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Synopsis

Background: A global antimicrobial resistance (AMR) awareness intervention targeting the general public has been prioritised.

Objectives: To evaluate the effectiveness of interventions which aim to change AMR awareness and subsequent stewardship behaviours amongst the public.

Methods: Five databases were searched between 2000 and 2016 for interventions to change the public’s AMR awareness and/or antimicrobial stewardship behaviours. Study designs meeting the EPOC criteria: non-controlled before and after studies and prospective cohort studies were considered eligible. Participants recruited from healthcare settings and studies measuring stewardship behaviours of healthcare professionals were excluded. Quality of studies was assessed using EPOC risk of bias criteria. Data were extracted and synthesised narratively.

Results: Twenty studies were included in the review with nine meeting the EPOC criteria. The overall risk of bias was high. Nineteen studies were conducted in high-income countries. Mass media interventions were most common (n = 7), followed by school-based (n = 6) and printed materials interventions (n = 6). Seventeen studies demonstrated a significant effect on changing knowledge, attitudes, or the public’s antimicrobial stewardship behaviours. Analysis showed that interventions targeting schoolchildren and parents have a notable potential but for the general public the picture is less clear.

Conclusions: Our work provides an in-depth examination of the effectiveness of AMR interventions for the public. However, the studies were heterogeneous and the quality of
evidence was poor. Well-designed, experimental studies on behavioural outcomes of such interventions are required.

Registration: PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO 2016:CRD42016050343).
Introduction

The rise of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) is a rapidly developing global threat that greatly affects our ability to deliver effective healthcare and results in a financial burden.\(^1\) AMR refers to the ability of a microorganism to adapt and grow despite the presence of antimicrobials. AMR threatens effective treatment of an ever-increasing range of infections.\(^1\) Therefore, increasing AMR is becoming a major public health concern. Although AMR is a naturally occurring phenomenon, inappropriate use of antimicrobials is the main driver of AMR.\(^1\) The demands for the use of antimicrobials are increasing worldwide and because of suboptimal management of these demands, huge quantities of antimicrobials are being misused.\(^2\) Together these highlight the need for effective strategies encouraging prudent use of antimicrobials.

The O’Neil report emphasises the need for AMR awareness interventions directed towards the public and development of a uniform, globally consistent set of AMR messages that could be then tailored to meet the specific demands of local settings.\(^2\) However, the report does not provide recommendations on components of such interventions.\(^2\)

Previous evidence syntheses shows that the overall levels of knowledge and understanding of AMR amongst the public is generally low and members of the public often lack an understanding of their potential contribution to the development of AMR.\(^3\)\(^5\) Although high-level evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of interventions in increasing public understanding of AMR exists,\(^5\)\(^7\) these evaluations are methodologically diverse. It is therefore challenging to identify what interventions work, why and for whom in order to inform future interventions.

Thus, the aim of this systematic review is to provide the best quality evidence regarding the effectiveness of AMR interventions that change public awareness and their subsequent antimicrobial stewardship behaviours. Although, antimicrobial stewardship is most commonly thought of in medical settings, the word “stewardship” means “taking care of” particularly on behalf of others.
Furthermore, a One Health perspective requires the collaborative effort of all stakeholders to take the responsibility for the prudent use of antimicrobials. Therefore, within this work, we use the term “antimicrobial stewardship” to explore the public’s behaviours related to their prudent use of antimicrobials (such as, but not limited to: adhering to prescribers’ directions, not taking or demanding antimicrobial prescription for colds and flu and safe disposal of leftover antimicrobials). We believe an understanding of the public’s antimicrobial stewardship is central to engaging them with their part to play in reducing the drivers of AMR on behalf of future generations, other key stakeholders such as prescribers, and the global community.

Methods

This review was prospectively registered on the PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO 2016:CRD42016050343 Available from: http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/display_record.asp?ID=CRD42016050343), and is reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement.

Search strategy

CINAHL, Cochrane Library, EMBASE, MEDLINE and PsycINFO databases were searched for articles published between 2000 and 2016 using keywords associated with the following four concept areas: (1) population - general public; (2) intervention - interventions designed to increase antimicrobial awareness and/or to improve antimicrobial stewardship behaviour amongst the general public; (3) context - AMR or the public’s antimicrobial stewardship; outcomes - all relevant short, medium or long-term outcomes related to the public’s antimicrobial resistance and/or antimicrobial stewardship behaviours (knowledge/awareness, learning, public behavioural and cognition outcomes). The search strategy incorporated controlled vocabulary thesaurus terms and free text words contained in titles and abstracts. No restrictions were applied to language and publication
status. The search strategy was amended according to the functionality of each of the databases. An example of the search strategy applied to MEDLINE is presented in Table S1 (available at JAC Online).

In addition to the database search, the reference lists of included papers and previous systematic reviews were searched manually and citation searches were conducted through Web of Science in order to identify additional records.

**Study selection**

Cochrane’s Effective Practice and Organization of Care (EPOC) recommendations were used to initially select studies for inclusion in the review. Although, EPOC guidelines suggest the inclusion of Randomised controlled trials (RCT), Non-randomised controlled trials (NRT), controlled before and after studies (CBA), Interrupted time series studies (ITS) and repeated measures studies exclusively, because of the limited number of eligible studies meeting the EPOC criteria, non-controlled before and after studies and prospective cohort studies were also deemed eligible to the review. Interventions targeting the general public population and designed to increase public antimicrobial awareness and/or to improve the public’s antimicrobial stewardship were deemed eligible to the review. Furthermore, time bound geographical controls or no exposure comparators and all relevant short, medium or long-term outcomes related to antimicrobial resistance and/or the public’s antimicrobial stewardship behaviours were included, while those related to antimicrobial prescribing were excluded as this was regarded as the behaviour of healthcare professionals rather than of the members of the general public. Eligibility criteria applied in this study are presented in detail in Table 1.

Titles and abstracts of identified records were screened against the eligibility criteria (Table 1) by one of three reviewers (MY, LG, FS) with a 30% sub-set of excluded studies independently checked by another reviewer (MY, LG or FS). The level of agreement on this sub-set was 99%. Disagreements were resolved with the involvement of another, experienced reviewer (LP). Full-texts of papers which appeared to meet the inclusion criteria, or where there was insufficient information within
the title and abstract were screened by two out of three independent reviewers (LG, MY, FS), with a fourth reviewer (LP) checking all decisions and resolving any discrepancies. Whenever possible, foreign-language papers were translated by members of the team who have a command in foreign languages (LG, JP), or were translated using Google Translate.

**Data extraction and quality assessment**

Two out of three reviewers (LG, MY, FS) independently extracted data from eligible studies using a standardised tool, designed for the purpose of the study (Table S2, available at JAC online).

For studies that met the EPOC study design criteria (RT, NRT, CBA, ITS), risk of bias was assessed across domains by one reviewer (MY, LG or FS) and checked by a second reviewer (MY, LG or FS) using standard EPOC risk of bias criteria. Disagreements were resolved through consensus or, if necessary consulted with fourth reviewer (LP). Risk of bias assessments were not conducted for non-controlled before and after studies as it was assumed that the risk of bias of these studies was high. No studies were excluded based on quality assessment.

**Data analysis**

Given the heterogeneity of the study designs, populations, interventions and outcome measures, it was not possible to pool the results in a meta-analysis. Therefore, we applied an alternative, systematic approach to assessing complex interventions and carried out a narrative synthesis of evidence following the Cochrane Consumers and Communication Review Group’s guidelines. Individual study characteristics and findings were summarised and similarities, differences and patterns identified. Studies were grouped to those meeting or not meeting the EPOC criteria and categorised according to the target population. To identify discernible patterns of effectiveness, identified studies were mapped across five categories of intervention effectiveness. These categories were based upon both the strength of the evidence and the position of the primary outcome within the casual chain linking antecedents of behaviour to actual behaviour change. For example,
knowledge is understood to be a necessary but insufficient predictor of behaviour as people can
develop good awareness and understanding of AMR yet still fail to implement the public’s AMR
stewardship. The five categories of a relative measure of effectiveness included (1) interventions
indicative of clear positive behaviour change in the desired direction, (2) interventions indicative of
some positive behaviour change in the desired direction, (3) interventions indicative of positive
effect on the antecedent of behaviour, such as knowledge or awareness in the desired direction, (4)
interventions indicative of no effect on behaviour or antecedents of behaviour, and (5)
interventions indicative of negative effect on behaviour or antecedents of behaviour in a non-desired direction.

Results

Electronic search resulted in the total of 17,312 records. An additional 31 records were identified
through reference and citation searching of the included papers. A total number of 60 studies that
did not meet eligibility criteria were excluded during the full text reviewing stage. Articles were
excluded for not meeting study design criteria, study participants being recruited from healthcare
settings, context other than AMR, study outcomes not related to the public’s AMR awareness or
antimicrobial stewardship, full text record being unavailable, and other reasons such as record being
a study protocol, conference abstract of already identified study, short report of already identified
study, inability to translate non-English paper, or majority of participants recruited for the study
being healthcare workers. A detailed list of excluded papers is presented in Table S3 (available at JAC
Online). Following screening, 20 studies that matched the eligibility criteria were included in the
review. A detailed process of study selection is presented in Figure 1.
Study characteristics

As shown in Table 2, study designs of the 20 reviewed studies included randomised controlled trials (n = 2),\textsuperscript{11, 12} non-randomised controlled trials (n = 3),\textsuperscript{13-15} controlled before-after studies (n = 4),\textsuperscript{16-19} non-controlled before-after studies (n = 10)\textsuperscript{20-29} and a prospective cohort study (n = 1).\textsuperscript{30}

Apart from one study conducted in Moldova,\textsuperscript{16} all studies were conducted in high-income countries, with the majority conducted in the United States (US) (n = 8),\textsuperscript{11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 23, 28, 30} or in the United Kingdom (UK) (n = 5).\textsuperscript{18, 22, 24, 26, 27} The remaining studies were conducted in Italy,\textsuperscript{13} Portugal,\textsuperscript{20} Poland,\textsuperscript{25} New Zealand,\textsuperscript{21} and Australia,\textsuperscript{29} while one study was a multisite study conducted in the UK, Czech Republic and France\textsuperscript{17} (Table 2).

As shown in Table 2, the most common types of interventions were mass media interventions.\textsuperscript{13, 14, 18, 24, 25, 29, 30} Apart from Madle et al. (2008)\textsuperscript{24} who used website only, all mass media interventions were multimodal and used a variety of outlets, such as billboards, radio, television, newspapers, magazines, websites, and printed resources such as, posters, brochures, pamphlets, leaflets, stickers or badges distributed to community sites or healthcare settings. Six studies used printed materials interventions, either alone,\textsuperscript{12, 15, 21, 23} or in combination with educational presentations,\textsuperscript{11, 19} while Stockwell et al. (2010)\textsuperscript{28} delivered taught modules to Latino community parents. Other interventions were school based, and included a student peer-taught program,\textsuperscript{16} e-bug web game,\textsuperscript{22} interactive workshops,\textsuperscript{27} school lessons delivered using the “Bug Investigators” pack\textsuperscript{26} and presentation followed by discussion,\textsuperscript{20} while the intervention delivered in the study by Lecky et al. (2010)\textsuperscript{17} involved the delivery of a lesson, printed materials, interactive activities and question & answer session.

Comparators were similar across the ten controlled studies.\textsuperscript{11-19, 30} With an exception of Lecky et al. (2010)\textsuperscript{17} who compared the educational intervention to the usual school curriculum, control groups were not exposed to the interventions.
Table 2 shows that the most common outcome measure was change in knowledge, attitudes or beliefs, measured alone (n = 10)\textsuperscript{11-13, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27} or in combination with change in the public’s antimicrobial stewardship behaviour (n = 8)\textsuperscript{16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 28, 29} Two studies measured the public’s antimicrobial stewardship behaviour outcomes exclusively (n = 2)\textsuperscript{14, 30}.

**Quality of studies**

Amongst the included studies, nine met the EPOC study design criteria.\textsuperscript{9} As shown in Table 3, the overall risk of bias of the included studies was generally high. Apart from one study,\textsuperscript{11} all had at least one item assessed as high risk with the number of high risk items ranging from one\textsuperscript{15} to five.\textsuperscript{18} High risk of bias was most commonly associated with generation of sequence allocation, risk of contamination and other risks.

For all studies that met the EPOC criteria, insufficient information was provided for at least 2 of the items which were regarded as unclear risk. None of the studies provided information regarding blinding, and in all studies reporting secondary outcomes, the risk of bias for incomplete secondary outcome data could not be assessed.\textsuperscript{13-16} The number of low risk items ranged from one\textsuperscript{17, 18} to five\textsuperscript{16} with the “selective outcome reporting” item being most commonly assessed as low risk. None of the studies had a low risk score for any of the following items: “allocation concealment”, “addressing incomplete secondary outcome data” and “blinding primary outcome data”.

Risk of bias was not assessed for the non-controlled before-after studies\textsuperscript{20-29} and a prospective cohort study.\textsuperscript{30} These study designs did not meet the EPOC criteria;\textsuperscript{9} therefore, it was assumed that the risk of bias of these studies was high.
**Relative effectiveness of interventions**

Reviewed interventions were grouped into five categories of relative measure of effectiveness. As shown in Table 4, six studies demonstrated a clear desired behaviour change following the intervention, while two studies resulted in some desired behaviour change. Desired effect on the antecedent of behaviour was reported in nine papers. One study showed no effect, while two studies demonstrated an increase in drivers of AMR following the intervention.

**Effectiveness of interventions delivered to populations through the lifecycle**

In 17 of the studies, the intervention had a significant effect on the outcome of interest amongst the populations through the lifecycle. These included schoolchildren, university students, parents and the general public.

**Schoolchildren**

All six school-based educational interventions that targeted schoolchildren aged between 9-15 years found a significant increase in knowledge following the educational intervention (Table 2). However, Farrell *et al.* (2011) found a significant knowledge change in only 3 out of 21 questions (p ≤0.02), and no overall change in knowledge. The three questions for which significant improvement was reported related to the valuableness of “good microbes”, the presence of microbes despite inability to see them, and handwashing being an effective method of removing microbes from the hands. Only one study measured behavioural outcome in addition to beliefs, and found that children in the intervention group were 3.2 times more likely than other students to report that they had not taken an antibiotic for a cold or flu (p <0.001).

None of the studies measured long term outcomes of school-based interventions. Post-intervention outcomes were measured immediately following the intervention, or between 1-8 weeks after the intervention. In addition, one study found that the increase in knowledge was maintained at 6 week post intervention in junior but not for senior school students.
University Students

University students were targeted in one experimental study that aimed to investigate whether an educational intervention (information booklet) resulted in an increase of young adult consumers’ preference for physicians who do not unnecessarily prescribe antibiotics for simple acute upper respiratory tract infections. This study demonstrated that exposure to the intervention significantly increased the mean preferred start date for antibiotics after the onset of an infection from 2.3–3.9 days ($p<0.1$) and preference for a physician who would not prescribe antibiotics at day 3 of an infection ($p<0.1$). However, this was still well before recommended time of 10–14 days.

Parents

The effect of educational interventions delivered to parents on change in their AMR knowledge, attitudes or beliefs alone, or in combination with parents’ antimicrobial stewardship behaviour outcomes was measured in six studies. The majority of these interventions were directed to parents or caregivers of children under the age of 6. In the remaining two studies, intervention was delivered to households with at least one children over 5 years old and parents of children aged 12-13.

As shown in Table 2, all studies showed a significant increase in knowledge following the interventions. In addition, four of the reviewed interventions also had a positive effect on changing parents’ antimicrobial stewardship behaviour. Cebotarenco & Bush (2008) found, that parents in the intervention group were 5.2 times more likely than other parents to indicate they had not taken an antibiotic for colds or flu ($p<0.001$). In Trepka et al. (2001), the proportion of parents who expected an antibiotic for their child and did not receive one declined in the intervention area from 14% to 9%, while it increased from 7% to 10% in the control area ($p = 0.003$) and the percentage of parents reporting that they brought their child to another physician because they did not receive an antibiotic decreased from 5% to 2% in the intervention area and increased from 2% to 4% in the control area ($p = 0.02$). Larson et al. (2009) found that the percentage of participants reporting
using alcohol hand sanitizers has increased from 1.4% to 66.8% following the intervention (p = 0.001) while the percentage of those reporting that at least one member of their household had been vaccinated against influenza has increased from 63.7% to 73.9% (p = 0.001). Stockwell et al. (2010) on the other hand, demonstrated that the number of parents reporting that they sought antibiotics without a prescription when their child was sick has decreased from 6 to 1 (p = 0.06).

**General public**

The general public were the population of interest in eight of the included studies. Apart from Curry et al. (2006) who used printed materials in the form of posters and leaflets, all studies were mass media campaigns, including four studies that measured the effects of the national campaign intervention. Five studies demonstrated a significant effect on the general public’s knowledge and attitudes (Table 2). With respect to antimicrobial stewardship behaviour amongst the public, four studies report a significant effect following the intervention.

Gonzales et al. (2008) found that visits to paediatricians declined in the intervention group for all conditions but mostly for acute respiratory infections (p = 0.01). Similarly, Curry (2006) demonstrated a significant decrease in the numbers of respondents who reported consulting a doctor for the common cold (p = 0.026). The results of Wutzke, (2006) showed that significantly less participants reported using antibiotics for cough, cold or flu following the intervention (7.4%) in comparison to baseline data (10.8%; percentage point change = 3.4; 95% CI: 1.3–5.5). Mazinska & Hryniewicz, (2010) on the other hand, demonstrated a significant increase in the percentage of respondents who have limited the use of antibiotics (from 27% at baseline to 43% post intervention), have become more disciplined and cautious in their use (from 3% to 24%), and who paid attention to the correct dosage (from 6% to 18%; no p values given).
The remaining three studies did not show a significant positive effect on outcomes of interest.\textsuperscript{13, 18, 30} In Mainous et al. (2009),\textsuperscript{30} intervention designed to decrease self-medication with antibiotics surprisingly resulted in significantly greater percentage of the intervention Latino community group using antibiotics without a prescription in comparison with the control group (OR = 1.81; 95% CI, 1.02-3.22). McNulty et al. (2010)\textsuperscript{18} on the other hand, found no positive effect on participants’ knowledge or antimicrobial stewardship behaviour following a national campaign, and there was a significant increase in the percentage of respondents from the intervention area who reported retaining leftover antibiotics (p <0.001). Formoso et al. (2013)\textsuperscript{13} reported that knowledge consistency with the national campaign messages either worsened (p <0.05) or did not improve in both the intervention and control groups after the intervention.

Discussion

Main findings of this study

This systematic review provides an in-depth examination of the effectiveness of interventions that target the public to increase their knowledge, understanding of AMR and engagement with antimicrobial stewardship behaviours. We have also identified patterns between target populations and relative intervention effectiveness. The findings present a complex picture reflecting the heterogeneity of the studies.

Our analysis has shown that interventions targeting schoolchildren and parents have notable potential. All interventions that targeted schoolchildren or parents showed a significant effect on the outcome of interest. However, effective school-based interventions tended to only have effects of increasing knowledge. In addition, these studies measured only short-term outcomes. In contrast, interventions targeting parents demonstrated changes in behaviour in addition to knowledge, with the follow up period ranging from 2 weeks\textsuperscript{28} to 3 years.\textsuperscript{12}
With regards to the interventions targeting the general public, the picture is less clear. Although the majority (n = 5) of these studies demonstrated effectiveness of interventions in improving the public’s AMR knowledge or their antimicrobial stewardship behaviour, three studied did not, with two showing a decrease in AMR knowledge and in antimicrobial stewardship behaviour. These findings highlight the need to examine differences in the content between these interventions targeting the general public.

Patterning of the effectiveness across the type of target population also suggests that different target populations should receive different interventions with different primary outcomes. Nevertheless, targeting children alone is unlikely to make a major contribution to AMR because attitudes and the public’s antimicrobial stewardship behaviours may be passed down through generations. Thus, using the power of familial social influence and parental duty where children’s AMR education within school is reinforced and boosted by parental interventions in the home, might be a more appropriate approach for the achievement of desired cultural change. This indicates the potential of a multimodal intervention or programmatic approach to AMR related interventions.

An ideal approach would be to address the entire population simultaneously, yet segmenting it to target sub-populations. Through such segmentation, or stratification of the general public, diverse tailored interventions addressing different sub-population, would be a strategic way to begin the process of cultural change required to reduce the drivers of AMR.

The nature of the increase in knowledge that is needed can also be specified by drawing on other evidence syntheses that has shown that the public’s AMR knowledge and understanding of their contribution to AMR is generally poor. Therefore, in addition to changing the public’s understanding of appropriate antimicrobial use, interventions should also target the public’s understanding of AMR to enable the public to understand their central role in tackling AMR, and the risks for the intervention recipient, their loved ones and the wider population.
Findings in relation to other research

In their recent paper, Wells & Piddock (2017) argued that amongst other actions, an urgent review of educational campaigns is required in order to fulfil UK and European AMR action plans. Our review addresses this need. Furthermore, to our knowledge this is the first systematic review that provides such an in-depth examination of the effectiveness of AMR related interventions that target the public specifically.

Previous literature focused on the level of the public’s AMR knowledge and beliefs, communication interventions or interventions that target both, the public and healthcare professionals. The latter found that multi-component interventions improve the public’s knowledge of appropriate antimicrobial use, specifically in relation to antibiotics and that interventions including both, physician and public education appear to be effective in reducing antibiotic use.

Similarly, Cross et al. (2016) reported that multi-modal communication interventions targeting both the public and clinicians can reduce antibiotic prescribing in high-income countries. Although, our review focused on the general public population specifically, the potential of multi-faceted interventions was also highlighted in our work.

Another previous systematic review by King et al. (2015) reviewed the evidence of effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of interventions changing the public’ risk related behaviours in relation to antimicrobial use. The review showed that direct contact education interventions were consistently more effective than mass media interventions. This appears to explain our findings on the varying effectiveness of interventions targeting the general public, as majority of these studies used mass media interventions.

There is also a body of evidence on large-scale antibiotic campaigns that although were not eligible for inclusion in our review as the participants were both members of the public and healthcare professions. A literature review showed that there have been numerous multifaceted antibiotic awareness campaigns launched in high-income countries; however, there was substantial
heterogeneity in outcomes, including knowledge and awareness, use of antibiotics and antimicrobial resistance, and the interventions themselves often lack a robust grounding in behavioural and social science theory. The majority of campaigns included in the review targeted both the general public and healthcare professionals simultaneously and they appeared to result in a reduction of antibiotic use. It therefore appears that targeting different populations at the same time might result in desired outcomes as healthcare professional’s prescribing decisions might also be influenced by the patient, while patient’s behaviour might be affected by the prescriber’s advice. One such campaign, conducted in the UK in 2014 simultaneously targeted members of the public and healthcare professionals who pledged as Antibiotic Guardians, and showed an increase in AMR knowledge and commitment to pledge behaviour in both surveyed sub-populations. Another antibiotic awareness campaign conducted in Hong Kong, targeted the general public, patients and healthcare professionals in a segmented fashion, and resulted in a significant improvement (p ≤0.002) in respondents’ knowledge on prudent use of antibiotics following the campaign. Yet another successful large-scale antibiotic awareness campaign segmented to target the general public and healthcare professionals was conducted in France. The effectiveness of this campaign in reducing the number of antibiotic prescriptions was evaluated and showed a 26.5% (95% CI 33.5–19.6) decrease in the total number of antibiotic prescriptions following the campaign, with the greatest decrease of 35.8% (95% CI 48.3% to -23.2%) in prescriptions issued for children and young adults in the 21-25 years age group (24.1% decrease; CI not provided). These findings further emphasise the potential of programmatic approach to AMR related interventions segmented to different target sub-populations, as suggested previously in our main findings section.

**Strengths and limitations**

We have conducted a rigorous search and systematic review accompanied by a narrative synthesis. Although, similar work concerning the effectiveness of interventions aimed to improve antibiotic use has been conducted previously, our work focused on interventions targeting the general public
population exclusively and did not include outcomes related to healthcare professionals’ AMR awareness or antimicrobial stewardship, such as antibiotic prescribing. Our analysis provides a sense of what is normative within this field, what has been attempted before and what could be repeated. It also provides a unique and valuable contribution to the available literature. However, the study also has limitations.

First, because the UK Antimicrobial Resistance Strategy and Action Plan was launched by the Department of Health (DH) in 2000\textsuperscript{17}, followed by the publication of the WHO Global Strategy for Containment of Antimicrobial Resistance in 2001\textsuperscript{1}, we limited our search to publications from 2000 onwards. This could result in omission of important, older papers. Second, the studies from low- and middle-income countries were underrepresented in our review. Thus, relevance and applicability of our findings to different geographical areas or resource contexts is limited. Third, the risk of bias was assessed only for studies that met the EPOC study design criteria. However, a suitable, validated tool for assessing the risk of bias of non-controlled before and after studies could not be identified. Furthermore, using different instrument could result in ambiguities in relation to the quality of stronger designs. The overall quality of the evidence was rather low. Major problems were associated with randomisation in experimental designs and the evaluation of mass media and other population level interventions. As these kinds of interventions aim for maximum population reach, it is difficult to attain adequate controls or indeed randomise at this population level. Therefore, good quality study designs are systematically less likely to be identified within this kind of population level intervention literature. Notwithstanding this, there was a considerable heterogeneity in outcomes. There are no standardised ways of measuring the public’s AMR related knowledge or associated stewardship behaviours. Furthermore, change in knowledge, awareness or beliefs, which were the most common outcome measures across the included studies, might not necessary lead to desired behaviour change. As a result, it is particularly challenging to build cumulative knowledge regarding the effectiveness of interventions to increase the public’s engagement with antimicrobial stewardship. Another limitation is that given the problems with the quality of primary research, our
measure of relative effectiveness should be treated with caution as this was based on our relative measure and are not equivalent of a strong evidence base within typical evidence based guidance. Finally, we did not conduct an analysis of the cost-effectiveness of reviewed interventions; however, for the majority of studies included in our review, cost effectiveness data was not reported.

Recommendations for future research

Although, our work demonstrated the potential of intervention, that targets particular sub-populations of the general public, taking into account the low quality of reviewed evidence, lack of cost-effectiveness evaluation and underrepresentation of studies from low- and middle-income countries, these findings must be treated with caution. There is a need for well-designed, randomised experimental studies focusing on behavioural outcomes of the interventions. Furthermore, measures of AMR knowledge and stewardship behaviours need to be standardised and there is a need for improvement of the reporting standards to ensure detailed and transparent reporting of intervention components. Finally, considering the underrepresentation of studies from low- and middle-income countries, there is a need for the development and evaluation of similar interventions within such settings.

Conclusions

Although some evidence on the effectiveness of interventions that target the general public to engage with the problem of AMR exists, the public's understanding of AMR and their role in combating this problem remains poor. Thus, there is a need for a cultural change and effective engagement of the public in addition to other key stakeholders. This need could be addressed through development of well-designed AMR related interventions robustly grounding within behavioural and social science theory. Our work provided an in-depth examination of the effectiveness of AMR related interventions targeting the members of the public specifically. We suggests that future policy makers should consider multimodal segmented population level
intervention that tailors its core messages to children, parents and the wider general public alike,
particularly in high-income geographical areas. Future interventions should convey messages that
elicit the public’s motivation to make their own efforts to address AMR as a growing problem for all
and a problem for the present as much as for the future.
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Identification

N=17,321 records identified through database searching

N=31 records identified through other sources

N=11,936 records after duplicates removed

Screening

N=11,936 records screened

N=11,856 records excluded

Eligibility

N= 80 of full-text articles assessed for eligibility

Records excluded N=60
- Design other than RCT, NRT etc. N=20
- Participants recruited from HC settings N=12
- Context other than AMR N=5
- Outcomes not related to AMR awareness/AM stewardship N=8
- Full text not available N=10
- Other reasons N=5

Included

N=20 records included

Figure 1. Study selection flowchart
Table 1. Review’s eligibility criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomised controlled trials, non-randomised trial, interrupted time series studies, controlled before and after studies, non-controlled before and after studies and cohort studies.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>Participants recruited from healthcare settings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the public</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention designed to increase public antimicrobial awareness and/or to improve antimicrobial stewardship (through mass media, social marketing or printed media campaigns).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time bound, geographical controls or no exposure</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-healthcare settings; AMR or the public’s antimicrobial stewardship</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Antimicrobial prescribing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All relevant short, medium or long-term outcomes related to antimicrobial resistance and/or antimicrobial stewardship behaviours (knowledge/awareness, learning, public behavioural and cognition outcomes)</td>
<td>Published before January 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication date</strong></td>
<td>Published before January 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azevedo et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Braga, Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebotarenc o &amp; Bush, (2008)</td>
<td>Chisinau, Moldova</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Wisconsin, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry et al. (2006)</td>
<td>Auckland, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study/Program</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell et al. (2011)</td>
<td>Glasgow, Gloucester and London, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formoso et al. (2013)</td>
<td>Emilia-Romagna, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales et al. (2008)</td>
<td>Colorado, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang et al. (2007)</td>
<td>Massachusetts, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Upper Manhattan, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecky et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Gloucestershire and London, England; Nice and Bordeaux, France; Prague</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
<td>Location/Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madle et al. (2004)</td>
<td>London, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainous III et al. (2009)</td>
<td>South Carolina, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazinska &amp; Hryniewicz, (2010)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNulty et al. (2001)</td>
<td>Gloucester, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNulty et al. (2007)&lt;sup&gt;26&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Gloucestershire, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNulty et al. (2010)&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>England and Scotland, UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontes &amp; Pontes, (2005)&lt;sup&gt;15&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Mid-Atlantic region, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell et al. (2010)&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>New York City, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepka et al. (2001)&lt;sup&gt;13&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Northern Wisconsin, USA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While the percentage of parents in the intervention area who brought their child to another physician because they did not receive an antibiotic decreased (5% to 2%), while it increased in the control area (2% to 4%). The difference between the 2 area changes was -4.5% (95% CI: -8.0, -0.9; p = 0.02).

Wutzke et al. (2006) in Australia NCBA N = 6217 general public National mass media intervention for consumers delivered during winter months in 2001, 2002, 2003, & 2004. About the inappropriate use of antibiotics for upper respiratory tract infection. Strategies included newsletters & brochures, mass media activity using billboards, television, radio & magazines & small grants to promote local community education. Knowledge & attitudes and behaviour There was a significant decline in those who believe taking antibiotics for cold & flu is appropriate, from 28.7% pre-programme in 2002 to 21.7% in 2004 (percentage point change = 7.0; 95% CI: 3.5–10.5). Significant decrease in self-reported use of antibiotics to treat cough, cold or flu, from 10.8% in 1999 down to 7.4% in 2004 (percentage point change = 3.4; 95% CI: 1.3–5.5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study ID</th>
<th>Allocation - sequence generation</th>
<th>Allocation - concealment</th>
<th>Baseline characteristics</th>
<th>Baseline secondary outcome</th>
<th>Blinding primary outcome data</th>
<th>Blinding secondary outcome data</th>
<th>Incomplete primary outcome data</th>
<th>Incomplete secondary outcome data</th>
<th>Contamination</th>
<th>Selective reporting primary outcome</th>
<th>Selective reporting secondary outcome</th>
<th>Other risks of bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Croft et al. (2007)</td>
<td>L U U n/a U L n/a U n/a U L n/a L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formoso et al. (2013)</td>
<td>H U U U L U U U U L L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales et al. (2008)</td>
<td>H U U L U U U U L H L L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang et al. (2007)</td>
<td>L U H n/a L L n/a U n/a H H n/a H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecky et al. (2010)</td>
<td>H U U n/a U H n/a U n/a H L n/a H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNulty et al. (2010)</td>
<td>H H H n/a U U n/a U n/a H L n/a H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontes &amp; Pontes</td>
<td>U U U U U U U U U L L L H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepka et al. (2001)</td>
<td>H U L n/a U L n/a U n/a H L n/a H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Interventions indicative of clear positive behaviour change in the desired direction</td>
<td>Interventions indicative of some positive behaviour change in the desired direction</td>
<td>Interventions indicative of positive effect on the antecedent of behavior in the desired direction</td>
<td>Interventions indicative of no effect on behaviour or antecedents of behaviour</td>
<td>Interventions indicative of negative effect on behaviour or antecedents of behaviour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azevedo et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croft et al. (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curry et al. (2006)</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrell et al. (2011)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formoso et al. (2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonzales et al. (2008)</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huang et al. (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larson et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecky et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madle et al. (2004)</td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainous et al. (2009)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latino Community, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNulty et al. (2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNulty et al. (2007)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>School Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McNulty et al. (2010)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontes et al. (2005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Young Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockwell et al. (2010)</td>
<td>Latino Community Parents, USA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trepka et al. (2001)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wutzke et al. (2006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>General Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Supplementary Table S1. An example of search strategy applied for MEDLINE database
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3. Supplementary Table S3. Excluded studies with rationale