

S3 Table: Risk of Bias assessment tables

Risk of bias assessment for interventions with a quasi-experimental design							
Study	Confounding	Selection of participants	Classification of interventions	Deviations from intended interventions	Missing outcome data	Measurement of the outcome	Selection of the reported results
Chau et al (2015) [58]	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low
Garrett (2016) [53]	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Holman et al (2009) [48]	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low
Holman & Axtell (2016) [60]	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low
Kirk et al (2013) – Study 1 [41]	High	Low	High	No information	No information	Some concerns	Low
Kirk et al (2013) – Study 1 [41]	High	Low	High	No information	No information	Some concerns	Low
Pickens et al (2016) [62]	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low	Some concerns	Low
Schneider et al (2012) [63]	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

Risk of bias assessment for interventions with a randomised or cluster-randomised-controlled design						
Study	Randomisation process	Deviation from intended interventions (assignment)	Deviation from intended interventions (adherence)	Missing outcome data	Measurement of the outcome	Selection of the reported results
Allexandre et al (2016) [49]	Low	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	Low
Cook et al (2004) [59]	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low
Krajewski, Wieland & Sauerland (2010) [42]	Low	Low	High	Low	Some concerns	Low
Krajewski, Sauerland & Rainer (2011) [43]	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Morris et al (2021) [10]	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Rempel et al (2006) [50]	Low	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low
Workman & Bommer (2004) [64]	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Mishra et al (2010) [44]	Low	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns
Bond et al (2008) [57]	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Workman (2003) [55]	Some concerns	Low	Low	Low	Some concerns	Low

Risk of bias assessment for interventions with a pre-post study design													
Study	Study question	Eligibility criteria and study population	Study participants representative of clinical populations of interest	All eligible participants enrolled	Sample size	Intervention clearly described	Outcome measures clearly described, valid, and reliable	Blinding of outcome assessors	Follow-up rate	Statistical analysis	Multiple outcome measures	Group-level interventions and individual-level outcome efforts	Overall
Chi & Lin (2009) [4]	Yes	Yes	No	Not reported	Not reported	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Fair
Kennedy & Pretorius (2008) [9]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not reported	Not reported	Yes	No	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Fair
Lehto et al (2003) [13]	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not reported	Not reported	Yes	No	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Not applicable	Fair
Sharifi, Denesh and Gholamnia (2022) [20]	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Not reported	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Not applicable	Fair
Tham (2004) [21]	Yes	No	No	Not reported	Not reported	Yes	No	Not applicable	Not reported	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Thatcher at al (2020) study 1 [22]	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	No	Yes	No	Yes	Fair
Thatcher at al (2020) study 2 [22]	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Not applicable	No	Yes	No	Yes	Poor

Wargocki, Wyon and Fanger (2004) [23]	Yes	No	Not reported	Not reported	Not reported	Yes	No	Not applicable	Can't determine	Yes	Yes	Yes	Poor
Yesilyurt & Yelken (2020) [26]	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Not reported	Yes	Yes	Not applicable	Yes	Yes	No	Not applicable	Fair