Reference and	Sedentary	Quali	Description of	Intervention	Control group	Intervention content	Promise
misc details	behaviour	ty	intervention	group(s)	description		
	measures *		treatment(s)	description			
Aittasalo et al	Waking	3/7	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1	N = 52	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1:
(2004) (also	sitting		behavioural	(counseling	Mean age 42y	Behaviour types targeted:	Non-promising
Aittasalo &	time on		counseling	only)	54% female	PA	Within-group:
Miilunpalo,	workday		promoting PA				Not reported.
2006) ‡	(unclear			N = 52		Primary behaviour change aim:	
	whether		Intervention 2:	Mean age 45y		to increase PA	Between-group:
Finland	typical or		behavioural	61% female			Smaller change in
	actual		counseling			Functions: Enablement	non-workday
3-arm RCT	workday)		promoting PA +	Intervention 2			sitting relative to
(2	(SR)		fitness testing	(counseling +		BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	Intervention 2.
interventions,				fitness)		Action planning; Review	Comparison with
1 control)	Waking					behaviour goals; Social support	control not
	sitting			N = 51		(unspecified); Information	reported.
Follow-up**:	time on a			Mean age 44y		about health consequences	
12 months	non-			53% female			Intervention 2:
only	workday					Intervention 2:	Quite promising
	(unclear					Behaviour types targeted: PA	
Theory	whether						Within-group:
mentioned?	typical or					Primary behaviour change aim:	Not reported.
Yes	actual)					to increase PA	
(Transtheoret	(SR) *						Between-group:
ical Model)						Functions:	Greater reduction
						Enablement, education	in non-workday
Sample:							sitting relative to
Employees						BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	Intervention 1 or
						Action planning; Review	control group. No

## Supplemental Table 2. Description of studies

SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No Setting: Worksite Total sample at follow-up*: N = 155						behaviour goals; Feedback on outcome of behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Information about health consequences; Social comparison	effects on other sitting indices.
Alkhajah et al (2012) Australia 2-arm, quasi- experimental (1 intervention, 1 control) Follow-ups: 1 week, 3 months Theory mentioned? No Sample: Employees	Waking sitting time (over last 7 days) (0, accelerom eter) * Worksite sitting time (over last 7 days) (0, accelerom eter)*	2/7	Provision of sit- stand workstations and motivational information	N = 18 Mean age 33.5y 17 female (94%)	N = 13 Mean age 39.9y 12 female (86%)	Behaviour types targeted: SB, PA Primary behaviour change aim: to reduce SB Functions: Environmental restructuring BCTs: Instruction on how to perform the behaviour; information about social and emotional consequences; restructuring the physical environment; adding objects to the environment	Very promising Within-group: Reduction in workplace sitting and overall waking time sitting at 1 week and 3 months. Between-group: Greater change in workplace sitting and overall waking time sitting at 1 week and 3 months relative to control group (for which no change was observed).

SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No Setting: Worksite Total sample at final follow-up: N = 31							
Barwais et al (2013) Australia 2-arm RCT (1 intervention, 1 control) Follow-up: 4 weeks only Theory mentioned? No Sample: Office	Waking sitting time (over last 7 days) (SR) *	4/7	Provision of an activity monitor for PA feedback	N = 18 Mean age 28.7y males, 29.5y females 6 females (33%)	N = 15 Mean age 26.1y males, 27.2y females 5 females (67%)	<ul> <li>Behaviour types targeted: SB, PA</li> <li>Primary behaviour change aim: to reduce SB</li> <li>Functions: Enablement, education</li> <li>BCTs: Goal-setting (outcome); Feedback on behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Adding objects to environment</li> </ul>	Very promising Within-group: Reduction in sitting time. Between-group: Greater change in sitting time relative to control group (for which no change was observed).

students							
SB an explicit eligibility criterion? Yes							
Setting: Community							
Total sample at follow-up: N = 33							
N = 35Burke et al(2013) (alsoBurke et al2010) †Australia2-arm RCT(1intervention,1 control)Follow-up: 6months onlyTheorymentioned?Yes (SocialCognitive	Waking sitting time (over a typical week) (SR) *	4/7	Multifaceted intervention promoting PA and healthy diet	N = 176 Mean age 65.8y 83 females (47%)	N = 199 Mean age 65.8y 98 females (49%)	Behaviour types targeted: PA, dietPrimary behaviour change aim: to increase PA (and improve diet)Function: EnablementBCTs: Goal setting (outcome); Feedback on behaviour; Self- monitoring of behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Adding objects to the environment	Very promising Within-group: Reduction in sitting time. Between-group: Greater change in sitting time relative to control group (for which no change was observed).

Theory)							
Sample: Older adults							
SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No							
Setting: Home-based							
Total sample at follow-up: N = 375							
Chang et al	Waking	2/7	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1	N/A	Intervention 1	Intervention 1:
(2013)	sitting time (over		8-week weekly empowerment	<u>(empowerment)</u> <u>:</u>		<u>(empowerment):</u> Behaviour types targeted: SB,	Very promising
USA	last 7		course in	<u>.</u> N = 27		PA	Within-group:
	days) (SR)		healthy lifestyle	Mean age 66.7y			Reduction in
2-arm quasi-	*			16 female (59%)		Joint primary behaviour	sitting time.
experiment (2			Intervention 2:			change aims: to reduce SB and	
interventions			Lectures on	Intervention 2		increase PA	Between-group:
)			causes, signs	<u>(education):</u> N = 21		Franctione Education training	Greater reduction
Follow-up: 8			and symptoms of hypertension	N = 21 Mean age 66.0y		Functions: Education, training enablement	in sitting than Intervention 2.
weeks only			or hypertension	11 female (52%)			
weeks only				11 Tennare (0270)		BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	Intervention 2:
Theory						Action planning; Monitoring of	Non-promising
mentioned?						behaviour by others without	- 0
Yes						feedback; Self-monitoring of	Within-group:

(Empowerme						behaviour; Social support	Unclear.
nt Theory)						(unspecified); Instruction on	
						how to perform the behaviour;	Between-group:
Sample: Older						Information about health	Lesser reduction
adults with						consequences; Behavioural	in sitting relative
hypertension						practice/rehearsal; Graded	to Intervention 1.
						tasks; Credible source; Adding	
SB an explicit						objects to the environment	
eligibility							
criterion?						Intervention 2 (education):	
No						Behaviour types targeted:	
						Unclear	
Setting:							
Community						Primary behaviour change aim:	
						Unclear	
Total sample							
at follow-up:						Functions: Education	
N = 48							
						BCTs: Social support	
						(unspecified); Credible source	
De Cocker et	Waking	5/7	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1	N/A	<u>Intervention 1 (pedometer +</u>	Intervention 1:
al (2012) ‡	sitting		Pedometer and	<u>(pedometer +</u>		<u>feedback):</u>	Non-promising
	time (over		tailored	<u>feedback):</u>		Behaviour types targeted: PA	
Netherlands	a typical		feedback	N = 32			Within-group:
	week)			Mean age 46.6y		Primary behaviour change aim:	No change in
2-arm RCT (2	(SR) *		Intervention 2:	15 females		to increase PA	sitting time.
interventions			Pedometer only	(47%)			
)						Functions: Education,	Between-group:
				Intervention 2		enablement, persuasion	No difference in
Follow-up: 3				<u>(pedometer</u>			sitting time
months only				<u>only):</u>		BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	change relative to
				N = 37		Problem solving; Action	Intervention 2.

Theory				Mean age 47.7y		planning; Feedback on	
				0 1			Later and the O
mentioned?				16 females		behaviour; Social support	Intervention 2:
Yes				(43%)		(practical); Instruction on how	Non-promising
(Transtheoret						to perform the behaviour;	
ical Model,						Information about health	Within-group:
Theory of						consequences; Graded tasks;	No change in
Planned						Adding objects to environment;	sitting time.
Behaviour)						Verbal persuasion about	0
· · · <b>)</b>						capability	Between-group:
Sample:						capability	No difference in
Patients/gene						Intervention 2 (pedometer	sitting time
10						only):	0
ral public							change relative to
						Behaviour types targeted: PA	Intervention 1.
SB an explicit						<b>.</b>	
eligibility						Primary behaviour change aim:	
criterion?						to increase PA	
No							
						Function: Enablement	
Setting:							
Community						BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	
5						Feedback on behaviour; Adding	
Total sample						objects to environment	
at follow-up:						objects to environment	
N = 69							
N = 0.9							
Dewa et al	Walting	0/7	Provision of	N = 22	N = 6	Pohoviour trmos torgotod, DA	Vonumonicina
	Waking	0/7			-	Behaviour types targeted: PA,	Very promising
(2009)	sitting		pedometer	Mean age 43.4y	Mean age 53.8y	SB	···· · ·
	time (over			Gender NR (all	Gender NR (all		Within-group:
Canada	last 7			participants =	participants = 25	Primary behaviour change aim:	Reduction in
	days) (SR)			25 females, 3	females, 3 males)	to increase PA and reduce SB	sitting time.
Quasi-	*			males)			
experimental						Function:	Between-group:

(1 intervention, 1 control) Follow-up: 4 weeks only Theory mentioned? No Sample: Employees SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No Setting: Worksite Total sample at follow-up:						Enablement BCTs: Self-monitoring of behaviour; Adding objects to environment	Greater change in sitting time relative to control group (for which no change was observed).
N = 28 Dunn et al	Waking	2/7	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1	N/A	Intervention 1 (structured):	Intervention 1:
(1998) (also: Dunn et al, 1997; Kohl et	sitting time (over last 7	2/1	Structured exercise classes	$\frac{(structured)}{N = 104}$ Mean age 46.2y		Behaviour types targeted: PA Primary behaviour change aim:	Quite promising
al, 1998) USA	days) (SR) *		Intervention 2: Advice on integrating PA	53 females (51%)		to increase PA Functions: Education,	Reduction in sitting time.

		into lifestyle	Intervention 2	enablement, persuasion,	Between-group:
2-arm RCT (2			(lifestyle):	training	No difference
interventions			N = 110		relative to
)			Mean age 45.9y	BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	Intervention 2.
<b>,</b>			55 females	Action planning; Self-	
Follow-up: 6			(50%)	monitoring of behaviour; Social	Intervention 2:
months only			(0070)	support (unspecified); Graded	Quite promising
montile only				tasks; Credible source; Social	Quite promising
Theory				reward	Within-group:
mentioned?				leward	Reduction in
Yes				Intervention 2 (lifestyle):	sitting time.
(Transtheoret				Behaviour types targeted: PA	sitting time.
ical Model,				Dellaviour types targeteu. I A	Between-group:
Social				Primary behaviour change aim:	No difference
				to increase PA	relative to
Cognitive				to increase PA	Intervention 1.
Theory)					Intervention 1.
				Functions: Persuasion,	
Sample:				enablement, education	
General					
public				BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	
				Problem solving; Action	
SB an explicit				planning; Commitment; Social	
eligibility				support (unspecified);	
criterion?				Information about health	
No				consequences; Prompts/cues;	
				Behaviour substitution; Self-	
Setting:				reward	
Unclear					
Total sample					
at follow-up:					
N = 214					

Ellegast et al (2012) ‡	Worksite sitting	1/7	Provision of sit- stand	N = 13 Age NR	N = 12 Age NR	Behaviour types targeted: PA	Very promising
	time (over		workstations	Total sample: 6	Total sample: 6	Primary behaviour change aim:	Within-group:
Germany?	last 7		and other	females (24%),	females (24%),	to increase PA	Reduction in
5	days) (SR)		intervention	19 males (76%)	19 males (76%)		sitting time (at 12
2-arm RCT (1	*		measures			Functions: Persuasion,	weeks – changes
intervention,			(unclear)			incentivisation, environmental	at other weeks
1 control)			()			restructuring, modelling,	unclear).
						enablement	
Follow-up:							Between-group:
weekly for 12						BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	Greater reduction
weeks						Discrepancy between current	in sitting time (at
						behaviour and goal; Feedback	12 weeks) relative
Theory						on behaviour; Self-monitoring	to control group.
mentioned?						of behaviour; Social support	
No						(unspecified); Social support	
						(practical); Instruction on how	
Sample: Office						to perform the behaviour;	
workers						Social comparison; Behavioural	
						practice/rehearsal; Behaviour	
SB an explicit						substitution; Material incentive	
eligibility						(behaviour); Material reward	
criterion?						(behaviour); Restructuring the	
No						physical environment;	
						Restructuring the social	
Setting:						environment; Adding objects to	
Worksite						the environment	
Total sample							
at final							
follow-up: N =							

25							
Evans et al	Worksite	4/7	Intervention 1	Intervention 1	N/A	Intervention 1 (education +	Intervention 1:
(2012) † ‡	sitting	,	(Education +	(education +	,	PoC)	Very promising
	time (last		Point of Choice):	PoC):		Behaviour types targeted: SB	
UK	5 days) (0,		Educational talk	N = 14			Within-group:
	accelerom		on health risks	Mean age 49y		Primary behaviour change aim:	Reduction in
2-arm RCT (2	eter)		of sitting and	11 females		To reduce SB	number and
interventions	-		computer	(79%)			duration of bouts
)	Worksite		reminders to			Functions:	of prolonged
-	sitting		stand every	Intervention 2		Education, Enablement,	sitting.
Follow-up: 5	events per		30mins	(education):		Environmental restructuring	
days only	day (last 5			N = 14			Between-group:
	days) (0,		Intervention 2	Mean age 39y		BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	Greater reduction
Theory	accelerom		(Education):	11 females		Action planning; Instruction on	in number and
mentioned?	eter) *		Educational talk	(79%)		how to perform behaviour;	duration of bouts
No			on health risks			Information about health	of prolonged
	Worksite		of sitting			consequences; Prompts/cues;	sitting relative to
Sample: Office	sitting					Behaviour substitution	Intervention 2.
workers	events						
	(last 5					Intervention 2 (education)	Intervention 2:
SB an explicit	days) (0,					Behaviour types targeted: SB	Non-promising
eligibility	accelerom						
criterion?	eter)					Primary behaviour change aim:	Within-group:
Yes						To reduce SB	Increase in
	Duration						number and
Setting:	of					Functions: Education	duration of bouts
Worksite	prolonged						of prolonged
	worksite					BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	sitting. No change
Total sample	sitting					Action planning; Instruction on	on other SB
at follow-up:	events					how to perform behaviour;	indices.
N = 28	(last 5					Information about health	
	days) (0,					consequences; Behaviour	Between-group:

	accelerom eter) *					substitution	Greater reduction observed in reduction in Intervention 1 than Intervention 2.
Fitzsimons et	Waking	3/7	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1:	N/A	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1:
al (2012)	weekday		Walking	N = 39		Behaviour types targeted: PA	Very promising
(also Baker et	sitting		programme with	Mean age 47.3y			
al, 2008;	time (over		provision of	31 females		Primary behaviour change aim:	Within-group:
Fitzsimons et	last 7		pedometer and	(79%)		To increase PA	Reduction in all
al, 2008)	days) (SR)		PA feedback (in				sitting time
	*		first 12 weeks),	Intervention 2:		Function: Enablement	indices (at 3
UK	XA7 1 ·		PA consultation	N = 40			months and 12
2 DCT (2	Waking		(at 12 weeks),	Mean age 51.2y 32 females		BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	months).
2-arm RCT (2 interventions	weekend		information and feedback at 24-	(80%)		Problem solving; Action planning; Feedback on	Patusan group
Interventions	sitting time (over		and 36-weeks	(80%)		behaviour; Self-monitoring of	<i>Between-group:</i> Greater change in
J	last 7		allu 50-weeks			behaviour; Social support	weekday sitting
Follow-up: 3	days) (SR)		Intervention 2:			(unspecified); Instruction on	(between baseline
months	*		Walking			how to perform the behaviour;	and week 12, and
(intervention			programme with			Graded tasks; Pros/cons;	between week 24
1 only), 12	Total		provision of			Adding objects to the	and 48), and total
months (both	waking		pedometer and			environment	sitting time
interventions	sitting		PA feedback				(between baseline
)	time (last		<u>(12-24 weeks),</u>			Intervention 2:	and week 12)
	7 days)		feedback at 24-			Behaviour types targeted: PA	relative to
Theory	(SR) *		and 36-weeks				Intervention
mentioned?						Primary behaviour change aim:	Group 2.
Yes						To increase PA	
(Transtheoret							Intervention 2:

ical Model)						Function: Enablement	Non-promising
Sample: General public						BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour); Action planning; Feedback on behaviour; Self-monitoring of	<i>Within-group:</i> Unclear.
SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No						behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Instruction on how to perform the behaviour; Graded tasks; Adding objects to the environment	<i>Between-group:</i> Less change than Group 1.
Setting: Community							
Total sample at final follow-up: N = 79							
Fitzsimons et al (2013)	Waking sedentary	2/7	Accelerometer feedback and	N = 22 Mean age 68y	N/A	Behaviour types targeted: SB, PA	Quite promising
Scotland, UK	time (over last 7		individualised consultation	Mostly male (number/% not		Primary behaviour change aim:	<i>Within-group:</i> Reduction in
Scoualiu, UK	days) (O,		consultation	specified)		To reduce SB	sitting time
1-arm pre- post (no control)	accelerom eter) *					Functions: Enablement, education, training	<i>Between-group:</i> N/A
Follow-up: 24 days only						BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour); Problem solving; Action planning; Commitment;	
Theory mentioned?						Feedback on behaviour; Instruction on how to perform	

No Sample: Older adults SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No Setting: Community Total sample at follow-up:						the behaviour; Information about health consequences; Behavioural practice/rehearsal; Habit formation; Habit reversal; Graded tasks; Pros and cons	
N = 22							
Gilson et al (2009)	Worksite sitting time (over	2/7	Intervention 1: Pedometer and advice to	<u>Intervention 1</u> <u>(route):</u> N = 60	N = 60 Mean age 40.8y 49 female (82%)	<u>Intervention 1 (route):</u> Behaviour types targeted: PA	Intervention 1: Non-promising
UK, Australia	5 days)		increase route-	Mean age 42.1y		Primary behaviour change aim:	Within-group:
& Spain	(SR) *		based walking	45 female (75%)		To increase PA	No change in
			during work				sitting time (for
3-arm RCT (2 interventions,			breaks	<u>Intervention 2</u> (incidental):		Function: Enablement	average change from baseline –
1 control)			Intervention 2:	N = 59		BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	change from
			Pedometer and	Mean age 41.0y		Self-monitoring of behaviour;	baseline at each
Follow-ups: 1,			advice to	47 female (80%)		Instruction on how to perform	timepoint
5, and 10			increase			behaviour; Graded tasks;	unclear).
weeks			incidental			Adding objects to the	
			walking during			environment	Between-group:
Theory			work				No difference in
mentioned?						Intervention 2 (incidental):	change relative to

No			Behaviour types targeted: PA	Intervention 2 or
				control group.
Sample:			Primary behaviour change aim:	
Employees			To increase PA	Intervention 2:
				Non-promising
SB an explicit			Function: Enablement	
eligibility				Within-group:
criterion?			BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	No change in
No			Self-monitoring of behaviour;	sitting time (for
			Instruction on how to perform	average change
Setting:			behaviour; Behaviour	from baseline –
Worksite			substitution; Graded tasks;	change from
			Adding objects to the	baseline at each
Total sample			environment	timepoint
at final				unclear).
follow-up: N =				-
179				Between-group:
				No difference in
				change relative to
				Intervention 1 or
				control group.

Hansen et al	Waking	4/7	Intervention:	N = 3555	N = 4249	Behaviour types targeted: PA	Non-promising
(2012)	sitting		Website	Mean age 50.7y	Mean age 50.4y		
	time		providing	3924 females	4043 females	Primary behaviour change aim:	Within-group:
Denmark	(unclear		tailored PA	(65%)	(65%)	To increase PA	No changes in
D D (TT (4	whether		advice				sitting time.
2-arm RCT (1	typical or					Function: Enablement	
intervention,	actual)						Between-group:
1 control)	(SR) *					BCTs: Goal setting (outcome);	No difference in
Follow-up: 6						Problem solving; Feedback on behaviour; Self-monitoring of	change relative to control.
months only						outcome of behaviour;	CONTROL.
months only						Biofeedback; Social support	
Theory						(unspecified); Information on	
mentioned?						social and emotional	
Yes						consequences; Credible source;	
(Transtheoret						Restructuring the social	
ical Model,						environment	
Theory of							
Planned							
Behaviour)							
Sample:							
General							
public							
SB an explicit							
eligibility criterion?							
No							
INU							
Setting:							
Online							

Total sample at follow-up: N = 7804							
Healy et al (2013) (also Dunstan et al, 2013; Neuhaus et al, 2014) † ‡ Australia 2-arm non- randomised controlled	Worksite sitting time (over 7 days) (O, accelerom eter) *	2/7	Multilevel intervention promoting organizational, environmental and individual- level change to support SB reduction	N = 18 Mean age 42.4y 17 females (77%)	N = 18 Mean age 42.9y 7 females (33%)	Behaviour types targeted: SB, PA Primary behaviour change aim: To reduce SB Function: Enablement, environmental restructuring, training, education BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour); Problem solving; Goal setting	Very promising Within-group: Reduction in sitting time. Between-group: Greater change in intervention group than control group (for which no change was

trial (1 intervention, 1 control) Follow-up: 4 weeks only Theory mentioned? No Sample: Employees SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No Setting: Worksite Total sample at follow-up: N = 36	Webberg	2.47		N 12		(outcome); Action planning; Review behaviour goal(s); Discrepancy between current behaviour and goal; Feedback on behaviour; Self-monitoring of behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Social support (practical); Instruction on how to perform the behaviour; Information about health consequences; Prompts/cues; Behavioural practice/rehearsal; Behaviour substitution; Habit formation; Graded tasks; Restructuring the physical environment; Restructuring the social environment; Adding objects to the environment	observed).
John et al (2011) USA 1-arm pre-	Waking sitting time on workday (over 2 workdays)	2/7	Provision of treadmill workstations	N = 12 Age 46.2y 7 females (58%)	N/A	Behaviour types targeted: PA Primary behaviour change aim: To increase PA Function: Environmental	<b>Quite promising</b> <i>Within-group:</i> Reduction in sitting time at both 3 & 9
post (no	(0					restructuring	months.

accelerom						D (
eter)*					bCTs: Restructuring the physical environment; Adding objects to the environment	Between-group: N/A
Waking sedentary	2/7	Provision of information and	N = 16 Age 46.5y	N/A	Behaviour types targeted: SB	Quite promising
time (last 7 days) (O; accelerom		suggested SB reduction strategies	15 female (75%)		Primary behaviour change aim: To reduce SB	<i>Within-group:</i> Reduction in sitting time by
eter) *		-			Functions: Education, Enablement	both measures. Between-group:
e V soti 7 a e	ter) * Vaking edentary ime (last ' days) (O; ccelerom	ter) *	ter) *	ter) * Vaking edentary ime (last 'days) (0; ccelerom ter) * 2/7 Provision of information and suggested SB reduction strategies N = 16 Age 46.5y 15 female (75%)	ter) * Vaking edentary ime (last 'days) (0; ccelerom ter) * 2/7 Provision of information and suggested SB reduction strategies N = 16 Age 46.5y 15 female (75%) N/A	ter)*       Image: Sector of the

Follow-up: Between 1-7 days only Theory mentioned? No Sample: Employees SB an explicit eligibility criterion? Yes Setting: Worksite Total sample at follow-up: N = 16	worksite sedentary time (over 6h period) (O, direct observatio n) *					BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour); Action planning; Self- monitoring of behaviour; Instruction on how to perform the behaviour; Information about health consequences; Prompts/cues; Behavioural substitution	N/A
Marshall et al (2003a) (also: Marshall et al, 2003b) *** Australia 2-arm RCT (2 interventions	Waking sitting time on weekday (SR) *	7/7	Intervention 1: Print-based intervention to increase PA <u>Intervention 2:</u> Web-based intervention to increase PA	Intervention 1 (print): N = 87 Mean age 43y Gender N NR (47% females in group from which 87 derived)	N/A	Intervention 1 (print): Behaviour types targeted: PA Primary behaviour change aim: To increase PA Function: Enablement BCTs: Goal setting (outcome);	Intervention 1: Non-promising Within-group: No change in sitting time. Between-group: No difference in

) Follow-up: 10 weeks only Theory mentioned? Yes (Transtheoret ical Model) Sample: Employees SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No Setting: Worksite Total sample at follow-up: N = 156				Intervention 2 (web): N = 69 Mean age 43y Gender N NR (50% females in group from which 69 derived)		Self monitoring of outcome of behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Prompts/cues <u>Intervention 2 (web):</u> Behaviour types targeted: PA Primary behaviour change aim: To increase PA Function: Enablement BCTs: Goal setting (outcome); Self monitoring of outcome of behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Prompts/cues	change relative to Intervention 2. <u>Intervention 2:</u> <b>Non-promising</b> <i>Within-group:</i> No change in sitting time. <i>Between-group:</i> No difference in change relative to Intervention 1.
Mazzeo et al (2008) USA 2-arm RCT (1 intervention,	Waking sitting time (over last 7 days) (SR) *	3/7	Series of group sessions on weight loss (diet and PA)	N = 17 Total sample: Mean age 40.1y 33 (97%) female	N = 17 Total sample: Mean age 40.1y 33 (97%) female	Behaviour types targeted: PA, diet Primary behaviour change aim: weight loss (increased PA, improved diet)	Very promising Within-group: Intervention group reduced their sitting time.

1 control) Follow-up: Wave 1 sample: 8 weeks only Wave 2 sample: 12 weeks only (data pooled for analysis)			Functions: Training, enablement BCTs: Social support (unspecified); Identification of self as role model	Between-group: Reduction in sitting time in intervention group significantly greater than in control group.
Theory mentioned? Yes (Social Cognitive Theory)				
Sample: Parents of overweight children				
SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No				
Setting: Community Total sample				

(2012) (also: Macmillan etsedentary time (overfeedback and individualizedMean age 71.6y 13 femalesMean age 70.0y 13 femalesMean age 70.0y Primary behaviour change aim:Within-group	at follow-up: N = 34							
Scotland, UKdays) (0, accelerom eter) *sedentary tin 12 weeks. ***2-arm RCT (1 	N = 34Mutrie et al (2012) (also: Macmillan et al, 2011) †Scotland, UK2-arm RCT (1 intervention, 1 control) ****Follow-up: 12 & 24 weeks ****Follow-up: 12 & 24 weeks ****Theory mentioned? Yes (Social Cognitive Theory)Sample: Older adultsSB an explicit eligibility criterion?	sedentary time (over last 7 days) (0, accelerom	,	feedback and	Mean age 71.6y	Mean age 70.0y	<ul> <li>Primary behaviour change aim: To increase PA</li> <li>Function: Enablement</li> <li>BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour); Problem solving; Self- monitoring of behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Instruction on how to perform behaviour; Information on health consequences; Graded tasks; Pros and cons; Adding</li> </ul>	group than control group (no change observed) at 12

Setting: General practice Total sample							
at final follow-up: N = 39							
Opdenacker & Boen (2008)	Waking sitting time (over	3/7	Intervention 1: PA coaching programme with	Intervention 1 (face-to-face): N = 33	N/A	Intervention 1 (face-to-face) Behaviour types targeted: PA	Intervention 1: Quite promising
Belgium 2-arm RCT (2	last 7 days) (SR) *		face-to-face support	Mean age 38.8y Gender NR		Primary behaviour change aim: To increase PA	<i>Within-group:</i> Reduction in sitting time.
interventions )			Intervention 2: PA coaching programme with	<u>Intervention 2</u> (phone): N = 33		Function: Enablement BCTs:	<i>Between-group:</i> No difference in
Follow-up: 3 months only			telephone support	Mean age 39.9y Gender NR		Goal setting (behaviour); Problem solving; Review behaviour goals; Self-	change relative to Intervention 2.
Theory mentioned? No						monitoring of behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Instructions on how to perform	Intervention 2: Quite promising
Sample: Employees						behaviour Intervention 2 (phone):	<i>Within-group:</i> Reduction in sitting time.
SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No						Behaviour types targeted: PA Primary behaviour change aim: To increase PA Function: Enablement	<i>Between-group:</i> No difference in change relative to Intervention 1.

Setting: Worksite Total sample at follow-up: N = 66						BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour); Problem solving; Review behaviour goals; Self- monitoring of behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Instructions on how to perform behaviour	
Østeras &	Waking	2/7	Individual	N = 131	N/A	Behaviour types targeted: PA	Non-promising
Hammer (2006)	sitting time <i>(unclear</i>		consultation about increasing PA	Mean age 41.2y 51 females (39%)		Primary behaviour change aim: To increase PA	<i>Within-group:</i> No change in
Norway	whether typical or					Function: Enablement	sitting time
1-arm pre-	actual)					Function. Enablement	Between-group:
post (no control)	(SR) *					BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour); Action planning; Review behaviour goals; Social support	N/A
Follow-up: 6 months only						(unspecified)	
Theory mentioned? No							
Sample: Employees							
SB an explicit eligibility criterion? Yes							

Setting: Worksite Total sample at follow-up: N = 131							
Pronk et al (2012) USA 2-arm non- randomised time-series (1 intervention, 1 control) Follow-ups: 5 & 7 weeks Theory mentioned? No Sample: Employees SB an explicit eligibility criterion? Yes	Worksite sitting time (over a typical day) (SR) *	2/7	Provision of sit- stand workstations and supportive organizational policies	N = 23 Mean age 38.4y 23 females (96%)	N = 10 Mean age 44.2y 8 females (80%)	Behaviour types targeted: SB Primary behaviour change aim: To reduce SB Functions: Environmental restructuring, Enablement BCTs: Restructuring the physical environment; Restructuring the social environment; Adding objects to the environment	Very promising Within-group: Intervention group decreased workplace sitting at 5 weeks. Between-group: Greater decrease in workplace sitting at 5-week follow-up among intervention group relative to control (control group increased workday sitting at 5 weeks).

Setting: Worksite							
Total sample							
at follow-up: N = 33							
Shaw & Page	Waking (?)	3/7	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1:	N/A	Intervention 1:	Intervention 1:
(2008)	sitting	,	Instruction to	N = 10	1	Behaviour types targeted: PA	Non-promising
	time (over		walk for at least	Modal age 65-69		(and diet, as part of	
USA	a typical		10mins per day	(31%)		intervention administered	Within-group:
	week) (SR)		and provision of	10 female		prior to this one)	No change in
2-arm RCT (2 interventions	<b></b> Υ		walking aids if needed (and	(100%)		Primary behaviour change aim:	sitting time.
)			separate PA and	Intervention 2:		To increase PA	Between-group:
)			dietary	N = 8		10 mercase 1 M	No change relative
Follow-up: 90			intervention	Joint modal age		Function: Enablement	to Intervention 2.
days only			administered to	<65 & 65-69			
			all participants	(each 18%)		BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	Intervention 2:
Theory			before this	8 female (100%)		Action planning; Monitoring of	Non-promising
mentioned?			treatment)			bhvr by others without	147', 1 '
No			Intervention 2:			feedback; Instruction on how	Within-group:
Sample: Older			Provision of			to perform behaviour; Graded tasks; Adding objects to the	No change in sitting time.
women			walking aids if			environment	sitting time.
already			needed (and				Between-group:
participating			separate PA and			Intervention 2:	No change relative
in a nutrition			dietary			Behaviour types targeted: PA	to Intervention 1.
and PA			intervention			(and diet, as part of	
programme			administered to			intervention administered	
CD on combinit			all participants			prior to this one)	
SB an explicit			before this				

eligibility criterion? No Setting: Community Total sample		treatment)			Primary behaviour change aim: To increase PA Function: Enablement BCTs: Adding objects to the environment, instruction on how to perform behaviour	
at follow-up: N = 18						
Spittaels et al (2007) (alsoW si Si Spittaels & De Bourdeaudhu ij, 2007) ‡W w ty Belgium	Vaking 3/7 itting ime unclear whether vpical or ctual) SR) *	Intervention 1 (one-off feedback): Website providing one- off PA feedback Intervention 2 (repeated feedback): Website providing repeated PA feedback	Intervention 1 (one-off feedback): N = 103 Mean age 43.3y 67 females (65%) Intervention 2 (repeated feedback): N = 78 Mean age 39.6y 52 females (67%)	N = 104 Mean age 40.7y 70 females (67%)	Intervention 1 (one-off feedback): Behaviour types targeted: PAPrimary behaviour change aim: To increase PAFunction: EnablementBCTs: Goal setting (outcome); Feedback on behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Social rewardIntervention 2 (repeated feedback): Behaviour types targeted: PAPrimary behaviour change aim: To increase PA	Intervention 1:Very promisingWithin-group:Reduction insitting on bothweekdays andweekdays andweekends.Between-group:Greater changethan controlgroup. Nodifference relativeto Intervention 2.Intervention 2:Very promisingWithin-group:Reduction insitting on both

Planned Behaviour)						Function: Enablement	weekdays and weekends.
Sample: School staff and parents						BCTs: Goal setting (outcome); Feedback on behaviour; Social support (unspecified); Social reward	<i>Between-group:</i> Greater change than control group. No
SB an explicit eligibility criterion? No							difference relative to Intervention 1.
Setting: Online							
Total sample at follow-up: N = 285							
Verweij et al (2012) †	Waking sitting	4/7	Intervention 1: Advising	Intervention 1 N = 230	N/A	Intervention 1: Behaviour types targeted: PA,	Intervention 1: Very promising
Netherlands	time (over a typical		employers on environmental	Mean age 46y 87 females		SB, diet	Within-group:
Netherlands	week) (SR)		risk factors for	(38%)		Primary behaviour change aim:	Reduction in
2-arm cluster	*		employee			Weight loss (not behaviour)	weekday sitting
RCT (2			weight gain, and	Intervention 2			time at work.
interventions			employees on	N = 224		Function: Enablement	Det
)			individual-level risk factors and	Mean age 48y 78 females		BCTs: Goal setting (behaviour);	<i>Between-group:</i> Greater SB change
Follow-up: 6			providing advice	(35%)		Problem solving; Goal setting	relative to
months only			on PA, SB, and			(outcome); Action planning;	Intervention 2.
			diet			Review outcome goals; Self-	
Theory						monitoring of behaviour; Self-	Intervention 2:

mentioned?	Intervention 2:	monitoring of outcomes of	Non-promising
No	Individual	behaviour; Social support	
	health risk	(unspecified); Pros and cons;	Within-group:
Sample:	appraisal and	Adding objects to the	No change in SB.
Employees	advice	environment	5
			Between-group:
SB an explicit		Intervention 2:	Less SB change
eligibility		Behavioural types targeted:	relative to
criterion?		Unclear	Intervention 1.
No			
		Primary behaviour change aim:	
Setting:		Weight loss (not behaviour)	
Worksite			
		Function: Unclear	
Total sample			
at follow-up:		BCTs: None coded	
N = 454			

Abbreviations: BCT = Behaviour Change Technique. N/A = Not applicable. NR = Not reported. O = Objective. PA = Physical activity. RCT = Randomised controlled trial. SB = Sedentary behaviour. SR = Self-report.

Ns denote sample size for those entered into analysis of changes in sedentary behaviour, at the last follow-up point (or last point at which changes from baseline were reported), so may differ from Ns reported in sample descriptions within published papers. Demographics refer to those recruited at baseline, so total N may not match Ns reported in this table.

† Information also extracted from record in public trial database.

**‡** Information also extracted from additional material sent by author.

\* Measures marked with two asterisks indicate those used as indicators of intervention promise (final column of this table).

\*\* 'Follow-up' refers to point(s) at which SB was measured, so excludes time points at which SB was not measured.

\*\*\* Data reported from Marshall et al (2003a) relate to participants who received *and read* the information given to them, as this represents closest fidelity to the intervention treatments.

\*\*\*\* Mutrie et al (2012) used a waiting-list control group design, administering the intervention to the control group at 12 weeks, and comparing groups at 24 weeks. Given both groups had received the intervention by 24-weeks, intervention promise cannot be reliably estimated and so is not reported here.