products via obviously illegal outlets.)

- Differences in the variables of interest between the two classrooms/groups (no storytelling, and the classroom where the storytelling was used) in the post-intervention assessment, with higher scores in knowledge, self-efficacy, etc., and lower scores in positive attitudes towards issues related to the purchase and/or the use of medicinal products including counterfeit medicinal products via obviously illegal outlets; towards illicit substances (less desire and stronger resistance to temptation to buy and use those products via obviously illegal outlets) in the class where the intervention was conducted.

**Long-term follow-up**

In order to assess retention of the message as well as the intended behavioural changes, follow-up after 2-3 months can be considered by the teacher: this can be done via focus groups or questionnaires.

The follow-up assessment can be carried out in line with the procedure presented above.

Another possibility for conducting follow-up is to repeat the storytelling session 2-3 months after the initial training. This may be particularly suitable for children in whom the use of standardised assessment tools such as questionnaires is more difficult. Again, the teacher can present the situations where decision-taking is required (dilemmas) and document all decisions proposed by the children and discuss their views related to the decision-making process. To facilitate assessment of retention and comparison with the initial storytelling session, it is strongly recommended that the teacher be supported by a person (e.g. another teacher) who will document the answers and debates in class.

The desirable side-effect of the repeat storytelling session could be a reinforcement of the key messages in the story through repetition, thus facilitating acceptance and retention and consolidating learning effect and implementation in risk-avoiding behaviour.