Supplementary Material

# Search queries

##  1st phase query

Query 1 : (("disinformation" OR "misinformation" OR "fake news" OR "conspiracy theor\*" OR "urban legend\*" OR "rumor\*" OR "hate speech" OR "cyberbullying" OR "fake science" OR "mislead\*" OR "fake source\*" OR "propagand\*") AND ("social media" OR "facebook" OR "instagram" OR "twitter" OR "tiktok" OR "youtube" OR "messenger" OR "whatsapp" OR "telegram" OR "internet" OR "media" OR "blog\*" OR "reddit" OR "4chan")) AND ("intervent\*" OR "tag\*" OR "factcheck\*" OR "false-tag" OR "refutation" OR "correct\*" OR "retraction" OR "flag\*" OR "headline\*" OR "counter\*" OR "rated false" OR "disrupted" OR "questionnaire\*" OR "survey\*" OR "interview\*" OR "focus group\*" OR "case stud\*" OR "observ\*" OR "experiment\*" OR "qualitative" OR "quantitative" OR "mixed method\*" OR "experiment\*") AND ("view\*" OR "experienc\*" OR "opinion\*" OR "attitude\*" OR "perce\*" OR "belie\*" OR "judge\*" OR "feel\*" OR "know\*" OR "understand\*" OR "assess\*" OR "expect\*" OR "tenden\*") AND ("share\*" OR "verify" OR "follo\*" OR "unfollo\*" OR "subscrib\*" OR "unsubscrib\*" OR "click\*" OR "induc\*" OR "trust\*" OR "distrust\*" OR "check\*" OR "reduc\*" OR "judge\*" OR "inferenc\*" OR "correct\*" OR "reflect\*" OR "reliance" OR "resist\*" OR "backfire" OR "influe\*" OR "like")

## 2nd phase query

Query 2: (“disinformation” OR “misinformation” OR “fake news” OR “conspiracy theory” OR “fake science”) AND (“intervention”) AND (“social media” OR “facebook” OR “instagram” OR “twitter” OR “tiktok” OR “youtube” OR “messenger” OR “whatsapp” OR “telegram” OR “internet” OR “media” OR “blog” OR “reddit” OR “4chan”)

# Intervention Assessment Score Survey

In order to assess the efficacy of psychological interventions reported in the studies included in the review, in parallel with data extraction the contributors completed an intervention assessment score survey using the following form:

**Intervention assessment score survey**

Please rate the intervention employed in this paper on a 1-5 scale, where 1 means ‘strongly disagree’ and 5 means ‘strongly agree’.

1. This intervention was proven in the paper to be successful (qualitative analysis).

Strongly Disagree 1------2------3------4------5 Strongly Agree

2. This intervention seems to be technically easy to implement in social media, based on your knowledge.

Strongly Disagree 1------2------3------4------5 Strongly Agree

3. This intervention does not require vast technological or financial resources to be implemented.

Strongly Disagree 1------2------3------4------5 Strongly Agree

4. This intervention does not require highly motivated participants.

Strongly Disagree 1------2------3------4------5 Strongly Agree

5. This intervention does not require big changes in the way social media UX currently works.

Strongly Disagree 1------2------3------4------5 Strongly Agree
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