

A cluster randomised feasibility trial assessing an interactive film intervention to improve wellbeing of young people in school settings in the North of England

Christie-de Jong, F.¹; Walker, E.¹; Corlett, H.²; Hardarce, C.³; Soulsby, E.²; Arnott, B.⁴; Franks, K.⁵; Ling, J.⁶; Stephenson J.⁷, Azevedo, L.B.⁸.

Authors:

Floor Christie-de Jong

¹School of Medicine, University of Sunderland, Sunderland, United Kingdom

Murray Health, City Campus

Chester Road

Sunderland, SR1 3SD

Corresponding author: floor.christie@sunderland.ac.uk

¹School of Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences and Wellbeing, University of Sunderland, Sunderland, United Kingdom

²Northeast and North Cumbria Child Health and Wellbeing Network, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom

³Faculty of Health and Education, Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester, United Kingdom

⁴Population Health Sciences Institute, Newcastle University, Newcastle, United Kingdom

⁵Youth Focus North East, Gateshead, United Kingdom

⁶Faculty of Health Sciences and Wellbeing, University of Sunderland, Sunderland, United Kingdom

⁷Department of Allied Health Professions, Sport and Exercise, University of Huddersfield, Huddersfield, United Kingdom

⁸School of Sport and Physical Activity, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, United Kingdom

Abstract

Background

Adolescence is a critical period for the onset of mental illness. A partnership of a health and care network and filmmakers developed an interactive film for youth wellbeing. While such films have potential as a cost-effective preventative tool, their effectiveness remains unproven. This study aimed to assess the feasibility and acceptability of a randomised controlled trial of the interactive film intervention to improve wellbeing in school-aged youth.

Methods

In a mixed-methods cluster randomised feasibility trial in North East England (2021-2022), students in Years 10 (14-15 years) and 12 (16-17 years) from three schools were recruited and randomised to the following conditions: 1) watching the film in class, 2) watching the film in class with support from youth workers or 3) regular class activities. Feasibility outcomes included willingness of schools to participate, participant recruitment, and retention, which was accessed quantitatively and qualitatively. Data were analysed descriptively and with the use of thematic analysis.

Results

School recruitment targets were met, although this was challenging due to resource constraints and the COVID-19 pandemic. Questionnaires were completed before watching the film by 172 students (48% of the recruitment target). Follow-up targets for retention were met at 3-months (n=138) and 6-months (n=136). Retention of Year 10 students was high (96%), but Year 12 students had lower retention (60%). Qualitative findings showed students and teachers supported the intervention and trial and measurements however, consent-taking required more time. Communication and resource issues within schools were challenging and need addressing before moving to a larger trial.

Conclusion

Although some trial aspects were feasible and acceptable, particularly the intervention, others, such as recruitment, retention and school communication, posed challenges. We recommend future feasibility studies should address barriers such as randomisation, communication with schools, recruitment of older students (16-18 years), consent and measurement alignment before moving to a larger-scale trial.

Keywords: interactive film intervention, feasibility study, young people, youth engagement, mental health

Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT06807931
Retrospectively registered 04 February 2025
<https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT06807931>

1 **1) What uncertainties existed regarding the feasibility?**

2 The effectiveness of this newly developed intervention had not been tested. It was unclear
3 whether testing its effectiveness would be feasible and acceptable, particularly within school
4 settings, due to potential challenges in recruitment, retention, and data collection.

5

6 **2) What are the key feasibility findings?**

7 Progression criteria evaluating key trial parameters—such as recruitment of schools and
8 participants, participant retention, and the acceptability of data collection measures—
9 indicated that progressing to a full trial would be feasible. However, qualitative data and
10 researcher insights into the school context highlighted some challenges that would need to
11 be addressed before proceeding to a full trial. These included logistical barriers and
12 communication issues within the school environment.

13

14 **3) What are the implications of the feasibility findings for the design of the main study?**

15 Key challenges, such as communication with schools, would need to be addressed before
16 progressing to a full trial. Closer engagement with schools from the outset, ideally through co-
17 production and the appointment of a key contact person within each school, would help
18 resolve some of the challenges encountered. A deeper understanding of the school context
19 will be essential for ensuring smoother implementation and higher engagement in the main
20 study.

21

1 **Background**

2 Adolescence is a period of heightened vulnerability for the onset of mental illness, with 75%
3 of all mental health problems established before 18 years old (1, 2). Mental illness can impact
4 young people's ability to navigate the stresses of adolescence, leading to isolation,
5 diminished self-esteem, and academic struggles (3). Unaddressed, these issues may persist
6 into adulthood, becoming more severe and chronic, with consequences for physical health,
7 social adjustment, and economic productivity across the life course (4). Beyond individual
8 outcomes, early mental health difficulties can have long-term consequences that shape life
9 trajectories, reducing opportunities for education, employment, and social participation,
10 which can ultimately limit the chance to lead fulfilling and independent lives. These
11 cumulative effects contribute to broader social and economic inequalities (4). In 2020, a UK
12 national survey showed that one in six young people (aged 5-19) had a probable mental
13 health condition – an increase from one in nine young people in 2017 (5). Rising levels of
14 mental ill health may be partly attributed to increased reporting and awareness. Strategies to
15 tackle what may be framed as a mental health crisis emerge at pace (3, 6, 7) including school-
16 based mental health programmes, counselling services, and de-stigmatisation campaigns.
17 However, adolescents still lack a good understanding of the experience, impact, and
18 management of mental health, which results, as recent systematic reviews show, in negative
19 attitudes towards available support and a reluctance to seek help (8-10). Film-based
20 interventions may improve mental health literacy because of their potential to engage and be
21 emotionally impactful, which could help young people understand human experiences (8,
22 11), but the effectiveness of such interventions has been given little scrutiny and there is a
23 lack of evidence on the feasibility of deploying such interventions in schools. Difficulties to
24 implement such interventions include the practicalities of executing interventions in complex,
25 dynamic settings, which can introduce issues with selection, performance, and detection bias.

1 Ethical challenges are also typical in the school environment, particularly when obtaining
2 informed consent or ensuring equitable access to interventions (12). Finally, health and
3 education research systematically assesses the effectiveness of innovative approaches using
4 randomised controlled trial (RCT) designs (13, 14). However, this research methodology is
5 troubled by the challenge of conducting work in real-life school environments and needs to
6 be trialled before being implemented on a large scale (32). Taken together, these challenges
7 require careful consideration and planning to deliver and evaluate the intervention in school
8 settings. Assessing the viability of recruitment, implementation, and measures, underscores
9 the significance of feasibility studies as an important preliminary stage for evaluations using
10 RCTs in naturalistic settings (15).

11

12 **Aim and Objectives**

13 The primary aim of this study was to assess the feasibility and acceptability of a randomised
14 controlled trial of an interactive film intervention aiming to build resilience, enhancing
15 mental wellbeing and help-seeking attitudes for young people (14-18 years) in schools
16 located in deprived areas of the North East and North Cumbria (NENC).

17 The specific objectives of the study were:

- 18 1. To assess the feasibility of delivering a brief interactive film intervention in school
19 settings with a three-arm randomisation at the school level.
- 20 2. To explore the suitability of measuring the selected parameters (e.g. recruitment,
21 retention) of the trial with a view to developing a large-scale trial.
- 22 3. To explore views and experiences of young people on acceptability and feasibility
23 of the trial and the film intervention through using a qualitative design.

4. To gather preliminary data on the effectiveness of a brief interactive film intervention in school settings to enhance resilience, help-seeking attitudes and mental wellbeing in young people.

Methods

This study adheres to the CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials) extension for pilot and feasibility trials (16).

Ethical considerations

Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Sunderland Research Ethics Group in September 2021 (reference number 009976). Each participating school received a payment of £750 to compensate for the time, effort and resources involved. Students received a £5 retail gift voucher at each quantitative data collection point. Students who participated in focus groups received an additional £5 voucher to acknowledge their time and effort.

Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)

To inform the design of this study we invited young people's from NENC region to take part in seven meetings held between August 2021 to September 2022. The number of young people attending each meeting varied between one and eight. Two sessions were originally planned with three participants each, but only one participant was able to attend in both cases. As these sessions were held online and the young person had taken time out to attend, the sessions proceeded, as their input was still considered valuable. These sessions focused on trial design, including recruitment, data collection, and dissemination, as well as feedback on the film. Participants also gained research skills, covering topics including developing research questions and methods.

PPI activities were also conducted towards the end of the study, in July 2023. Creative methods including card sorting and ranking and an effort/impact matrix were used with nine young people to explore key study elements and develop recommendations on developing

1 resources for future research, and strategies for sharing findings (17). The PPI work
2 underwent external evaluation by Investing in Children (IiC), an independent children's
3 rights organisation based in the North East of England, and achieved the quality standards
4 necessary to receive the Dialogue and Change award. This award acknowledges research
5 projects that actively involve individuals with lived experience, particularly children and
6 young people. This was a pilot scheme that was developed by the funder in collaboration with
7 IiC to evaluate the impact of public involvement and community engagement.

8 *Study Design*

9 A mixed-methods feasibility cluster randomised controlled trial was conducted with three
10 arms to assess the feasibility and acceptability of intervention delivery and study procedures.
11 Progression criteria, including a qualitative process evaluation to provide context (18), were
12 developed to evaluate feasibility and readiness for a definitive trial based on the literature
13 (15), including school recruitment and randomisation (at the *school* level for a cluster-
14 randomised trial), participant recruitment and retention, consent-taking, data collection tools,
15 data analysis, intervention acceptability and delivery.

16 *Setting*

17 Three schools located in the NENC region and identified by the NENC Child Health and
18 Wellbeing Network, were contacted by telephone and email to engage with head teachers.
19 We aimed to select, from the pool of potential schools, three schools with approximately
20 comparable mean socio-economic status (SES) scores based on the proportion of children
21 entitled to free school meals.

22 *Participants*

23 Participants were recruited from Years 10 (aged 14-15 years) and 12 (aged 16-17 years) from
24 participating schools. Years 11 and 13 were not targeted because of exam preparation,
25 particularly in light of COVID-19 disruption. Schools were asked to identify classes within

1 these year groups. Participant information and consent/assent forms were provided by the
2 schools to students and parents of Year 10 students. Year 10 and 12 students who provided
3 written informed consent/assent, and Year 10 students who received parental consent, were
4 invited to complete baseline measures. No other eligibility criteria were applied. Since Year
5 12 were 16 years old and older, they did not require parental consent. For the qualitative
6 evaluation, all participants who had completed the baseline measures were invited to take part
7 in focus groups to share their perspectives on the trial procedures and the intervention's
8 impact. A researcher explained the purpose of the focus groups during a classroom session,
9 making clear that participation in both the trial and focus groups was voluntary and that
10 individuals could withdraw at any time.

11 As this was a feasibility study, a formal sample size calculation was not required (19).
12 Informed by evidence indicating a median sample size of 36 per arm (range: 10 to 300) in
13 UK feasibility trials (19), we adopted a pragmatic approach, aiming for a sample size of 120
14 adolescents per school (i.e. 360 in total). Within each participating school, we aimed for an
15 approximately equal distribution between Year 10 and Year 12 participants. This target was
16 considered achievable within the study timeline and available budget.

17 *Study Intervention*

18 In 2019, the NENC Health & Wellbeing Network commissioned TryLife to make an
19 interactive film co-produced with young people in 2021. TryLife is an interactive film series
20 that aims to provide young people with a virtual experience of making choices and facing
21 consequences in various scenarios. TryLife is designed to simulate real-life situations and
22 challenges, allowing young people to explore different paths and outcomes based on the
23 decisions they make for the characters in the story. Multiple public health issues are
24 integrated into the films, including mental health and wellbeing. The film series that was
25 commissioned and included in the trial was 'Jessica's Story', which focused on the

1 intersection between young parenthood and perinatal mental health, as well as other public
2 health issues relevant to young people, including domestic violence and help-seeking
3 behaviour.

4 *Randomisation*

5 The three participating schools were randomly assigned by a researcher using a number
6 generator using block randomisation (with a single block of 3), to one of three intervention
7 conditions:

8 *Interactive Film (IF)*: Participants in this condition engaged in two class sessions wherein
9 they watched the interactive film facilitated by a teacher. The film featured decision points,
10 and the viewer's choices influenced the storyline's progression.

11 *Interactive Film Plus Youth Worker Support (IFYWS)*: Participants in this condition watched
12 the interactive film as in the previous condition, but with facilitation by a trained youth
13 worker. They engaged in interactive discussions that focused on the decisions made in the
14 film and their potential consequences.

15 *Control Condition*: Participants in this condition received the standard Personal, Social,
16 Health, and Economic (PSHE) Education curriculum provided by the school. PSHE is a
17 school subject in the UK that supports pupils' personal development by teaching them about
18 health, relationships, wellbeing, and financial literacy.

19 Only one school per arm was included due to the study's focus on feasibility rather than
20 effectiveness, and was therefore small in scale; a limited budget was also a contributing
21 factor. As such, the findings are not intended to be generalisable but to inform the design of a
22 future, larger trial. Blinding was not considered necessary for a feasibility trial, which
23 focused on assessing the feasibility and acceptability of recruitment, intervention and
24 measurements (16).

25 *Data Collection*

1 Primary Outcomes

2 Quantitative and qualitative measurements were used to assess feasibility as primary
3 outcome. These included school recruitment, randomisation, participant recruitment and
4 retention, consent procedures, data collection tools, and perspectives on intervention delivery.
5 Researcher notes were used to record school and participant recruitment and retention.
6 Acceptability for randomisation, consent procedures, measurements and interventions were
7 explored via qualitative interviews with teachers (n=4) and focus groups. Four face-to-face
8 focus groups were conducted with 20 students in total, two in IFYWS, two in IF, but none in
9 the control school. The discussions focused on participants' perspectives on trial procedures
10 and the intervention's impact.

11 Qualitative assessment also included semi-structured interviews conducted via Microsoft
12 Teams or telephone with teachers to assess the acceptability of the trial and the intervention.
13 Three teachers were recruited from the IF school, one from the control, but none from
14 IFYWS. Topic guides aimed to explore the acceptability of the content and delivery of the
15 intervention, as well as the acceptability of the delivery of the research and recommendations
16 for improvement.

17 Secondary outcomes

18 Preliminary analyses were also performed to summarise the following secondary outcomes
19 including resilience, attitudes toward help-seeking, and mental wellbeing at baseline, 3-
20 months, and 6-months follow-up, assessed via validated questionnaires. Resilience was
21 assessed using the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale for young adults (10 items (20)). This
22 scale has been developed and validated as a measure of degree of resilience and for screening
23 participants according to the level of resilience (i.e. high, intermediate or low). Attitudes
24 toward help-seeking was measured via the 10-item Attitudes Toward Seeking Professional
25 Psychiatric Help Scale (ATSPPHS) tool (21). This tool has been validated and has four sub-
26 scales: recognition of personal need for professional help, tolerance of stigma associated with

1 psychological help, interpersonal openness, and confidence in mental health professionals.
2 Finally, wellbeing was assessed via the 14-item Warwick Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale
3 (SWEMWBS). This scale has been validated and is used UK and worldwide (22). Baseline
4 data were collected in November 2021, 3-month follow-up between March-May 2022, 6-
5 month follow-up between May-July 2022. Delay in timely follow-up data collection was
6 caused by school holidays, a burst pipe in one school, and difficulty in arranging data
7 collection. The trial ended upon completion of the project's designated funding period.

8
9

10 *Data analysis*

11 Descriptive statistics were employed to summarise the feasibility of recruitment and
12 retention. Secondary outcomes of resilience, attitudes toward help-seeking, and mental
13 wellbeing were summarised using descriptive statistics. Qualitative interviews and focus
14 groups were transcribed verbatim by a professional agency. Data were analysed using
15 thematic analysis (23) by two independent researchers using NVivo software.

16 **Results**

17 Trial feasibility is reported here according to: 1) The willingness of schools to participate and
18 be randomised; 2) Recruitment, retention and consent; 3) Suitability of data collection tools
19 and data analysis; and 4) Feasibility and acceptability of the intervention. We also present a
20 summary of questionnaire **scores** for resilience, help-seeking behaviour and wellbeing for
21 intervention arms and control across the three-timepoints. Quantitative and qualitative
22 findings are integrated in a true mixed-methods style (24).

23

24 *Willingness of schools to participate and be randomised*

Commented [EW1]: Or results

1 Six schools were directly contacted by telephone or email. Four of these schools were willing
2 to participate and be randomised. Reasons for non-inclusion were non-response after initial
3 contacts (n=2), and teachers' perception of the school's inability to facilitate film delivery
4 due to school resources, which meant the school was only willing to be in the control
5 condition and not be randomised (n=1). Hence three schools were recruited to the project
6 between May 2021 and October 2021. Figure 1 shows flow of eligibility, randomisation and
7 reasons for non-inclusion. Schools from across the North East region and the North Cumbria
8 area (North West region) were targeted for recruitment. However, none of the schools
9 targeted in North Cumbria were able to participate. Hence, participating schools were all in
10 North East England. Schools were diverse in socioeconomic status with the included schools
11 having 39.2%, 15.4% and 12.2% young people eligible for free school meals, a proxy used
12 for levels of deprivation.

13

14

15 *Figure 1 CONSORT flow diagram for cluster (school-based) randomisation*

16 Qualitative data from teachers (n=4) revealed that they believed that project participation was
17 worthwhile, particularly as the study focussed on mental health. Teachers believed the study
18 could be beneficial to students and offered a good opportunity to highlight mental health
19 issues, especially in light of the COVID-19 pandemic and making staff aware of mental
20 health research.

21 Research itself was also perceived as '*something very crucial and relevant in education at the*
22 *moment*' (Teacher 1-IF). Teachers shared they thought participating in research would be a
23 beneficial experience for students and would provide valuable information; for example, for
24 an Extended Project Qualification (EPQ). Teachers also felt that this was an opportunity to

1 contribute to relevant academic research and to ‘give back’ to the university, which is
2 involved with outreach work with the school.

3 *“Yes, I would take part again. I think as long as the schools see the value, and*
4 *in this situation, as I said at the start, the value was that the topic, I think, was*
5 *something very crucial and relevant in education at the moment.”*

6 (Teacher 1-IF)

7 Qualitative interviews showed that teachers understood that randomisation and control
8 conditions were required in research. Randomisation was seen by teachers as the fairest way
9 to assign conditions. Teachers shared that they would have accepted any condition they were
10 assigned, but noted that watching the video was more exciting for students and would lead to
11 better engagement. Delivery with youth workers would have also been accepted and
12 embraced, as again, it was seen as more exciting for students due to the novelty.
13 Student participants also had a good understanding of the necessity of a control condition and
14 its role in research and perceived it as the fairest way to assign condition. Although
15 participants in the control condition did not take part in focus groups, participants in the other
16 conditions stated that they would still have participated in the project if assigned to the
17 control condition. However, they shared that being in the control condition might reduce
18 interest and engagement, potentially resulting in attrition. Although the control condition
19 would be acceptable if the group had the opportunity to watch the film afterwards, which was
20 described as a factor aiding willingness to be randomised.

21 *“I think you should do it like that, but then give them the option to watch the film*
22 *after”*
23 (Student-Y10).
24

25

1 *Recruitment, retention and consent*

2 Two Year 10 and two Year 12 classes at each school participated, including 172 participants
3 at baseline; 138 at 3-month follow-up; and 136 at 6-month follow-up.

4 Participant recruitment and retention at baseline, 3-month and 6-month follow-up are
5 summarised by group in Table 1.

6 *Table 1 Participant recruitment and retention by group*

Timepoint	Variable	Group (study condition)		
		Control	Interactive Film	Interactive Film with Youth Worker Support
Baseline	Year of study	(n=58)	(n=55)	(n=59)
	Year 10	31 (53.4%)	25 (45.5%)	34 (57.6%)
	Year 12	27 (46.6%)	30 (54.5%)	25 (42.4%)
	Gender			
	Female	52 (89.7%)	32 (58.2%)	40 (67.8%)
3-month follow-up	Male	6 (10.3%)	20 (36.4%)	14 (23.7%)
	Other gender identity	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.6%)	3 (5.1%)
	Not recorded	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.8%)	2 (3.4%)
	Year of study	(n=45)	(n=58)	(n=35)
	Year 10	31 (68.9%)	28 (48.3%)	18 (51.4%)
6-month follow-up	Year 12	14 (31.1%)	30 (51.7%)	17 (48.6%)
	Gender			
	Female	44 (97.8%)	35 (60.3%)	25 (71.4%)
	Male	1 (2.2%)	22 (37.9%)	7 (20.0%)
	Other gender identity	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.7%)	1 (2.9%)
	Not recorded	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (5.7%)
	Year of study	(n=42)	(n=57)	(n=37)
	Year 10	33 (78.6%)	29 (50.9%)	25 (67.6%)
	Year 12	9 (21.4%)	28 (49.1%)	12 (32.4%)
	Gender			
	Female	38 (90.5%)	29 (50.9%)	26 (70.3%)
	Male	2 (4.8%)	23 (40.4%)	10 (27.0%)
	Other gender identity	0 (0.0%)	2 (3.5%)	0 (0.0%)
	Not recorded	2 (4.8%)	3 (5.3%)	1 (2.7%)

7
8 Throughout the study, a higher proportion of female than male participants were recruited
9 (72.1% female at baseline), with differences in gender balance across all groups.
10 Overall, participant numbers dropped by 20% from baseline (n=172) to 3 months follow-up
11 (n=138), but were subsequently practically maintained (a net drop of 1%) at 6 months follow-
12 up (n=136). Attrition varied across groups. The control group experienced moderate attrition
13 between baseline and 3-month (23% decrease), and minimal attrition between 3-month and 6-
14 month follow-up (7% decrease). The IFYWS group experienced larger attrition between

1 baseline and 3-month follow-up (41% decrease), and small increase from 3 to 6-month (5%
2 increase). The difference in attrition rates is out of expectation and suggests disparities in the
3 level of engagement of the included schools over time. Table 1 shows that attrition loss
4 occurred primarily in Year 12, with substantial attrition, particularly from 3-month to 6-
5 month follow-up.

6 Interviews with teachers reported that most students in their class did participate in the
7 project. Teachers suggested that some students might have decided not to participate if they
8 did not fully comprehend the purpose of the study. Teachers thought that students' interest
9 increased throughout the project as they heard other students discuss the film and teachers felt
10 that there was some disappointment from students who did not take part, that they had missed
11 out when the film was discussed in class.

12 *"There were a few students at the beginning that didn't consent. They weren't*
13 *interested in taking part. I think probably because again they didn't know what*
14 *it was about. But I think, as it went through and as they were talking to other*
15 *people in the group and they saw bits of the video and things, I think the*
16 *interest level increased after that"*

17 (Teacher 2-IF)

18 Teachers suggested that more information at the project start may have led to better
19 engagement, and noted that some male students did not want to participate. Teachers
20 suggested that this might be due to 'teenage ego,' describing it as some male students
21 declining to participate precisely because most other males were not participating. Teachers
22 also suggested that the film might have been 'too young' for Year 12 students and may be
23 more suitable for Year 10 students, who were 14-15 years of age. In focus groups, students
24 expressed their motivation to participate because they recognised the importance of mental

1 health research. To further enhance participation, they recommended emphasising practical
2 applications of the research.

3 Qualitative interviews also explored ethical considerations, including consent-taking.

Participants stated that they were aware that they had a choice, that participation was voluntary and that they could say no to taking part, which a few did. Some students shared that they were sufficiently informed, although others stated that they would have liked more information, for example what the content of the film would be, and what would be involved:

8 "Yeah, before we had these sheets, we had no clue about the video or
9 whatever. I didn't know anything, to be honest"

10 (Student Y12).

Many of the participants saw the £5 voucher they received as a ‘thank you’ or reimbursement rather than an incentive. Teachers stated the £5 voucher given to students each time they completed a set of questionnaires was really appreciated by the student and made them ‘feel valued’ and showed ‘their time was being rewarded’. The vouchers were seen by teachers as ‘very generous’ and it was suggested that perhaps it was unnecessary to provide a voucher every time.

17 *Suitability of data collection tools and data analysis*

Response rates achieved for all three questionnaires were high, with full participation by over 95% of participants. Response rates for the individual questionnaires were 97.5% for the wellbeing questionnaire, 96.2% for the resilience questionnaire and 95.5% for the help-seeking questionnaire. Participation rates are summarised in Table 2.

22 *Table 2. Questionnaire response rate*

Measure	Questionnaire completion status		
	Completed	Partially completed ¹	Incomplete ²
Wellbeing (WEMWB5)	435 (97.5%)	10 (2.2%)	1 (0.2%)

Resilience (CD-RISC)	428 (96.2%)	15 (3.4%)	2 (0.4%)
Help-seeking (ATSPPHS)	426 (95.5%)	11 (2.5%)	9 (2.0%)

Note: Questionnaires were considered fully complete when every question was answered, 'partially complete' when at least 80% of the questions were answered and incomplete where < 80% of questions were answered (2 or more missing responses).

Qualitative data suggest that questionnaires were acceptable to both teachers and students, with most not minding completing them, and a few even expressing enjoyment in doing so. The data collection procedure was seen as well-organised, easy to facilitate and acceptable to all. The timing and questionnaire length, as well as the number and clarity of questions, were perceived to be acceptable. A teacher mentioned that students had the same query each time about one particular question in the help-seeking questionnaire. However, questions about the questionnaire were directed to the researcher, who offered support. Teachers shared that organisational procedures made it easy to hand back completed questionnaires as required:

"None of them [questionnaires] [has] taken long, so they're all right"

(Student Y10)

Follow-up questionnaires were perceived as useful, as participants knew what to expect. Questionnaires were also seen as a platform to talk about mental health. However, some students suggested that classmates might not have completed questionnaires because they found questions too personal. Some participants also questioned the questionnaires' relevance in relation to the film, with some participants unsure if the questions asked and film topic matched.

"I don't think they were relevant to the film"

(Student Y12)

1 *Feasibility and acceptability of the intervention*

2 At baseline, participants were asked if they had heard of TryLife and its interactive films
3 before the study, and if they had watched the specific intervention film, ‘Jessica’s story’
4 (Table 3). The majority (95.9%) had not heard of TryLife, and nearly all (98.8%) had not
5 watched ‘Jessica’s story’.

6 *Table 3. Awareness of TryLife and interactive film*

Timepoint	Variable	Group (school type)		
		Control	IF	IFYWS
Baseline	Heard of TryLife			
	Yes	4 (6.9%)	1 (1.9%)	2 (3.4%)
	No	54 (93.1%)	52 (98.1%)	56 (96.6%)
	Watched <i>Jessica’s Story</i>			
	Yes	1 (1.7%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.7%)
	No	57 (98.3%)	52 (100.0%)	57 (98.3%)

7
8 Qualitative data show that there were generally no concerns about the intervention, and it was
9 seen as a straightforward process. Initially, we expected that participants would watch the
10 film individually on a school computer. However, the main obstacle to intervention delivery
11 was the lack of access in schools to the technology required to show the film. In IFYWS this
12 was overcome by watching the film as a group with one big screen for Year 10 and allowing
13 pupils in Year 12 to watch the film on their personal phones, individually. In IF, classes were
14 selected based on the room they were in and what technology would be available there.
15 Teachers highlighted challenges with timetabling, suggesting that additional lead-in time
16 could have been beneficial; however, this was not perceived as a barrier to participation.

17 *“So that was the only issue I had, logistically, because our academy students*
18 *are not meant to use their phones. They’re meant to be on silent, and put*
19 *away, and they’re not used in the daytime”*

20 *(Teacher 3- IF).*

1 The film's content was also perceived as acceptable by both teachers and students, who
2 enjoyed the film and particularly the discussions that followed. They said that the film fitted
3 the curriculum and helped to raise awareness of issues involved in teenage pregnancy. Some
4 students could see how other topics such as mental health, relationships and domestic abuse
5 were intertwined, although not all could see the relevance of the topics. Most young people in
6 the study sample thought the film was a valuable resource for use at school. However, they
7 could not see themselves interacting with it at home, due to discomfort discussing these
8 topics in the home environment.

9 ***Feasibility summary***

10 Trial feasibility was assessed across four main parameters using project monitoring data
11 collected throughout the project, and according to predefined progression criteria, with a
12 summary provided in Table 4 and the full version in Appendix 1. Progression criteria were
13 assessed against the target of full (green), partial (amber), and non-achievement (red) to
14 provide an in-depth understanding of what worked well and what did not. The full target was
15 met for the feasibility of recruiting schools, participant retention, and acceptability of the
16 intervention and its delivery mode. Partial target was met for school randomisation,
17 participant recruitment, acceptability of consent procedures, secondary outcomes and data
18 collection methods.

19 *Table 4 Summary progression criteria outcomes*

Feasibility outcome	Full (Green)	Partial (Amber)	Non-achievement (Red)	Outcome
Recruitment-schools	3	<3 before baseline	<3	Green (3 schools recruited)
Randomisation	Yes	Some issues	No	Some issues (1 school not willing to be randomised)
Recruitment-participants	≥60%	40-60%	<40%	Amber (49% recruited)
Follow-up 3 and 6 months	≥60%	40-60%	<40%	Green (80% at 3-months, 79% at 6-months)
	Yes	Some issues	No	

Acceptability consent procedures				Amber (some issues identified)
Acceptability data collection				
- Response rate - Qualitative feedback	≥70% Yes in all schools	60-70% Some issues	<50% No	Green (95% response rate) Amber (some issues)
Acceptability intervention	Yes	Some issues	No	Green

Preliminary analyses changes in resilience, help-seeking behaviour and wellbeing

Preliminary findings on outcomes presented are indicative only and are not designed to be used to draw conclusions about the efficacy of the intervention due to the small sample size. Resilience, help-seeking behaviour and wellbeing questionnaire scores are summarised in Table 5. Higher scores indicate greater resilience, better mental wellbeing and more positive attitudes toward professional help seeking.

Table 5: Mental wellbeing, resilience, and help-seeking attitudes (mean (SD)), at group and timepoint

Timepoint	Variable	Group (school type)		
		Control	IF	IFYWS
Baseline	WEMWBS total score	(n=58) 42.2 (8.6)	(n=55) 43.5 (10.1)	(n=58) 42.4 (8.7)
	CD-RISC total score	(n=58) 19.2 (7.1)	(n=53) 20.9 (6.5)	(n=59) 21.3 (7.6)
	ATSPPHS total score	(n=58) 13.8 (4.8)	(n=54) 14.6 (5.4)	(n=58) 12.8 (5.6)
3-month follow-up	WEMWBS total score	(n=45) 40.3 (7.8)	(n=58) 44.5 (8.9)	(n=35) 42.3 (9.5)
	CD-RISC total score	(n=45) 18.6 (6.6)	(n=58) 22.6 (7.2)	(n=35) 22.0 (6.6)
	ATSPPHS total score	(n=44) 14.2 (4.5)	(n=56) 13.7 (4.8)	(n=35) 12.7 (4.8)
6-month follow-up	WEMWBS total score	(n=42) 43.5 (8.1)	(n=57) 44.3 (10.0)	(n=37) 42.7 (8.8)
	CD-RISC total score	(n=42) 21.4 (6.7)	(n=57) 23.9 (7.9)	(n=37) 20.2 (6.3)
	ATSPPHS total score	(n=40) 13.4 (5.5)	(n=57) 13.6 (6.1)	(n=35) 11.7 (5.8)

Discussion

The results from this feasibility study indicated that three of the seven progression criteria offered a strong indication to proceed (full target achieved), four showed a medium indication

1 (partial target achieved), and none raised concerns about moving forward (non-achievement
2 target). These findings suggest that it was feasible to recruit schools, retain participants, that
3 the intervention and its implementation were acceptable, and that the use of data collection
4 measurements were feasible. However, before conducting a fully powered randomised
5 controlled trial, findings also suggest that certain methods, such as school randomisation,
6 participant recruitment, clarity of consent procedures, and the applicability of outcome
7 measures, must be reviewed.

8 While we successfully recruited the required number of schools, this recruitment was
9 challenging, and there was no surplus, leaving no flexibility had any schools withdrawn.

10 Although one participating school had some existing links with the hosting University
11 through outreach activities, these activities had been delivered by a different team and were
12 unrelated to the research. While this prior connection may have provided some familiarity, it
13 is unlikely to have directly influenced the school's decision to participate. Nonetheless, this
14 context should be considered when interpreting the feasibility of school recruitment in this
15 study.

16 Lack of resources to deliver the film might have acted as a barrier to randomisation. In this
17 feasibility study, intervention delivery was adjusted to a certain extent to schools' capability
18 of delivering the intervention (e.g., participants used their phones to watch the film).

19 However, these adjustments were not considered at the initial recruitment stage. In a review,
20 school resources have been highlighted as an issue for delivering mental health promotion
21 interventions in schools (27), suggesting that interventions must adapt to school culture and
22 resources, while supporting the outcome benefits. However, in our study although school
23 resources affected one school's willingness to be randomised this did not impact recruitment
24 as we reached our sample target.

1 We had aimed to match schools in terms of SES as there is a relation between young people's
2 mental health and deprivation (28). However, some diversity between schools' SES was
3 observed in our study which used a pragmatic approach. Exploring a gradient of school SES
4 might be needed to understand the acceptability of the intervention, since there is evidence
5 that mental health interventions might need to be adapted to target low-SES populations,
6 including booster sessions (29).

7 Recruitment of participants was around 50% of our target, with a higher proportion of
8 females in all groups. A few students believed that some of their peers chose not to
9 participate in the study because of a lack of understanding of the study. Teachers also shared
10 that the study's details could have been clarified verbally in greater depth. This is supported
11 by the qualitative data with students which indicated some study participants wanted more in-
12 depth information about the video and the study. Although every effort had been made to
13 produce easily accessible and age-appropriate documentation to explain the study, crucial to
14 informed consent (26), time for researchers to verbally explain the study was limited. Data
15 collection, including obtaining consent, was constrained by the tight school timetable, leaving
16 researchers dependent on the availability and cooperation of teachers. Logistical challenges
17 during a school-based intervention, including time constraints, have been found elsewhere
18 (30). Nevertheless, teachers thought that the way that student recruitment was conducted was
19 appropriate, and students who agreed to participate wanted to continue and engage with the
20 study.

21 Although baseline recruitment did not reach the pre-specified target, retention of participants
22 at 3- and 6-months was adequate, meeting the progression criterion. The IF group
23 surprisingly slightly increased from baseline to 3-months (5% increase), possibly due to
24 participants consenting to participate but not attending baseline data collection. As data were
25 collated and analysed by groups, it could not be known who these individuals were, which is

1 a study limitation. However, in feasibility studies, analysing data at group level rather than
2 individual level can be appropriate (31). The attrition rates varied according to the study arm,
3 being higher in IFYWS. Reasons for higher attrition in this particular group were not
4 explored but could be related to intervention acceptability or measurements for this specific
5 school due to cultural or environmental factors and impacting the internal validity. However,
6 given that there was only one school in each arm, the most likely reason is chance. In future
7 studies, different attrition rates between intervention arms should be further explored through
8 qualitative methods, and analysed using statistical approaches such as intention-to-treat and
9 multiple imputation (32).

10 There was a drop in participant numbers in the first 3 months, primarily among Year 12
11 students who were preparing for or discontinued their A-levels. In hindsight, choosing Year
12 12 may therefore not have been suitable. Researchers need to address the logistical challenges
13 of working with schools by implementing robust procedures to gather information on school
14 scheduling and curricula before the study starts (33). Establishing open communication with
15 a designated staff member who had protected time to support the research project, would help
16 address logistical challenges as they emerge (34).

17 Regarding acceptability of measurements, participants found questionnaires relatively easy to
18 understand and low burden, contributing to a high response rate (over 95%). Teachers viewed
19 the measurements as a potential platform for discussion about broader mental health issues.
20 However, some students questioned the questionnaires' relevance to the intervention. The
21 questionnaires covered help-seeking, resilience, and wellbeing, while the film (intervention)
22 aimed to raise awareness of young parenthood. While help-seeking, resilience, and wellbeing
23 were underpinning themes in the film, its primary focus on young parenthood may have
24 obscured these underlying issues for some viewers. Given more time and different
25 circumstances, it might have been possible to align the measures more closely with the

1 intervention's focus. However, pandemic-related delays in the film's production,
2 communication challenges, and the selection of study outcomes and data collection measures
3 before film completion posed significant constraints. Future interventions should tailor
4 outcomes more specifically to mental health issues targeted by the intervention.

5 The intervention's content, particularly the follow-up discussion, was seen as positive by
6 students, and suggestions for addressing other mental health issues could use a similar
7 approach. However, participants indicated they preferred that this type of intervention be
8 delivered at school rather than at home because they felt some discomfort discussing these
9 topics with parents. It has been reported that dropout rates in mental health interventions at
10 home are significantly higher compared to a school intervention (35). Therefore, school
11 settings might be ideal for intervention delivery of this type. Students enjoyed the
12 intervention delivery by youth workers; however, they also found teacher delivery
13 acceptable. A systematic review found no difference in outcomes between teacher and
14 external intervention delivery, with students appreciating both the relatability of external
15 facilitators and the trusted presence of teachers (32). Considering scalability, teacher delivery
16 may be a viable option.

17 Researchers were concerned about the risk of contamination of the control group, since the
18 TryLife films were in the public domain when the study started. However, only one control
19 participant was aware of the intervention, indicating that the dissemination of TryLife should
20 be intensified to reach the target population.

21 The strengths of this study include use of a mixed-methods approach and validated
22 questionnaires. However, this study has some limitations inherent to feasibility studies, such
23 as limited statistical power and imbalances in baseline scores, influenced by differences
24 between schools, such as the gender imbalance in participating classes. Future research could
25 use targeted strategies to recruit more male students. Our approach to determining the sample
26 size was pragmatic, informed by evidence available at the time of proposal development,
27 which reported a median of 36 participants per arm (range: 10–300) in UK feasibility trials
28 (19). While this offered a useful benchmark, we acknowledge that more recent guidance (37),
29 offers a more structured, progression-criteria-driven approach to sample size justification in

1 feasibility studies, which could have strengthened our work and may be particularly valuable
2 in informing a future definitive trial.
3 Particular contextual factors also affected project feasibility. Data collection started in
4 November 2021, when students were just returning to school after the COVID-19 lockdown.
5 Although students or teachers did not mention this during interviews, conducting the study
6 was challenging, largely due to pandemic-related delays and the significant impact on schools
7 still recovering from the pandemic. Communication issues with schools, staff turnover, and
8 unplanned absences, both in schools and within the research team, created additional
9 obstacles. Key contacts in schools left their roles, and illness among school staff as well as
10 the research team, further reduced available personnel, straining the team and hindering
11 progress. The difficulties of conducting research within the complex environment schools had
12 to operate in during and after the pandemic, is well documented (38). Recommendations for
13 future studies include improved communication with schools and ensuring a dedicated
14 teacher is allocated sufficient time to support the project. Co-production and ensuring key
15 stakeholders from within all recruited schools are involved from the start, including study
16 design and planning, may have prevented some of the issues.
17 Other recommendations include providing additional support to schools with the technology
18 required to deliver the project and adopting a flexible approach to deliver the intervention to
19 suit the school's needs. However, the "active ingredients" of the intervention should be
20 maintained, such as the discussion following the interactive film delivery, and the role of
21 youth workers should be explored further in follow-up studies. Other recommendations
22 include the use of a variety of interactive films to tackle different mental health problems
23 faced by adolescents and involve teachers and students in the selection of mental health
24 issues. The intervention needs to be trialled in more school settings, perhaps investigating
25 more in-depth intervention feasibility in schools at different socio-economic levels. Likewise,

Commented [LA2]: It sounded repetitive so I removed.

1 measurement tools must match what has been delivered in the intervention, as highlighted by
2 students and reported in the preliminary data analysis.

3 In conclusion, while the intervention appears feasible and acceptable, its effectiveness as a
4 tool for supporting wellbeing, resilience, and help-seeking behaviour requires further
5 investigation. Conducting a school-based RCT is possible but challenging, particularly in the
6 aftermath of the pandemic, which created barriers not fully captured in the feasibility data.
7 Four out of seven progression criteria were classified as ‘partial target achieved’, indicating a
8 medium likelihood of success in moving to a definitive trial.

9 Unforeseen issues arose during the feasibility study that could not have been foreseen, and
10 could not be corrected during the conduct of the study. Given the challenges faced—
11 especially with randomisation, communication, and alignment of measurement tools—we
12 recommend pausing before proceeding to a definitive trial. Future feasibility studies should
13 focus on improving communication with schools, involving schools more into the design of
14 studies and aim for co-production, recruitment and consent processes, and developing
15 measurement tools that align closely with the intervention's targeted behaviours. Addressing
16 these issues will create a stronger foundation for eventual implementation and evaluation.

17

18 **Ethical approval**

19 Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Sunderland Research Ethics Group in
20 September 2021 (reference number 009976).

21 **Consent for Publication**

22 Consent for publication was obtained from participants as part of the informed consent process.

23 **Availability of data and material**

24 Data and materials are available upon reasonable request.

25 **Competing Interests**

26 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

27 **Funding**

1 This study received funding from NIHR Applied Research Collaboration NENC (ref OFC20-57). The funders
2 had no role in the design of the study, data collection, analysis, interpretation of data, or writing of the
3 manuscript.

Authors' contribution

FC conceived the study. FC, HC, ES, BA, JL, LA, KF equally contributed to designing the study approach. EW and FC collected data. EW & FC analysed the qualitative data; EW, JS, LA analysed the quantitative data. EW and CH conducted the PPI involvement. All authors supported the study throughout, contributed to editing drafts and approved the current manuscript for publication. FC is the author responsible for the overall content as the guarantor.

4 Acknowledgements

5 We would like to acknowledge and thank our participating schools, participants and PPI group.

6 References

- 7 1. de Girolamo G, Dagani J, Purcell R, Cocchi A, McGorry PD. Age of onset of mental
8 disorders and use of mental health services: needs, opportunities and obstacles. *Epidemiol*
9 *Psychiatr Sci*. 2012;21(1):47-57.
- 10 2. Patten SB. Age of Onset of Mental Disorders. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*.
11 2017;62(4):235-6.
- 12 3. Burns JR, Rapee RM. Adolescent mental health literacy: young people's knowledge of
13 depression and help seeking. *J Adolesc*. 2006;29(2):225-39.
- 14 4. Santini, ZI, Koyanagi A, Stewart-Brown S, Perry BD, Marmot M, Koushede, V. Cumulative
15 risk of compromised physical, mental and social health in adulthood due to family conflict and
16 financial strain during childhood: a retrospective analysis based on survey data representative
17 of 19 European countries. *BMJ Global Health*. 2021;6(3):e004144.
- 18 5. Ford T, Vizard T, Sadler K, McManus S, Goodman A, Merad S, et al. Data Resource
19 Profile: Mental Health of Children and Young People (MHCYP) Surveys. *International Journal*
20 *of Epidemiology*. 2020;49(2):363-4g.
- 21 6. McGorry P, Mei C. Youth mental health: A rising public health challenge. *Australasian*
22 *Psychiatry*. 2023;31(3):245-6.
- 23 7. Gunnell D, Kidger J, Elvidge H. Adolescent mental health in crisis. *BMJ*. 2018 Jun
24 19;361:k2608. doi: 10.1136/bmj.k2608.
- 25 8. Goodwin J, Savage E, O'Brien N, O'Donovan Á. "We're not educated on that enough,
26 and we really should be": adolescents' views of mental health service education. *Int J Qual Stud*
27 *Health Well-being*. 2023 Dec;18(1):2249287. doi: 10.1080/17482631.2023.2249287.
- 28 9. Salazar de Pablo G, De Micheli A, Nieman DH, Correll CU, Kessing LV, Pfennig A, et al.
29 Universal and selective interventions to promote good mental health in young people:
30 Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Neuropsychopharmacol*. 2020 Dec;41:28-39. doi:
31 10.1016/j.euroneuro.2020.10.007.

- 1 10. Seedaket S, Turnbull N, Phajan T, Wanchai A. Improving mental health literacy in
2 adolescents: systematic review of supporting intervention studies. 2020(1365-3156
3 (Electronic)).
- 4 11. Davaasambu S, Hauwadhanasuk T, Matsuo H, Szatmari P. Effects of interventions to
5 reduce adolescent depression in low- and middle-income countries: A systematic review and
6 meta-analysis. *J Psychiatr Res*. 2020 Apr;123:201-215. doi: 10.1016/j.jpsychires.2020.01.020.
- 7 12. Head, G. Ethics in educational research: Review boards, ethical issues and researcher
8 development. *European Educational Research Journal*. 2020; 19(1): 72-83.
9 <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/1474904118796315>
- 10 13. Gorard S, See, B.H., & Siddiqui, N. *The Trials of Evidence-based Education: The*
11 *Promises, Opportunities and Problems of Trials in Education*. 1st ed: Routledge; 2017.
- 12 14. Connolly P, Keenan C, Urbanska K. The trials of evidence-based practice in education:
13 a systematic review of randomised controlled trials in education research 1980–2016.
14 *Educational Research*. 2018;60(3):276-91.
- 15 15. Eldridge SM, Lancaster GA, Campbell MJ, Thabane L, Hopewell S, Coleman CL, et al.
16 *Defining Feasibility and Pilot Studies in Preparation for Randomised Controlled Trials:*
17 *Development of a Conceptual Framework*. *PLOS ONE*. 2016;11(3):e0150205-e.
- 18 16. Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, et al. CONSORT
19 2010 statement: Extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. *Pilot and Feasibility*
20 *Studies*. 2016;2(1):1-32.
- 21 17. O'Cathain A, Hoddinott P, Lewin S, Thomas KJ, Young B, Adamson J, et al. Maximising
22 the impact of qualitative research in feasibility studies for randomised controlled trials:
23 guidance for researchers. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies*. 2015;1(32). doi: 10.1186/s40814-015-
24 0026-y.
- 25 18. Helmke, S. Where do you start when everything feels urgent? Use an effort-to-impact
26 matrix. *The Learning Professional*, 2022; 43(2): 72-74.
- 27 19. Billingham SA, Whitehead AL, Julious SA. An audit of sample sizes for pilot and
28 feasibility trials being undertaken in the United Kingdom registered in the United Kingdom
29 Clinical Research Network database. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2013;13(1).
- 30 20. Connor KM, Davidson JRT. Development of a new Resilience scale: The Connor-
31 Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*. 2003;18(2):76-82.
- 32 21. Fischer EH, & Farina, A. Attitudes toward seeking professional psychological help: A
33 shortened form and considerations for research. *Journal of College Student Development*.
34 1995;36(4):368-73.
- 35 22. Tennant, R., Hiller, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., Parkinson, J., Secker, J.,
36 & Stewart-Brown, S. (2007). *Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-Being Scale (WEMWBS)*
37 [Database record]. APA PsycTests. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t01628-000>
- 38 23. Braun V, Clarke V. Toward good practice in thematic analysis: Avoiding common
39 problems and becoming a *knowing* researcher. *Int J Transgend Health*. 2022 Oct 25;24(1):1-
40 6. doi: 10.1080/26895269.2022.2129597.
- 41 24. Creswell JW, Plano Clark V. (2011) *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*
42 (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- 43 25. Forsyth R, Purcell C, Barry S, Simpson S, Hunter R, McDaid L, et al. Peer-led intervention
44 to prevent and reduce STI transmission and improve sexual health in secondary schools
45 (STASH): Protocol for a feasibility study. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies*. 2018;4(1):1-14.

26. Mitchell, K.R., Purcell, C., Simpson, S.A. *et al.* Feasibility study of peer-led and school-based social network Intervention (STASH) to promote adolescent sexual health. *Pilot Feasibility Stud* **7**, 125 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40814-021-00835-x>
27. O'Reilly M, Svirydzenka N, Adams S, Dogra N. Review of mental health promotion interventions in schools. *Soc Psychiatry Psuchiatr Epidemiol*. 2018;53(7):647-62.
28. Visser K, Bolt G, Finkenauer C, Jonker M, Weinberg D, Stevens GWJM. Neighbourhood deprivation effects on young people's mental health and wellbeing: A systematic review of the literature. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2021;270:113542.
29. García-Carrión R, Villarejo-Carballido B, Villardón-Gallego L. Children and Adolescents Mental Health: A Systematic Review of Interaction-Based Interventions in Schools and Communities. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2019;10.
30. Garcia A. Is Health Promotion Relevant Across Cultures and the Socioeconomic Spe. *Family & Community Health*. 2006;29(1):20S-7S.
31. Lancaster GA, Dodd S, Williamson P. Design and analysis of pilot studies: recommendations for good practice. *Journal of evaluation in clinical practice*. 2004;10(2):307-12.
32. Austin PC, White IR, Lee DS, van Buuren S. Missing Data in Clinical Research: A Tutorial on Multiple Imputation. *Can J Cardiol*. 2021;37(9):1322-31.
33. Bartlett J, Higgins C, Kotrlik J. Organizational Research: Determining Appropriate Sample Size in Survey Research. *Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journa*. 2001;19(1):1-8.
34. Wheatley C, Beale N, Wassenaar T, Graham M, Eldridge E, Dawes H, et al. Fit to Study: Reflections on designing and implementing a large-scale randomized controlled trial in secondary schools. *Trends Neurosci Educ*. 2020;Sep;20:100134.(2211-9493 (Electronic)).
35. Fridrici M, Lohaus A. Stress-prevention in secondary schools: online- versus face-to-face-training. *Health Education*. 2009;109(4):299-313.
36. Mackenzie K, Williams C. Universal, school-based interventions to promote mental and emotional wellbeing: what is being done in the UK and does it work? A systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8(9):e022560.
37. Montgomery R. Sample size justification in feasibility studies: moving beyond published guidance. *Pilot Feasibility Studies*. 2025 Jun 23;11(1):88. doi: 10.1186/s40814-025-01675-9.
38. DeMatthews D, Knight D, Reyes P, Benedict A, Callahan R. From the Field: Education Research During a Pandemic. *Educational Researcher*. 2020;49(6):398-402.

34

35

36 Appendix 1 Progression criteria full text

Criterion and method	Full, partial, and non-achievement target	Target met?
Criterion: Was it feasible to recruit schools? Method: Project monitoring data (number of schools and time of recruitment)	Full: Target number of schools (3) recruited before baseline data collection	Full target met: contact was made with seven schools of which three schools were recruited between May and October 2021.
	Partial: Target number of schools (3) not recruited <i>before</i> baseline data collection date (but is achieved overall)	
	Non-achievement: full or partial recruitment targets not achieved and recruitment method and eligibility need	

	careful review before progressing to full scale trial.	
Criterion: Were schools willing to be randomised? Method: Qualitative assessment	Full: All schools willing to take part in the study were willing to be randomised.	Partial target met: three schools were willing to be randomised and qualitative analysis of teacher interview and student focus groups suggest there is a good understanding and acceptable of necessity of randomisation for RCT. However, due to lack of resources to show the film, a fourth school that was initially contacted could only take part if assigned to control condition and was therefore not selected to participate.
	Partial: Some schools participating in the study were willing to be randomised, but randomisation was a barrier to participating for others.	
	Non-achievement: full or partial target not achieved, recruitment targets not achieved. Randomisation was a key barrier to non-participation. Recruitment method need careful review before progressing to full scale trial.	
Criterion: Was it feasible to recruit participants? Method: Quantitative descriptive data	Full: In each school and for each arm, at least 60% of participant recruitment is achieved within 6 months (25).	Partial target met: Original target was 120 participants in each school. In each school 48-49% of this target was achieved.
	Partial: In each location and for each arm, between 40% and 60% of participant recruitment is achieved within 6 months.	
	Non-achievement: full or partial target not achieved, recruitment targets not achieved and recruitment method and eligibility need careful review before progressing to full scale trial.	
Criterion: What proportion of participants could be followed up at 3 and 6 months? Method: Quantitative descriptive data	Full: In each school and for each arm, at least 60% of participants could be followed-up at 3 and 6 months (26).	Full target met: Participant numbers dropped by 20% from baseline to 3 months follow-up, but were subsequently practically maintained (a net drop of 1%) at 6 months. (80% retention rate at 3 months and 79% retention rate at 6 months).
	Partial: In each location and for each arm, between 40% and 60% of participant could be followed-up at 3 and 6 months.	
	Non-achievement: full and target not achieved, less than 40% of participants could be followed-up at 3 and 6 months, retention and attrition need careful review before progressing to full scale trial.	
Criterion: Were consent procedures acceptable to participants? Method: Qualitative data	Full: In each school, consent procedures were acceptable to all participants, teachers, and parents and no issues raised	Partial target met: Qualitative data suggested consent procedures acceptable to participants however, some participants indicated they did not have a complete understanding of the project when signing consent.
	Partial: Qualitative data suggested consent procedures were acceptable to most participants, teachers, and parents, although some issues were raised	
	Non-achievement: full or partial target not achieved, qualitative data suggested consent procedures were not acceptable to participants, teachers, and parents.	
Criterion: Were the selected secondary outcomes and data collection methods acceptable to participants and stakeholders? Method: Quantitative descriptive data and Qualitative data	Full: Student response rate > 70% at baseline and follow up (26). In each school, participants and teachers express all data collection process and methods to be acceptable.	Partial target met: Response rates achieved for all three surveys implemented in the study were high, with full participation by over 95% of participants. Surveys were seen as straightforward and most questions were perceived as clear, very few were difficult to comprehend. However, some participants questioned the relevance of the surveys.
	Partial: Student response rate > 60% at baseline and follow-up. In at least two schools, participants and teachers express most data collection process and methods to be acceptable.	
	Non-achievement: Student response rate < 50% at baseline and follow up.	

	amber target not achieved. Participants shared major concerns about data collection methods, which need careful review before proceeding to full scale trial.	
Criterion: Was the intervention and its implementation acceptable to participants and stakeholders, including intervention components and delivery mode? Method: Qualitative data	Full: in each school, intervention content and delivery were predominantly acceptable to all participants and teachers.	Full target was met. Qualitative data suggested participants and teachers were positive about the intervention, particularly about the delivery with youth workers and the discussion resulting from this
	Partial: intervention content and delivery were mostly acceptable to participants and teachers, but some issues were raised.	
	Non-achievement: Participants and teachers shared major concerns about intervention delivery, content or modality, which need careful review before proceeding to full scale trial.	

Note: Full target achieved: Very strong indication to proceed to a full trial. Partial target achieved: Medium indication to proceed to a full trial. Further discussions need to take place with members of the research team, PPI and stakeholders to improve performance. It should be reviewed in context of relevant qualitative and quantitative data provided in this feasibility study. Non-achievement target: Indication of doubt as to whether to proceed to a full trial. Further discussions need to take place with members of the research team, PPI and stakeholders, review in context of relevant qualitative and quantitative data provided in here. Should only proceed if other indicators are full or partial and there is a clear strategy to improve performance of indicators.