filters for presentation

The results of our online interactive EGM will be presented as a matrix of rows (comprising two layers: (1) intervention agency; (2) intervention type) and columns (outcomes). We will additionally employ the following filters:

- Study type (toggle filter): research synthesis, research study
- Research design: RCT, strong quasi-experimental
- Document type: published, unpublished
- Study location: country, region

- Country income group: low income, middle income, high income
- Implementation setting: prisons/correctional facilities, courts, community, school, workplace, places of worship, home, other
- Focus of intervention: preventing radicalisation, preventing terrorism, preventing both
- Prevention category: primary, secondary, tertiary
- Age of targets: youth, adults, both
- Target population:
 - Criminal justice practitioners
 - Victims
 - Communities
 - Individuals or groups who have been identified as at-risk of becoming radicalised or engaging in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
 - Radicalised individuals or groups (including pre-criminal justice involved radicalised individuals)
 - Individuals or groups who have engaged in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
 - Family members of radicalised individuals or individuals who have engaged in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
 - Micro places (e.g., street corners, buildings, police beats, street segments)
 - Macro places (neighbourhoods or larger geographies)

In addition to the systematic reviews, we will visually differentiate between systematic reviews that have included studies and those that do not by the use of colour coding (White 2021).

Dependency

The unit of analysis is the primary study, not the publication or document that reports on the study. We are conscious of the risk of using documents as the unit of analysis, as a visual tool such as an EGM can appear to indicate a preponderance of evidence on an intervention where there are multiple publications drawn from the same research study.

The two most common ways in which dependency can manifest in an EGM are as many:one dependency or as one:many dependency. Firstly, there may be more than one document reporting on the same study (many:one dependency). In this situation, all documents that report on the one study will be linked, and the study is what will appear on the map. Secondly, one document may report on more than one study (one:many dependency). If a document reports on more than one study, we will link that document to both 'parent' studies.

Systematic reviews provide a unique challenge in terms of the one:many dependency. A systematic review may contain multiple studies, that may report on multiple intervention and outcome combinations. The challenge lies in deciding how a systematic review should be represented in an EGM. If it were to appear in the same map as its component studies, it would visually suggest more evidence than actually exists. But if it were only to be harvested for its component studies, then the EGM could not show where there has been rigorous synthesis of studies in the area, or attempts at rigorous synthesis, in the case of 'empty reviews'. We propose a multi-armed approach to dealing with systematic reviews in the EGM:

1. We will harvest the primary research studies that are included in any systematic review, and link those documents back to the parent study as with any document that has a one:many dependency.
2. We will include systematic reviews in addition to their component studies, *but* systematic reviews will not be visible at the same time as primary studies. We will do this using a strict toggle filter for Study Type, with mutually exclusive options of research synthesis or research studies. This will allow the user to choose between an EGM of primary studies, and an EGM of systematic reviews, in order to not visually inflate the weight of evidence.

A further form of dependency is where one study compares two eligible treatments head-to-head. In these cases, the study itself may be eligible to appear in two different columns of the map. In addition to linking any related documents, we will flag studies of this design so that it is clear where there is the potential for double-counting. Similarly, if a systematic review is eligible to appear in more than one cell on the map, we will flag the review to ensure that the reader is aware of the potential for double-counting.

Data collection and analysis

Screening and study selection

Our screening approach will differ slightly for the different sources, but all documents will be assessed on the same final eligibility criteria. Documents from the GPD have already been screened on their full-text as reporting on a quantitative impact evaluation of a policing intervention. Therefore, we will assess the full-text of these documents for their eligibility to the review. Documents from other sources have not been verified as quantitative impact evaluations, so we plan to screen these on their title and abstract in order to remove documents not related to criminal justice responses to terrorism/radicalisation, and then screen eligible full-text documents on the same criteria as for the GPD documents.

For all stages described below, we will develop standardised screening companions and inter-rater reliability tests to ensure consistency in decision-making across the research team. For title and abstract screening, each team member will screen the same set of 30 records prior to commencing screening. Similarly, at the full-text screening stages, prior to commencing screening, team members will screen the same set of 30 documents. All team member decisions will be compiled and compared to determine any divergence in decisions. Feedback on screening decisions will be provided with further training when necessary. We will double screen 5% of each screener's included documents to identify any potential false negative decisions. In instances where a screener's decisions are considered unreliable, their exclusion screenings will be reassigned. Where disagreements about screening decisions occur, these will be mediated by a third team member.

All documents will be screened in DistillerSR - a web based, reference management software that incorporates artificial intelligence (AI) to expedite the review process (Evidence Partners 2022). DistillerSR has an inbuilt AI function which cross-checks exclusion decisions. This helps to ensure consistency across reviewers and reduce human error. DistillerSR also draws on machine learning to reorder references based on their likelihood of inclusion, learning from the decisions made by human users (Evidence Partners 2022). Using this function, we will screen

documents up until the point that DistillerSR indicates 100% of all potentially eligible records are included. At this point, we will cross-check a random sample of remaining records to ensure no eligible records are excluded.

Following Campbell Collaboration guidance (White 2020), we will screen systematic reviews on their PICOS rather than on their included studies. In this way we will retain 'empty reviews', and allow the EGM user to see where synthesis has been attempted but was unsuccessful.

GPD Sourced Documents

First, we will import all documents reporting on a quantitative impact evaluation of a policing intervention captured by the systematic search into DistillerSR. Quantitative impact evaluations indexed in the GPD generally have a pre-existing full-text document attached, and document retrieval is therefore not required. We will then screen the full-text of the records according to the following exclusion criteria:

1. Document is not unique
2. Document is not about a criminal justice intervention for preventing/responding to terrorism/radicalisation.
3. Document does not include an impact evaluation of a criminal justice intervention that aims to prevent or respond to terrorism/radicalisation.

While efforts are made to remove duplicate records within the GPD, exclusion criterion 1 will be used to remove any that were missed during the initial data cleaning. Exclusion criterion 2 will be used to remove records unrelated to terrorism, radicalisation or extremism. Exclusion criterion 3 will be used to produce a corpus of studies that report on quantitative impact evaluations of an eligible intervention, using an eligible research design.

As part of the GPD protocol, all attempts are made to locate full-text documents via existing university resources, ordering documents through the university library, or by directly contacting study authors. Should the search within the GPD return records (i.e., citations) for which we have been unable to locate the full-text and cannot unequivocally exclude on the title and abstract as not relating to a criminal justice intervention for preventing/responding to terrorism/radicalisation, these documents will be recorded as 'Studies awaiting classification'.

Documents from other sources

Second, we will import all records identified by our electronic searches and other sources (grey literature, hand-searching, etc.) into DistillerSR. This data will be assessed on title and abstract on the following criteria:

1. Document is not unique
2. Ineligible document type
3. Document is not about a criminal justice intervention for preventing/responding to terrorism/radicalisation.

Prior to screening, we will make all efforts to remove duplicates and ineligible document types (such as book reviews, blog posts etc). However, criteria 1 and 2 will allow us to remove any that were missed during data cleaning. Exclusion criterion 3 will be used to

remove titles and abstracts unrelated to terrorism, radicalisation or extremism.

Records that successfully progress through the title and abstract screening stage will move to a literature retrieval stage. For records without documents, we will endeavour to locate the full-text document via existing university resources. In instances where we cannot locate the record, we will order the document through the university library or by directly contacting study authors. Documents for which we cannot locate the full-text and cannot unequivocally exclude on title and abstract will be listed in 'Studies awaiting classification'.

Once the literature is retrieved, all potentially eligible records will then progress to full-text eligibility screening. The full-text of the records according to the following exclusion criteria:

1. Document is not unique
2. Ineligible document type
3. Document does not report on quantitative bivariate or multivariate data which may be indicative of an evaluation
4. Document is not about a criminal justice intervention for preventing/responding to terrorism/radicalisation.
5. Document does not include an impact evaluation of a criminal justice intervention that aims to prevent or respond to terrorism/radicalisation.

The addition of criterion 3 allows us to refine the corpus of studies to those which do not contain bivariate or multivariate data which may be indicative of an impact evaluation. A similar approach is taken for the GPD (Higginson 2015). Criteria 4 and 5 will be used to remove records unrelated to terrorism, radicalisation or extremism and produce a corpus of studies that report on quantitative impact evaluations of an eligible intervention, using an eligible research design.

Data extraction and management

Once deemed eligible for the review, documents will be coded in EPPI-reviewer. We will use a standardised coding companion (see Appendix 3) to code documents across the following domains:

1. Participants (sample characteristics, recruitment, etc.)
2. Intervention (setting, components, agencies, etc.)
3. Outcomes (conceptualisation, data source)
4. Research methodology (research design, comparison group)

All coders will code the same four eligible studies to ensure consistency across team members. These will be compiled and compared to determine any divergence in coding, and feedback will be provided prior to independent coding. To check for inter-rater reliability, 5% of each person's coding will be double-coded by a second person. Where disagreements arise, a third review author will be consulted. Study authors will be contacted directly if documents are missing any pertinent information.

Tools for assessing risk of bias/study quality of included studies

We do not plan to assess the risk of bias or study quality of the included studies, as the methodological thresholds of this EGM already exclude studies where the design is not appropriate to make causal claims. Campbell Collaboration guidance notes that critical appraisal of the included studies is not mandatory in EGMs (White 2020). We argue that, whilst risk of bias or study quality information is vital for use in interpreting the findings from systematic reviews, this EGM does not aim to provide the type of synthesis that requires this form of evaluation.

Methods for mapping

We will use EPPI-reviewer to create the EGM (Eppi-Centre 2019).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This EGM is funded by a Campbell Collaboration grant awarded to Lorraine Mazerolle, Michelle Sydes, Lorelei Hine, Angela Higginson and Laura Dugan via the United States Department of Homeland Security. We thank our advisory group for their considered feedback. We also acknowledge the research assistance provided by James McEwan and feedback provided by Harley Williamson.

REFERENCES

Additional references

Bardwell 2020

Bardwell H, Iqbal M. The economic impact of terrorism from 2000 to 2018. *Peace Economics, Peace Science and Public Policy* 2020;**27**(2):227-261. [DOI: 10.1515/peps-2020-0031]

Beutel 2016

Beutel A, Weinberger P. Public-private partnerships to counter violent extremism: field principles for action. National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and Responses to Terrorism. 2016.

Borum 2015

Borum R. Assessing risk for terrorism involvement. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management* 2015;**2**(2):63-87. [DOI: 10.1037/tam0000043]

Breen-Smyth 2014

Breen-Smyth M. Theorising the "suspect community": counterterrorism, security practices and the public imagination. *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 2014;**7**(2):223-240. [DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2013.867714]

Carter 2014

Carter J. Inter-organisational relationships and law enforcement information sharing post 11 September 2001. *Journal of Crime & Justice* 2014;**38**(4):522-542. [DOI: 10.1080/0735648X.2014.927786]

Cherney 2016

Cherney A, Murphy K. Being a 'suspect community' in a post 9/11 world - the impact of the war on terror on Muslim communities in Australia. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 2016;**49**(4):480-491. [DOI: 10.1177/0004865815585392]

Cherney 2017

Cherney A, Hartley J. Community engagement to tackle terrorism and violent extremism: challenges, tensions and pitfalls. *Policing and Society* 2017;**27**(7):750-763. [DOI: 10.1080/10439463.2015.1089871]

Cherney 2021a

Cherney A. The release and community supervision of radicalised offenders: issues and challenges that can influence reintegration. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 2021;**33**(1):119-147. [DOI: 10.1080/09546553.2018.1530661]

Cherney 2021b

Cherney A, Belton E. Evaluating case-managed approaches to counter radicalization and violent extremism: an example of the proactive integrated support model (PRISM) Intervention. *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 2021;**44**(8):625-645. [DOI: 10.1080/1057610X.2019.1577016]

Cherney 2021c

Cherney A, De Rooy K, Eggins E. Mandatory participation in programs to counter violent extremism: a review of evidence for and against. *Journal for Deradicalization* 2021;**27**:1-33.

Davis 2016

Davis L, Helmus T, Hunt P, Payne L, Jahedi S, Tsang F. Assessment of the state and local anti-terrorism training (SLATT) program. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RR1276.html 2016.

Davis 2021

Davis R, Petersen K, Weisburd D, Taylor B. Updated protocol: effects of second responder programs on repeat incidents of family abuse: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 2021;**17**(4):e1200. [DOI: 10.1002/cl2.1200]

Desmarais 2017

Desmarais S, Simons-Rudolph J, Brugh C, Schilling E, Hoggan, C. The state of scientific knowledge regarding factors associated with terrorism. *Journal of Threat Assessment and Management* 2017;**4**(1):180-209. [DOI: 10.1037/tam0000090]

Dudek-Hoefer 2018

Dudek-Hoefer A. Resisting radicalisation: a critical analysis of the UK Prevent duty. *Journal for Deradicalization* 2018;**14**(1):154-191.

Eggins 2021

Eggins E, Mazerolle L, Higginson A, Hine L, Walsh K, Sydes M, Williams J. Criminal justice responses to child sexual abuse material offending: a systematic review and evidence and gap map. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice* 2021;**623**:1-18. [DOI: 10.52922/ti78023]

Elshimi 2017

Elshimi M. De-radicalisation in the UK prevent strategy: security, identity and religion. Routledge, 2017. [DOI: 10.4324/9781315271361]

Eppi-Centre 2019

Eppi-Centre. EPPI-Centre Home. <https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/> 2019.

Evidence Partners 2022

Evidence Partners. Why organisations choose DistillerSR. <https://www.evidencepartners.com/> 2022.

Fisher 2018

Fisher D, Dugan L, Chenoweth E. Does US presidential rhetoric affect asymmetric political violence? *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 2019;**12**:132-150. [DOI: 10.1080/17539153.2018.1494120]

Glass 1997

Glass G. Interrupted time series quasi-experiments. In: R Jaeger, editors(s). Complementary methods for research in education. American Educational Research Association, 1997: 589-608.

Haner 2019

Haner M, Sloan M, Cullen F, Kulig T, Lero Jonson, C. Public concern about terrorism: fear, worry, and support for anti-Muslim policies. *Socius* 2019;**5**:1-16.

Haner 2021

Haner M, Sloan M, Cullen F, Graham A, Jonson C, Kulig T et al. Making America safe again: public support for policies to reduce terrorism. *Deviant Behavior* 2021;**42**(10):1209-1227. [DOI: 10.1080/01639625.2020.1738638]

Hardy 2018

Hardy K. Comparing theories of radicalisation with countering violent extremism policy. *Journal for Deradicalization* 2018;**15**:76-110.

Heath-Kelly 2013

Heath-Kelly C. Counter-terrorism and the counterfactual: producing the 'radicalisation' discourse and the UK PREVENT strategy. *The British Journal of Politics and International Relations* 2013;**15**(3):394-415. [DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-856X.2011.00489.x]

Higginson 2015

Higginson A, Eggins E, Mazerolle L, & Stanko E. The Global Policing Database [Database and Protocol]. Retrieved from <http://www.gpd.uq.edu.au> 2015.

Horgan 2008

Horgan J. From profiles to pathways and roots to routes: perspectives from psychology on radicalization into terrorism. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2008;**618**(1):80-94. [DOI: 10.1177/0002716208317531]

IEP 2022

Institute for Economics and Peace (IEP). Global terrorism index 2022: measuring the impact of terrorism. <https://www.visionofhumanity.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/GTI-2022-web.pdf> 2022.

Irwin 2015

Irwin N. The complexity of responding to home-grown terrorism: radicalisation, de-radicalisation, and disengagement. *Journal of Policing, Intelligence and Counter Terrorism* 2015;**10**(2):166-175. [DOI: 10.1080/18335330.2015.1089639]

Jacobs 2021

Jacobs L, van Spanje J. Not all terror is alike: how right-wing extremist and Islamist terror threats affect anti-immigration party support. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 2021;**33**(4):737-755.

Jensen 2018

Jensen MA, Atwell Seate A, James PA. Radicalization to violence: a pathway approach to studying extremism. *Terrorism and Political Violence* 2018;**32**(5):1067-1090.

Jensen 2020

Jensen M, Atwell Seate A, James P. Radicalization to violence: a pathway approach to studying extremism.

Terrorism and Political Violence 2020;**32**(5):1067-1090. [DOI: 10.1080/09546553.2018.1442330]

Jones 2018

Jones C, Narag R. Inmate radicalisation and recruitment in prisons. Routledge, 2018.

Kerry 2007

Kerry A. 2007-2008 integrated summative evaluation of the chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear first responder training program. <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/cnt/rsrscs/pblctns/archive-vltn-chmcl-biol-2007-08/archive-cbrn-pfpi-eng.pdf> 2007.

Knight 2009

Knight K. Exploring the Tampa Fusion Centre: interagency collaboration for homeland security. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global database (UMI No.: 3384701).

Kruglanski 2019

Kruglanski A, Bélanger J, Gunaratna R. The three pillars of radicalisation: needs, narratives, and networks. Oxford University Press, 2019.

Lamb 2013

Lamb L. Preventing violent extremism; a policing case study of the west midlands. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice* 2013;**7**(1):88-95. [DOI: 10.1093/polic/pas063]

Lewandowski 2012

Lewandowski C. Information sharing using a state fusion center: a case study of the New Jersey Regional Operations Intelligence Centre (Doctoral dissertation). ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No.: 3509012) 2012.

Lindekilde 2016

Lindekilde L, Bertelsen P, Stohl M. Who goes, why, and with what effects: the problem of foreign fighters from Europe. *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 2016;**27**(5):858-877. [DOI: 10.1080/09592318.2016.1208285]

Lum 2006

Lum C, Kennedy L, Sherley A. Are counter-terrorism strategies effective? The results of the Campbell systematic review on counter-terrorism evaluation research. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 2006;**2**(4):489-516. [DOI: 10.1007/s11292-006-9020-y]

Mazerolle 2018

Mazerolle L, Eggins E, Sydes M, Hine L, McEwan J, Norrie G, Somerville A. Criminal justice responses to domestic and family violence: a rapid review of the literature. <https://www.courts.qld.gov.au/data/assets/pdf/0006/586185/systematic-review-of-criminal-justice-responses-to-domestic-and-family-violence.pdf> 2018.

Mazerolle 2020

Mazerolle L, Eggins E, Cherney A, Hine L, Higginson A, Belton E. Police programmes that seek to increase community connectedness for reducing violent extremism behaviour,

attitudes and beliefs. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 2020;**16**(3):e1111. [DOI: 10.1002/cl2.1162]

Mazerolle 2021

Mazerolle L, Cherney A, Eggins E, Hine L, Higginson A. Multiagency programs with police as a partner for reducing radicalisation to violence. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 2021;**17**(2):e1162. [DOI: 10.1002/cl2.1111]

Ortiz 2007

Ortiz C, Hendricks N, Sugie N. Policing terrorism: the response of local police agencies to homeland security concerns. *Criminal Justice Studies* 2007;**20**(2):91-109. [DOI: 10.1080/14786010701396830]

Razik 2013

Razik S, Ehring T, Emmelkamp PM. Psychological consequences of terrorist attacks: Prevalence and predictors of mental health problems in Pakistani emergency responders. *Psychiatry Research* 2013;**207**(1-2):80-85.

Ritchie 2019

Ritchie H, Hasell J, Appel C, Roser M. Terrorism. Our world in data. <https://ourworldindata.org/terrorism> 2019.

Salguero 2011

Salguero J, Fernández-Berrocá P, Iruarrizaga I, Cano-Vindel A, Galea S. Major depressive disorder following terrorist attacks: a systematic review of prevalence, course and correlates. *BMC Psychiatry* 2011;**11**(1):1-11.

Sarma 2017

Sarma K. Risk assessment and the prevention of radicalization from nonviolence into terrorism. *American Psychologist* 2017;**72**(3):278-288. [DOI: 10.1037/amp0000121]

Schanzer 2016

Schanzer D, Kurzman C, Toliver J, Miller E. The challenge and promise of using community policing strategies to prevent violent extremism. <https://nij.ojp.gov/library/publications/challenge-and-promise-using-community-policing-strategies-prevent-violent-0> 2016.

Shanahan 2016

Shanahan T. The definition of terrorism. In: P Jackson, editors(s). *Routledge Handbook of Critical Terrorism Studies*. London and New York: Routledge, 2016:103-113.

Snilsveit 2016

Snilsveit B, Vojtková M, Bhaumik A, Stevenson J, Gaarder M. Evidence and gap maps: a tool for promoting evidence informed policy and strategic research agendas. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 2016;**79**:120-129. [DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.05.015]

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 1. Search plan

Source	Type	Approach	Website (if applicable)
--------	------	----------	-------------------------

US Agency for International Development 2016

United States Agency for International Development. The development response to violent extremism and insurgency. https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdacs400.pdf 2016.

van der Heide 2020

van der Heide L, Kearney O. The Dutch approach to extremist offenders. <https://icct.nl/app/uploads/2020/02/vanderheide-kearney-thedutchapproach.pdf?msclkid=e9c39505aa8d11eca4825dec4a43bd8f> 2020.

Vejvodová 2020

Vejvodová P, Kolář O. Training prison staff to recognize inmate radicalisation. *Security Journal* 2020;**33**(4):552-564. [DOI: 10.1057/s41284-019-00192-7]

White 2020

White H, Albers B, Gaarder M, Kornør H, Littell J, Marshall Z et al. Guidance for producing a Campbell evidence and gap map. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 2020;**e1125**:1-27. [DOI: 10.1002/cl2.1125]

Williamson 2019

Williamson H. Pride and prejudice: exploring how identity processes shape public attitudes towards Australian counter-terrorism measures. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 2019;**52**(4):558-577. [DOI: 10.1177/0004865819846944]

Williamson 2020

Williamson H, Murphy K. Animus toward Muslims and its association with public support for punitive counter-terrorism policies: did the Christchurch terrorist attack mitigate this association? *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 2020:1-21. [DOI: 10.1007/s11292-020-09450-x]

Wilner 2010

Wilner A, Dubouloz C. Homegrown terrorism and transformative learning: an interdisciplinary approach to understanding radicalization. *Global Change, Peace & Security* 2010;**22**(1):33-51. [DOI: 10.1080/14781150903487956]

Windisch 2016

Windisch S, Simi P, Ligon G, McNeel H. Disengagement from ideologically-based and violent organizations: a systematic review of the literature. *Journal for Deradicalization* 2016;**9**:1-38.

Wolfowicz 2019

Wolfowicz M, Litmanovitz Y, Weisburd D, Hasisi B. A field-wise systematic review and meta-analysis of putative risk and protective factors for radicalization outcomes. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 2019;**36**:407-447. [DOI: 10.1007/s10940-019-09439-4]

Table 1. Search plan (Continued)

Global Policing Database	Database	Title and abstract search on terrorism terms only
EBSCO	Database	Full search string <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criminal Justice Abstracts
HeinOnline	Database	Full search string <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Law Journal library Criminal Justice & Criminology Foreign and International Law Resources Database United Nations Law Collection
Informit	Database	Full search string with databases searched simultaneously <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Australian Criminology DB (CINCH) AGIS Plus Text
National Criminal Justice Reference Service	Database	We have access to the free website where we will conduct basic keyword searches for terrorism terms. Will be able to web-scrape results.
ProQuest	Database	Full search string with databases searched simultaneously <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criminal Justice Dissertations & Theses Global Digital National Security Archive PTSDPubs Social Science Database Sociological Abstracts (incl. Social Services Abstracts)
FORENSICnetBASE	Database	Modified search due to database functionality, focus on terrorism search terms
PsycINFO	Database	Full search string
CrimeSolutions.gov	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature in the corrections subsets
Campbell Collaboration – terrorism reviews	Journal	Hand search for terrorism intervention reviews
Cochrane Library	Database	Full search string
Urban Institute	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature https://www.urban.org/policy-center

Table 1. Search plan (Continued)

			ters/justice-policy-center/publications
What Works Toolkit	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	http://whatworks.college.police.uk/toolkit/Pages/Toolkit.aspx
National Institute of Corrections	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	
RAND	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature in the Better Policing Toolkit, the Courts and Corrections sections	https://www.rand.org/pubs/tools/TL261/better-policing-toolkit.html https://www.rand.org/jie/justice-policy/pubs/courts.html https://www.rand.org/jie/justice-policy/correctional-education.html https://www.rand.org/jie/justice-policy/projects/priority-criminal-justice-needs.html
UK Government research	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature. Policing literature is already captured in GPD for this site, so the search will target the courts/correctional agencies	https://www.gov.uk/search/research-and-statistics
Prison Research Centre	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.prc.crim.cam.ac.uk/publications/articles
Correctional Service Canada	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	http://www.csc-scc.gc.ca/research/005008-2006-eng.shtml
NZ Corrective Services	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	http://www.corrections.govt.nz/resources/research_and_statistics.html
Centre for Advancing Correctional Excellence	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.gmuace.org/
Victorian Corrections, Prisons and Parole	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.corrections.vic.gov.au/publications-manuals-and-statistics
New South Wales Corrective Services	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	http://www.correctiveservices.justice.nsw.gov.au/Pages/CorrectiveServices/related-links/publications-and-policies/cor

Table 1. Search plan (Continued)

			rections-research-evaluation-and-statistics/Research_Publication.aspx
			http://www.correctiveservices.justice.nsw.gov.au/Pages/CorrectiveServices/related-links/publications-and-policies/corrections-research-evaluation-and-statistics/collaborative-reports.aspx
South Australia Corrective Services	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.corrections.sa.gov.au/about/our-research
Western Australia Corrective Services	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.correctiveservices.wa.gov.au/about-us/statistics-publications/default.aspx
Northern Territory Corrective Services	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://justice.nt.gov.au/attorney-general-and-justice/justice-publications
Tasmanian Corrective Services	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.justice.tas.gov.au/
Australian Capital Territory Corrective Services	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	http://www.cs.act.gov.au/act_corrective_services/statistics_and_publications
Queensland Corrective Services	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://corrections.qld.gov.au/documents/reviews-and-reports/
Global Terrorism Research Centre (Monash University)	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://www.monash.edu/arts/social-sciences/gtrec/publications
Triangle Centre on Terrorism and Homeland Security	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://sites.duke.edu/tcths/#
Department of Homeland Security	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://www.dhs.gov/topics
Public Safety Canada	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/index-en.aspx
National Consortium for the Study of Terrorism and	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://www.start.umd.edu/

Criminal justice interventions for preventing terrorism and radicalisation: An evidence and gap map (Protocol)
14

Copyright © 2022 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Table 1. Search plan (Continued)

Responses to Terrorism
(START)

Terrorism Research Centre	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	http://www.terrorism.org/
Global Centre on Cooperative Security	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://www.globalcenter.org/publications/
Hedayah	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	http://www.hedayahcenter.org/publications
Radicalisation Awareness Network (RAN)	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/radicalisation_awareness_network_en
RadicalisationResearch	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://www.radicalisationresearch.org/
Royal United Services Institute (RUSI)	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://rusi.org/
Impact Europe	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	http://impacteurope.eu/
International Association of Law Enforcement Intelligence Analysts	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.ialeia.org/resources_publication-s.php
Naval Post-Graduate School	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://nps.edu/web/research/home
World Health Organisation International Trial Registry	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.who.int/clinical-trials-registry-platform
Trial registries indexed on the Office for Human Research Protections website	Grey	Hand search for terrorism intervention literature	https://www.hhs.gov/ohrp/international/clinical-trial-registries/index.html
International Centre for Counter-Terrorism	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://icct.nl/topic/criminal-justice-response/
International Centre for the Study of Radicalisation	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://icsr.info/publications/
Combating Terrorism Center	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://ctc.usma.edu/ctc-sentinel/
Centre of Excellence Defence Against Terrorism	Grey	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://www.tmmm.tsk.tr/research.html

Table 1. Search plan (Continued)

Critical Studies on Terrorism	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Dynamics of Asymmetric Conflict	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Intelligence and Counter Terrorism	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
International Journal of Conflict and Violence	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Journal for Deradicalization	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Perspectives on Terrorism	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Studies in Conflict and Terrorism	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Terrorism and Political Violence	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Democracy and Security	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
International Journal of Cyber Warfare and Terrorism	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Small Wars & Insurgencies	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms
Journal of Peace Research	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms

Table 1. Search plan (Continued)

International Studies Review	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms	
Media, War & Conflict	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Web of Science. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms	
Counter Terrorist Trends & Analysis (CTTA)	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Jstor. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms	
Prism	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Jstor. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms	
International Journal of Peace Studies	Journal	Targeted search within journal in Jstor. Search on courts/corrections and evaluation terms	
Journal of Security, Intelligence and Resilience Education	Journal	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://jsire.org/about/
Journal of Terrorism Research	Journal	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://cvir.st-andrews.ac.uk/articles/search/
The Journal of International Security Affairs	Journal	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	https://security-affairs.com/about/
Journal of 9/11 Studies	Journal	Hand search for criminal justice intervention literature	http://www.journalof911studies.com/J911S/articles/

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Appendix A: GPD Systematic search strategy

Search Terms

To ensure optimum sensitivity and specificity, the GPD search strategy utilises a combination of free-text and controlled vocabulary search terms. Because controlled vocabularies and search capabilities vary across databases, the exact combination of search terms and field codes are adapted to each database. Final search syntax for each location will be reported in the final review.

The free-text search terms for the GPD are provided in Table 1 and are grouped by substantive (i.e., some form of policing) and evaluation terminology. Although the search strategy may vary slightly across search locations, it follows a number of general rules:

- Search terms are combined into search strings using Boolean operators “AND” and “OR”. Specifically, terms within each category are combined with “OR”, and categories will be combined with “AND”. For example: (police OR policing OR “law#enforcement”) AND (analy* OR ANCOVA OR ANOVA OR ...).
- Compound terms (e.g., law enforcement) are considered single terms in search strings by using quotation marks (i.e., “law#enforcement”) to ensure that the database searches for the entire term rather than separate words.
- Wild cards and truncation codes are used for search terms with multiple iterations from a stem word (e.g., evaluation, evaluate) or spelling variations (e.g., evaluat* or randomi#e).

- If a database has a controlled vocabulary term that is equivalent to “POLICE”, the term is combined in a search string that includes both the policing and evaluation free-text search terms. This approach ensures that the search retrieves documents that do not use policing terms in the title/abstract but have been indexed as being related to policing in the database. An example of this approach is the following search string: (((SU: “POLICE”) OR (TI,AB,KW: police OR policing OR “law*enforcement”)) AND (TI,AB,KW: intervention* OR evaluat* OR compar* OR ...)).
- For search locations with limited search functionality, a broad search that uses only the policing free-text terms is implemented.
- Multidisciplinary database searches are limited to relevant disciplines (e.g., include social sciences but exclude physical sciences).
- Search results are refined to exclude specific types of documents that are not suitable for systematic reviews (e.g., newspapers, front/back matter, book reviews).

Table 1. Free-text search terms for the GPD systematic search

Policing Search Terms	Evaluation Search Terms			
police	analy*	data	outcome	result*
policing	ANCOVA	effect*	parame*	“risk#ratio*”
“law*enforce- ment”	ANOVA	efficacy	“post-test”	sampl*
constab*	“ABAB design”	eval*	posttest	“standard deviation*”
detective*	“AB design”	experiment*	“post test”	statistic*
sheriff*	baseline	hypothes*	predict*	studies
	causa*	impact*	“pre-test”	study
	“chi#square”	interven*	pretest	survey*
	coefficient*	interview*	program*	“systematic review*”
	“comparison condition*”	longitudinal	“propensity score*”	“t#test*”
	“comparison group*”	MANCOVA	quantitative	“time#series”
	“control condition*”	MANOVA	“quasi#experiment*”	treatment*
	“control group*”	“matched group”	questionnaire*	variable*
	correlat*	measure*	random*	variance
	covariat*	“meta-analy*”	RCT	
	“cross#section*”	“odds#ratio*”	regress*	

Search Locations

To reduce publication and discipline bias, the GPD search strategy adopts an international scope and involves searching for literature across a number of disciplines (e.g., criminology, law, political science, public health, sociology, social science and social work). The search captures a comprehensive range of published (i.e., journal articles, book chapters, books) and unpublished literature (e.g., working papers, governmental reports, technical reports, conference proceedings, dissertations) by implementing a search strategy across bibliographic/academic, grey literature, and dissertation databases or repositories.

It is noted that there is substantial overlap of the content coverage between many of the databases. Therefore, the *Optimal Searching of Indexing Databases* (OSID) computer program (Neville & Higginson, 2014) has been used to analyse the content crossover for all databases that have accessible content coverage lists. OSID analyses the content coverage and creates a search location solution that provides the most comprehensive coverage via the least number of databases. Another advantage of using OSID when designing a search strategy is the reduction in the number of duplicates that would need to be removed prior to the screening phase. Databases with >10 unique titles are searched in full, whereas databases with ≤10 unique titles were searched only the unique titles and any non-serial content (e.g., reports, conference proceedings). Where a modified search of a database would be more labour-intensive than a full search and export results, a full search of the database is conducted. The final search locations and solutions are reported in Table 2.

Table 2. GPD search locations and protocol (January 1st 1950 – December 2019)

INDEXED & ACADEMIC DATABASES		CONTENT COVERAGE FED INTO OSID?	FULL OR MODIFIED SEARCH?	SEARCH MODIFICATIONS
ProQuest	Criminal Justice	Yes	Full	None.
	Dissertation and Theses Database Global	Not Available	Modified	Social Sciences subset.
	Political Science	Yes	Full	None.
	Periodical Archive Online	Yes	Full	None.
	Research Library	Yes	Modified	Social Sciences subset.
	Social Science Journals	Yes	Full	None.
	Sociology	Yes	Modified	Search 2 unique journal titles and non-serial content only.
	Applied Social Sciences Index and Abstracts	Yes	Full	None.
	International Bibliography of the Social Sciences	Yes	Full	None.
	Public Affairs Information Service	Yes	Full	None.
	Social Service Abstracts	Yes	Modified	Search 5 unique journal titles and non-serial content only.
	Sociological Abstracts	Yes	Full	None.
EBSCO	Worldwide Political Sciences Abstracts	Yes	Modified	Search 9 unique journal titles and non-serial content only.
	Academic Search Premier	Yes	Full	None.
	Criminal Justice Abstracts	Yes	Full	None.

(Continued)

	EconLit	Yes	Full	None.
	MEDLINE with Full-Text (for initial search 1950-2014)	Yes	Full	None.
	Social Sciences Full-Text	Yes	Full	None.
OVID	International Political Science Abstracts	Not Available	Full	None.
	PsycARTICLES	Yes	Modified	Search 4 unique journal titles only.
	PsycEXTRA	Not Available	Full	None.
	PsycINFO	Yes	Full	None.
	Social Work Abstracts	Not Available	Full	None.
Web of Science	Current Contents Connect – Social and Behavioural Sciences Edition	Yes	Modified	Search 1 unique journal title and non-serial content only.
	Book Citation Index (Social Sciences and Humanities)	Not Available	Full	None.
	Conference Proceedings Citation Index (Social Sciences and Humanities)	Not Available	Full	None.
	MEDLINE with Full-Text (for searches 2011 onwards)	Yes	Full	None.
	Social Science Citation Index	Yes	Full	None.
Informit	Australian Attorney General Information Service	Yes	Full	None.
	Australian Criminal Justice Database (CINCH)	Yes	Full	None.
	Australian Federal Police Database	Yes	Full	None.
	Australian Public Affairs Full-Text	Yes	Full	None.
	DRUG	Yes	Full	None.
	Health & Society Database	Yes	Modified	Search unique journal titles and non-serial content only.
	Humanities and Social Sciences Collection	Yes	Full	None.
Gale-Cengage	Expanded Academic ASAP	Yes	Full	None.
STANDALONE & OPEN ACCESS DATABASES	Cambridge Journals Online	Yes	Modified	Search 4 unique journal titles in Law and Political Science collections and

(Continued)

			full search of Social Studies collection.
Directory of Open Access Journals	Yes	Full	None.
HeinOnline	Yes	Modified	Law Journals Online collection only.
JSTOR	Yes	Modified	Search unique titles across the Law, Political Science, Public Health, Public Policy, Social Work and Sociology collections only. The Criminal Justice collection had no unique content and so will be excluded from the search. Only 10% of content in this database have abstracts and a full-text search returns >250,000 results because of inability to construct complex search strings. Therefore, a modified search of the unique titles across these collections will be more pragmatic than a full search of the database.
Oxford Scholarship Online	Yes	Full	None.
Sage Journals Online and Archive (Page Premier)	Yes	Modified	Search 5 unique journal titles and non-serial content only.
ScienceDirect	Yes	Full	None.
SCOPUS	Yes	Full	None.
SpringerLink	Yes	Full	Although this database has low uniqueness when combined with the full set of databases, a full search using only the policing search terms will be more pragmatic than a modified search on unique titles because of the restricted search functionality of this database.
Taylor & Francis Online	Yes	Modified	Although this database has low uniqueness when combined with the full set of databases, a full search using only the policing search terms will be more pragmatic than a modified search on unique titles

(Continued)

because of the restricted
search functionality of this
database.

Wiley Online Library	Yes	Full	None.
California Commission on Peace Officer Standards & Training Library	No	Full	None.
Cochrane Library	No	Full	None.
CrimeSolutions.gov	No	Full	None.
Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE)	No	Full	None.
FBI – The Fault (Reports and Publications)	No	Full	None.
Evidence-Based Policing Matrix	No	Full	None.
International Initiative for Impact Evaluation Database (3ie)	No	Full	None.
National Criminal Justice Reference Service	No	Full	None.
Safety Lit Database	No	Full	None.
Australian Institute of Criminology	No	Full	None.
Bureau of Police Research and Development (India)	No	Full	None.
Canadian Police Research Catalogue	No	Full	None.
Centre for Problem-Oriented Policing	No	Full	None.
College of Policing (including POLKA and Crime Reduction Toolkit)	No	Full	None.
European Police College (CEPOL)	No	Full	None.
Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Coordinating Centre	No	Full	None.
National Research Institute of Police Science (Japanese)	No	Full	None.
Office of Community Oriented Policing Services	No	Full	None.
Police Executive Research Forum (US)	No	Full	None.
Police Foundation (US)	No	Full	None.
Tasmania Institute of Law Enforcement Studies (Australia)	No	Full	None.

(Continued)

Policing Online Information System (POLIS, Europe)	No	Full	None.
Scottish Institute for Policing Research	No	Full	None.
Centre of Excellence in Policing and Security (Australian, now archived)	No	Full	None.
Alcohol and Alcohol Problems Science Database (ETOH, now archived)	No	Full	None.
African Journals Online	No	Full	None.
Campbell Collaboration Library of Systematic Reviews	No	Full	None.
Criminal Justice Press (Crime Prevention Studies, volumes 1-27)	No	Full	None.
Danish National Police (Politi)	No	Full	None.
Drug Policy Alliance – Lindesmith Library (Online Resource Library)	No	Full	None.
DrugScope	No	Full	None.
Finnish Police (Poliisi)	No	Full	None.
GeoRef	No	Full	None.
German Federal Criminal Police Office (Bundeskriminalamt)	No	Full	None.
Home Office (United Kingdom)	No	Full	None.
Indian Citation Index (Social Science and Humanities Subseries)	No	Full	None.
Institute for Law and Justice	No	Full	None.
Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science (JDI)	No	Full	None.
Justice Research and Statistics Association- State Statistical Analysis Centers	No	Full	None.
Ministry of Justice (United Kingdom)	No	Full	None.
Netherlands Institute for the Study of Crime and Law Enforcement (NSCR)	No	Full	None.
Netherlands Police (Politie)	No	Full	None.
New Zealand Ministry of Justice	No	Full	None.
New Zealand Police	No	Full	None.

(Continued)

Norwegian Ministry of Justice and the Police	No	Full	None.
Royal Canadian Mounted Police	No	Full	None.
SAGE Knowledge	No	Full	None.
Swedish National Council on Crime Prevention (Brå)	No	Full	None.
Swedish Police Service	No	Full	None.
Urban Institute	No	Full	None.
YU-DSpace Repository	No	Full	None.

Appendix 2. Appendix B: GPD Systematic Compilation Strategy

Inclusion Criteria

Each record captured by the GPD systematic search must satisfy all inclusion criteria to be included in the GPD: timeframe, intervention and research design. There are no restrictions applied to the types of outcomes, participants, settings or languages considered eligible for inclusion in the GPD.

Types of interventions

Each document must contain an impact evaluation of a policing intervention. Policing interventions are defined as some kind of a strategy, program, technique, approach, activity, campaign, training, directive, or funding/organisational change that involves police in some way (other agencies or organisations can be involved). Police involvement is broadly defined as:

- Police initiation, development or leadership
- Police are recipients of the intervention or the intervention is related, focused or targeted to police practices
- Delivery or implementation of the intervention by police

Types of study designs

The GPD includes quantitative impact evaluations of policing interventions that utilise randomised experimental (e.g., RCTs) or quasi-experimental evaluation designs with a valid comparison group that does not receive the intervention. The GPD includes designs where the comparison group receives 'business-as-usual' policing, no intervention or an alternative intervention (treatment-treatment designs).

The specific list of research designs included in the GPD are as follows:

- Systematic reviews with or without meta-analyses
- Cross-over designs
- Cost-benefit analyses
- Regression discontinuity designs
- Designs using multivariate controls (e.g., multiple regression)
- Matched control group designs with or without pre-intervention baseline measures (propensity or statistically matched)
- Unmatched control group designs with pre-post intervention measures which allow for difference-in-difference analysis
- Unmatched control group designs without pre-intervention measures where the control group has face validity
- Short interrupted time-series designs with control group (less than 25 pre- and 25 post-intervention observations)

- Long interrupted time-series designs with or without a control group (≥ 25 pre- and post-intervention observations)
- Raw unadjusted correlational designs where the variation in the level of the intervention is compared to the variation in the level of the outcome

The GPD excludes single group designs with pre- and post-intervention measures as these designs are highly subject to bias and threats to internal validity.

Systematic Screening

To establish eligibility, records captured by the GPD search are progress through a series of systematic stages which are summarised in Table 1, with additional detail provided in the following subsections.

All research staff working on the GPD undergo standardised training before beginning work within any of the stages detailed below. Staff then complete short training simulations to enable an assessment of their understanding of the GPD protocols and highlight any areas for additional training. In addition, random samples of each staff's work are regularly cross-checked to ensure adherence to protocols. Disagreements about screening decisions between staff are mediated by either the project manager or GPD chief investigators.

Title and abstract screening

After removing duplicates, the title and abstract of records captured by the GPD systematic search is screened by trained research staff to identify potentially eligible research that satisfies the following criteria:

- Document is dated between 1950 – present
- Document is unique (i.e., not a duplicate)
- Document is about police or policing
- Document is an eligible document type (e.g., not a book review)

Records are excluded if the answer to any one of the criteria is unambiguously 'No', and will be classified as potentially eligible otherwise. Records classified as eligible at the title and abstract screening stage progress to full-text document retrieval and screening stages.

Full-text eligibility screening

Wherever possible, a full-text electronic version of an eligible record is imported into *SysReview* (review management software; Higginson & Neville, 2015). For records without an electronic version, a hardcopy of the record is located to enable full-text eligibility screening. The full-text of each document is screened to identify studies that satisfy the following criteria:

- Document is dated between 1950 – present
- Document is unique
- Document reports a quantitative statistical comparison
- Document reports on policing evaluation
- Document reports in a quantitative impact evaluation of a policing intervention
- Evaluation uses an eligible research design

SYSTEMATIC SEARCH OF PUBLISHED & UNPUBLISHED LITERATURE

↓

EXPORT SEARCH RESULTS

- Bibliographic data and abstracts exported into EndNote

(Continued)

- Data cleaned and duplicate records removed

↓

IMPORT SEARCH RESULTS INTO SYSREVIEW

↓

SCREEN TITLES AND ABSTRACTS FOR ELIGIBILITY

1. Not a duplicate document?
2. Between 1950 – present?
3. About police or policing?
4. Eligible document type?

If not clearly excluded on any criteria...

↓

DOCUMENT RETRIEVAL

- Retrieve electronic and hard copies of all eligible documents
- Attach electronic versions to records in SysReview

↓

SCREEN FULL-TEXT OF DOCUMENTS

FOR FINAL ELIGIBILITY

1. Not a duplicate document?
2. Between 1950 – present?
3. Quantitative statistical comparison?
4. Policing intervention?
5. Quantitative impact evaluation?
6. Eligible research design?

If 'Yes' to all...

↓

CATEGORISE ELIGIBLE DOCUMENTS

1. Research design
2. Intervention location
3. Publication date
4. Problem targeted
5. Evaluation outcome measure(s)
6. Type of policing intervention

↓

GLOBAL POLICING DATABASE (GPD)

Web-based

Searchable

(Continued)

Updated biennially

Table 1. GPD systematic compilation process

Appendix 3. Appendix C: Coding Form

Coding form[1]

General Study Details

1. Study ID [textbox] (this will refer to the document/s using a unique identifier)
2. Report ID [textbox] (this will be used to denote whether multiple studies are nested within the document, e.g., Smith 2020a, 2020b, etc.)
3. What type of document is this study? [dropdown menu]
 - a. Peer-reviewed journal article
 - b. Book chapter
 - c. Dissertation
 - d. Conference presentation
 - e. Government report, technical report, or working paper
 - f. Other (specify in textbox)
4. Where was the intervention implemented (please list city, county, state/province and country as applicable)? [textbox]
5. In what year was the intervention implemented? [textbox]
6. If the evaluation and/or intervention was funded, record the funding source. [textbox]
7. Publication status
8. Ongoing
9. Completed

Participants

1. Who are the participants? [checkboxes]
 - a. Criminal justice practitioners
 - b. Victims
 - c. Radicalised individuals or groups (including pre-criminal justice involved radicalised individuals)
 - d. Individuals or groups who have engaged in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
 - e. Individuals or groups who have been identified as at-risk of becoming radicalised or engaging in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
 - f. Family members of radicalised individuals or individuals who have engaged in violent extremism and/or terrorist activity
 - g. Communities
 - h. Micro places (e.g., street corners, buildings, police beats, street segments)
 - i. Macro places (neighbourhoods or larger geographies)
 - j. Other
2. What were the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the study? [textbox]

Number of Participants	Treatment	Comparison	Total
Referred to study			
Consented			
Assigned			
Began intervention			

(Continued)

Completed intervention

Completed follow-up 1

Completed follow-up 2 (if applicable)

1. Describe the characteristics of the sample. [textboxes]

	Treatment	Comparison	Total
Age (M, SD, range)			
Gender (% female)			
Ethnicity (proportions)			
Socioeconomic status (proportions)			

1. Record any other pertinent sample information for both the treatment and comparison groups. [textbox].

Methodological Details and Nature of Comparisons

1. General research design classification [dropdown menu]
 - a. Systematic review
 - b. Randomised controlled trial
 - c. Quasi-experiment
 - d. Other (specify in textbox)
2. What type of comparison condition was used? [dropdown menu]
 - a. No treatment
 - b. Treatment-as-usual (specify in textbox)
 - c. Alternative treatment (specify in textbox)
 - d. Waitlist control
 - e. Other (specify in textbox)

Intervention Details

1. What is the name of the intervention(s), as reported by study authors? [textbox]

2. What settings were used during the intervention(s)? [select all that apply]
 - a. Prisons/correctional facilities
 - b. Courts
 - c. Community
 - d. School
 - e. Workplace
 - f. Places of worship (e.g., church)
 - g. Home
 - h. Other (specify)
3. Which agencies were involved in implementing the intervention? [select all that apply]
 - a. Police
 - b. Prison/correctional facilities
 - c. Courts
 - d. Probation/parole
 - e. Other criminal justice agency not listed here [specify]
 - f. Non-criminal justice partner* must be selected in combination with a-d options
4. If multiagency, how many agencies were involved? [textbox]
5. If the intervention involved non-criminal justice partner/s, please specify which these were [textbox]
6. Does the intervention target terrorism, radicalisation, or both? [textbox]
7. What level of prevention does the intervention involve (e.g., primary, secondary, tertiary)? [textbox]
8. Describe the intervention provided to participants, ensuring you record the specific components or materials implemented and the mode of implementation. [textbox]

Outcome(s) Measurement*

*To be completed for each eligible outcome within a study (or group of reports for a study).

1. Briefly describe the outcome being measured (e.g., its name, how it is conceptualised by study authors, what higher or lower value mean). [textbox]
2. What category does the outcome fall within? [dropdown menu]
 - a. Extremism or radicalisation
 - b. Crime or offending
 - c. Psychosocial
 - d. Other (specify)
3. How was the outcome data gathered? [dropdown menu]
 - a. Self-report
 - b. Observation
 - c. Official source
 - d. Interview
 - e. Other (specify in textbox)

[1] This form has been informed by published coding forms (e.g., Littel et al., 2008; Mazerolle, Higginson, & Eggins, in press; Mitchell, Wilson, Eggers, & MacKenzie, 2012; Mazerolle et al., 2021).

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

- Content: Michelle Sydes, Lorelei Hine, Laura Dugan, Angela Higginson, Lorraine Mazerolle

- EGM methods: Angela Higginson, Michelle Sydes, Lorelei Hine
- Statistical analysis: Angela Higginson, Michelle Sydes, Lorelei Hine
- Information retrieval: Lorelei Hine, Michelle Sydes, Angela Higginson, Laura Dugan

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Two of the review authors have internal roles within the Campbell Collaboration Crime and Justice Group. Angela Higginson is an Editor and Co-Chair of the Crime and Justice Coordinating Group (CJCG) and Lorelei Hine is the Managing Editor of the CJCG. Angela Higginson and Lorelei Hine will not be involved in any editorial or internal Campbell Collaboration communications about this review.

Plans for updating the EGM

Michelle Sydes will be responsible for updates of this review, which are anticipated to occur every 5 years.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

- No sources of support provided

External sources

- No sources of support provided