

**Additional file 4: Risk of bias in the included randomized study, with each potential source of bias judged as high, low, or unclear risk.**

<b>Study</b>	<b>Random sequence generation</b>	<b>Allocation concealment</b>	<b>Blinding</b>	<b>Completeness of data</b>	<b>Intention to treat analysis</b>	<b>Selective outcome reporting</b>
Van der Molen 2011 [20]	- Low risk “The stratified allocation ... was performed using a random, computerized allocation procedure.”	-Low risk “The primary researcher (HM) blindly randomized the groups for the hospital wards and workshop teachers as well as the needle supplier and the needle-use trainers”	-High risk “The intervention and implementation strategy made blind group assignment impossible for the participating wards, the workers and the trainers”	-High risk “The largest limitation of this study was the high proportion of workers lost to follow-up. At the cluster level, all wards remained in the study, but at the individual level 49% were lost at 12 months follow-up for the main outcome measure of self-reported NSIs compared to baseline”	-Low risk “The analysis were performed on an intention-to-treat basis”	-Low risk Outcomes listed in <a href="#">trial registry</a> (NTR1207) and in the methods section are reported in the results section