

**Digital Appendix Systematic Cochrane Review and Meta-Analysis on Psychological Interventions to Foster Resilience in Healthcare Professionals**

**Appendix D12 Risk of Bias Assessment of Included Studies**

**Table D12.1**

*Alexander 2015*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "After individuals completed consent forms and baseline assessments, they were enrolled in the study and randomized to the intervention (yoga) or usual care control group." Quote: "no significant differences in demographics were found between the control and experimental groups, suggesting that the two groups were similar in demographic makeup and the research team did not need to control for demographic characteristics in the primary analyses." Quote: "No significant differences between the intervention and control groups were found at baseline ( $p > .05$ )." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics and outcome variables ( $p > .05$ ) on the basis of analysis
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: information received from authors: all participants remained in the study
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified

**Table D12.2***Berger 2011*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "From the 80 who agreed, using a random number generator procedure, 42 WBC nurses received the intervention, while 38 were put on a control condition waiting list (WL)." Quote: "The demographic and exposure data are presented in Table 1. Univariate analyses comparing all the demographic and exposure variables showed no significant differences between the groups." Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (random number generator) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for demographic and exposure variables.; baseline comparability for outcome variables unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (unclear if there were any missing data and if missing data were imputed, for example)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but it is clear that the published report includes all expected outcomes, including those that were prespecified

**Table D12.3***Bernburg 2016*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Study participants were randomized into two groups (intervention and comparison group): (1) names of the pediatricians were listed in alphabetical order and (2) afterwards each name got a random number. The numbers had been allocated from number tables to the intervention or comparison group."</p> <p>Quote: "The fact that, although the comparison group and the intervened group shared similar levels of perceived job stress at baseline"</p> <p>Quote: "Baseline data on socio-demographic differences indicate only small, insignificant differences between our intervention and comparison group."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (random number table) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for some sociodemographic variables and perceived stress.; baseline comparability for other outcome variables (job satisfaction, work engagement) unclear</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online questionnaires); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "The high response rate in this study demonstrates a further strength: the drop-out rate (loss to follow-up) was very low."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (dropout rate is unclear; unclear if missing data were imputed, for example)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but it is clear that the published report includes all expected outcomes, including those that were prespecified

**Table D12.4***Bernburg 2019*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "This study is designed as randomized controlled pilot study." Quote: "Afterwards, these nurses were randomized into two study groups through a computer-generated algorithm." Quote: "Socio-demographics are illustrated in Table 1. We found no significant differences between intervention and WCG with regard to gender, age, and working experience." Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (computer-generated algorithm) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics (see Table 1).; baseline comparability for outcomes (i.e., statistical (non) significance in Table 2) not specified
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online surveys); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Due to sickness absence, six nurses were excluded. So in the end, 44 nurses were included in the intervention group (IG) and 42 nurses took part in the waitlist control group (WCG)." Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome (see reasons for missing data: sickness absence); number of participants randomized to each group and excluded from each group not stated; per-protocol analysis (only participants who took part in two groups)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified

**Table D12.5***Calder Calisi 2017*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "This pilot study used a randomized, wait-list control, quantitative study design"</p> <p>Quote: "The nurses who agreed to voluntary participation were randomized into either the wait-list control group or the intervention group."</p> <p>Quote: "As shown in Table 1, the two study groups were well balanced at baseline with respect to state-trait anxiety as well as the semantic differential scale measures of anxiety, depression, well-being, work-related stress, and confidence teaching the RR."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for outcome variables on the basis of analysis (see Table 1; all p's &gt; .31); baseline comparability for sociodemographic characteristics not specified</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (in part face-to-face intervention in class) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	<p>Quote: "Forty-six nurses (all female) completed the study (24 nurses in the intervention group and 22 nurses in the control group) of the 53 registered nurses who enrolled in the study."</p> <p>Quote: "However, 7 participants (13.2%) discontinued the study without providing reasons for withdrawal."</p> <p>Judgement comment: unclear if reasons for missing data are related to true outcome (number of participants randomized to each group is not stated; n = 7 dropouts, but unclear which group); per-protocol analysis (i.e., only participants who completed the study)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified

**Table D12.6***Chesak 2015*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Participants were randomized into either the intervention or control group through the use of a random number generator." Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (random number generator).; no information about comparability of groups at baseline or respective analysis (statistical (non)significance of differences in demographic variables unclear; baseline comparability for outcome variables not specified
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online questionnaires); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Quote: "55 consented and were randomized - 27 into the intervention arm and 28 into the control arm. Prior to the first group session, 2 participants from each group declined to participate." Quote: "Analysis was restricted to participants who completed the study, including all follow-up assessments." Quote: "Forty subjects (19 intervention, 21 control) completed the baseline and follow-up assessments. Some subjects did not complete all scales at both time points. Data are presented only for those who completed the given scale at both baseline and follow-up." Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome with relative balance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 8, CG: n = 7); no reasons for missing data stated for each group; per-protocol analysis with participants who complied with allocated intervention and for whom outcomes were obtained
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but it is clear that the published report includes all expected outcomes, including those that were prespecified

**Table D12.7***Cheung 2014*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	<p>Quote: "Computerized randomization was conducted using SPSS."</p> <p>Quote: "Participants were then randomly assigned to the waitlist control group or the PFA group using random numbers generated by SPSS."</p> <p>Quote: "Means and standard deviations of outcome variables across conditions at Time 1, Time 1b (post-training), Time 2 (3-month follow-up), and Time 3 (6-month follow-up) were presented in Table 9. Daggers denote significant differences of the baseline scores between intervention and control group"</p> <p>Quote: "At Time 1, no significant differences were found between intervention and control groups for age, gender, income, occupations, education, marital status, and previous training in post-disaster psychological interventions"</p> <p>Quote: "Meanwhile, significant difference was found for trauma history between intervention and controls groups, <math>\chi^2=63.40</math>, <math>p&lt;.001</math>. There was 67.8% of the intervention group reported prior traumatic experience while 39.8% of the control did that. Intervention group reported proportionately more prior traumatic experience than control group despite randomization."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (computerized randomization) and there is verified baseline comparability between groups for most sociodemographic characteristics except for trauma history/prior traumatic experience between groups.; no sig. baseline differences between groups in most outcome variables (psychological distress, distress from exposure to trauma, maladaptive coping, resilience and social support); however, sig. baseline differences in self-efficacy, knowledge on PFA and disaster mental health, general psychopathology, adaptive coping and life satisfaction</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Quote: "Investigators and authorized research assistants were responsible for data collection and consolidation. Main researcher who was also the trainer in the Psychological first aid training had access only to the anonymous dataset for

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		<p>further analyses due to the protection of participants' anonymity."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (paper-pencil and online questionnaires; unclear if investigators and research assistants responsible for data collection were blinded); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)</p>
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	<p>Quote: "Figure 4. Algorithm of the randomized controlled study"</p> <p>Quote: "Among the 458 participants assigned to training intervention, 395 of them joined 9 identical training sessions on the training days from April to June 2011. A total of 393 completed pre-post questionnaires (Appendix VI) were received at Time 1 and Time 1b, 364 participants completed the 3-month follow-up questionnaire at Time 2, and 319 at 6-month follow-up at Time 3. Among the waitlist control group, 407 out of 460 filled the questionnaires and 53 withdrew from the study before it starts and 369 participants completed the 3-month follow-up questionnaire. At 6-month follow up, 305 filled in the questionnaire (Figure 4 for the flow of the study). The completion rate of intervention arm is 80% while that of control group is 75%."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data likely to be related to true outcome with imbalance in missing data between groups (over study course: IG: n = 139; CG: n = 155); reasons for missing data in groups not stated; available case analysis (only participants for whom outcomes were obtained; see Table 9) and per-protocol analysis (only participants who completed allocated intervention, i.e., without n = 2 participants in IG who did not complete PFA intervention)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: trial registration available (registered at the CUHK Centre for Clinical Trials, Clinical Trials Registry (Appendix V); CUHK_CCT00278); all of the study's pre-specified (primary and secondary) outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way; only actual psychological support provided/actual helping behavior was not analyzed and could therefore not be reported (too small numbers for statistical analyses)</p>



**Table D12.8**

*Cieslak 2016*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Po rejestracji uczestnicy, którzy zapoznali się z regulaminem badania i podpisali zgodę na udział w nim, zostali losowo przydzieleni do jednego z 3 modułów interwencyjnych" ["After registration, participants who read the test regulations and signed consent to participate in it were randomly assigned to one of the three intervention modules"]</p> <p>Quote: "Interwencja składała się z modułu 1 – wzmacniającego przekonania o własnej skuteczności, modułu 2 – wzmacniającego spostrzegane wsparcie społeczne oraz modułu 3 – edukacyjnego. Każdy z uczestników badania został losowo przypisany do jednego z nich." ["The intervention consisted of module 1 - strengthening the conviction of its own effectiveness, module 2 - reinforcing perceived social support and module 3 - educational. Each of the study participants was randomly assigned to one of them."]</p> <p>Quote: "Respondents were randomly assigned to the experimental and control groups: the self-efficacy enhancement intervention (n = 87) or an education active control group (n = 81)."</p> <p>Quote: "Participants assigned to the two groups did not differ across the study variables. In particular, non-significant effects were found for age, <math>F(1,166) = 0.95, p = 0.33</math>, gender, <math>\chi^2 = (1, N = 168) = 0.46, p = 0.27</math>, profession, <math>\chi^2 = (8, N = 165) = 4.40, p = 0.82</math>, the duration of employment, <math>F(1,166) = 0.09, p = 0.76</math>, T1 indirect exposure, <math>F(1,166) = 2.87, p = 0.09</math>, self-efficacy at T1, <math>F(1,166) = 2.53, p = 0.11</math>, STS at T1, <math>F(1,166) = 2.75, p = 0.10</math>, and SPTG at T1, <math>F(1,166) = 0.97, p = 0.33</math>."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic variables and some outcome measures (self-efficacy, secondary traumatic stress, secondary post-traumatic growth); baseline comparability for other outcome variables (2nd measure for self-efficacy, burnout, work engagement) unclear</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Finally, our study does not conform to all standards of fully randomized controlled trials, applying blinding procedures and evaluating the fidelity of the intervention processes. Thus, any conclusions should be treated with caution."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Quote: "Finally, our study does not conform to all standards of fully randomized controlled trials, applying blinding procedures" Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of participants and personnel to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (web-based intervention, in part interactive; unclear if no blinding procedures refers to performing the intervention or outcome assessment)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Quote: "Finally, our study does not conform to all standards of fully randomized controlled trials, applying blinding procedures and evaluating the fidelity of the intervention processes. Thus, any conclusions should be treated with caution." Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (online questionnaires; unclear if no blinding procedures refers to performing the intervention or outcome assessment)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Quote: "FIGURE 1   Flow of participants in a study." Quote: "Only 68 participants completed all experimental/control group procedures and participated in the measurements at T1, T2, and T3. Overall, 54 participants dropped out from the experimental condition, and 46 dropped out from the control condition, making a total of 100 (59.5%)." Quote: "Spośród 168 uczestników badania, którzy wypełnili skalę w pomiarze 1. (T1), 51,2% osób nie wypełniło kwestionariuszy w pomiarze 2. (T2), a odsetek ten wzrósł do 59,5% w pomiarze 3. (T3). W celu sprawdzenia, czy danych brakowało w sposób losowy, zastosowano test MCAR Little'a (Missing Completely at Random). Jego wynik okazał się nieistotny statystycznie ( $\chi^2(2216) = 1596,86, p = 1$ ), co potwierdziło losowość braków danych. Różnica między 2 modułami w zakresie liczby osób, które wycofały się z badania, nie była statystycznie istotna ( $\chi^2(1, N = 168) = 0,48, p = 0,49$ )." ["Of the 168 study participants who completed the scale in Measure 1 (T1), 51.2% did not complete the questionnaires in Measure 2. (T2), and this proportion increased to 59.5% in measurement 3 (T3). In order to check whether the data was missing randomly, the MCA Little's (Missing Completely at Random) test was used. His result turned out to be statistically insignificant ( $\chi^2(2216) = 1566.86, p = 1$ ), which confirmed the randomness of missing data. The difference between the two modules in terms of the number of people who withdrew from the study was not statistically significant ( $\chi^2(1, N = 168) = 0.48, p = 0.49$ )."] Quote: "Braki danych uzupełniono, stosując metodę wielokrotnego podstawiania (multiple imputation method). W fazie podstawiania wprowadzono 3 skale mierzące odpowiednio: przekonania o własnej skuteczności, wypalenie zawodowe i zaangażowanie w pracę (jako predyktory i

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		<p>zmienne podstawiane), a także rodzaj modułu interwencyjnego (wyłącznie jako predyktor). Liczba podstawień wyniosła 5. Po zastosowaniu metody wielokrotnego podstawiania uzyskano dane od 168 osób we wszystkich 3 pomiarach." ["Data deficiencies were completed using the multiple imputation method. In the substitution phase, 3 scales were introduced, measuring, respectively: self-efficacy convictions, occupational burnout and involvement in work (as predictors and substitutable variables), and the type of intervention module (only as a predictor). The number of substitutions was 5. After applying the multiple substitution method, data from 168 people in all 3 measurements were obtained."]</p> <p>Quote: "Missing data were imputed with regression procedures (estimated maximization). In line with suggestions to apply intention-to-treat analysis for the experimental studies with health-related outcomes (Gupta, 2011), data from dropouts were also imputed. Missing data analysis indicated that data were missing completely at random, with Little's <math>\chi^2 = (2035) = 1732.05</math>, <math>p = 1.00</math>. Thus, the final analysis was conducted with a sample of <math>N = 168</math>."</p> <p>Quote: "Due to high drop-out rate at T2 and T3 in social support enhancement module, we excluded from analysis participants assigned to this condition."</p> <p>Quote: "Dodatkowo wykluczono z analizy dane pochodzące od uczestników badania, którzy zostali przypisani do modułu wzmacniającego spostrzegane wsparcie społeczne (<math>N = 85</math>) ze względu na wysoki odsetek osób (78%), które nie wypełniły kwestionariuszy w drugim (T2) i trzecim pomiarze (T3) (tzw. drop-out) (ryc. 1)." ["In addition, data derived from study participants assigned to the self-efficacy enhancing module (<math>N = 85</math>) were excluded from the analysis due to the high percentage of people (78%) who did not fill in questionnaires in the second (T2) and third measurement (T3) (so-called drop-out) (Figure 1)."]</p> <p>Quote: "Compared to completers, those who dropped out did not differ in self-efficacy at T1, <math>F(1,166) = 2.23</math>, <math>p = 0.11</math>, STS at T1, <math>F(1,166) = 2.80</math>, <math>p = 0.10</math>, SPTG at T1, <math>F(1,166) = 1.66</math>, <math>p = 0.20</math>, the indirect exposure to trauma at work, <math>F(1,166) = 2.75</math>, <math>p = 0.10</math>, gender, <math>\chi^2 = (1, N = 168) = 0.41</math>, <math>p = 0.52</math>, age, <math>F(1,158) = 0.95</math>, <math>p = 0.33</math>, profession, <math>\chi^2 = (8, N = 165) = 3.11</math>, <math>p = 0.93</math>, and the duration of employment, <math>F(1,157) = 1.72</math>, <math>p = 0.19</math>, <math>\eta^2 = 0.01</math>. Finally, the dropout rates were the same for the experimental and the control groups, <math>\chi^2 = (1, N = 168) = 0.71</math>, <math>p = 0.40</math>."</p> <p>Quote: "Those who dropped out were asked to provide reasons for not completing the study. The open-ended question was applied. Among those who responded (<math>n = 54</math>) the most frequent reasons to discontinue were personal reasons unrelated to the trial (39%) and the technical problems with the website or internet access (15%)."</p> <p>Quote: "For participants who did not complete the study, a short questionnaire was sent asking for the reason. 54 people answered, which as the reason for the resignation gave, among others personal reasons not related to the</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	<p>intervention (39%) and technical problems on the website of the intervention (15%)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: high dropout of participants in social support enhancing module and exclusion of these participants from the analysis; reasons for missing data in two other groups (self-efficacy enhancing and educational module) unlikely to be related to true outcome (missing data at random); missing data were imputed (multiple imputation method); intent-to-treat analysis</p> <p>Quote: "Efektywność interwencji została więc zmierzona przez porównanie wyników uczestników przypisanych do modułu edukacyjnego i modułu wzmacniającego przekonania o własnej skuteczności. Hipotezy dotyczące modułu interwencji mającego na celu wzmacnianie spostrzeganego wsparcia społecznego nie mogły więc być zweryfikowane." ["Thus, the effectiveness of the intervention was measured by comparing the results of the participants assigned to the educational module and the self-efficacy enhancing module. Hypotheses regarding the intervention module aimed at strengthening the perceived social support could not be verified."]</p> <p>Judgement comment: no study protocol available; pre-specified hypotheses on the social support enhancing module could not be tested due to high dropout, therefore, only data on the self-efficacy enhancing module and the educational module were analyzed; within these analyses, all pre-specified outcomes and time points have been reported</p>

**Table D12.9***Clemow 2018*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Those who agreed to participate were randomly assigned to one of two groups: intervention (LifeSkills workshop) or minimally enhanced usual care."</p> <p>Quote: "Randomization was done by calling an off-site person holding the randomization envelopes, using random-sized randomization blocks provided by the study statistician (J.E.S.), in accordance with CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials) guidelines [43]."</p> <p>Quote: "No significant differences were observed between the intervention and control groups on demographic and clinical characteristics at baseline (Table 1)."</p> <p>Quote: "Baseline psychosocial characteristics did not vary between treatment and control groups (Table 3)."</p> <p>Quote: "At baseline, SBP and DBP were similar between the two groups."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (exact method of random sequence generation is not described); RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic and clinical characteristics (Table 1; all p's &gt; .08) and outcome variables (Table 2: physiological outcomes: SBP, DBP: p's &gt; .35; Table 3, subjective outcomes) on the basis of analysis</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Randomization was done by calling an off-site person holding the randomization envelopes, using random-sized randomization blocks provided by the study statistician (J.E.S.), in accordance with CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials) guidelines [43]."</p> <p>Judgement comment: Participants and investigators enrolling participants could not foresee assignment (allocation by off-site person holding randomization envelopes).</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	<p>Quote: "First, research staff were not blinded to participant group assignment."</p> <p>Judgement comment: no blinding of study personnel (also face-to-face intervention); blinding of participants unclear, but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Quote: "First, research staff were not blinded to participant group assignment."</p> <p>Judgement comment: no blinding of study personnel (also face-to-face intervention); blinding of participants unclear, the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	<p>Quote: "First, research staff were not blinded to participant group assignment."</p> <p>Quote: "However, we attempted to mitigate the potential influence of this problem by using automated BP</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		<p>measurements, which are blinded to group assignment and less susceptible to bias than manual BP measurements."</p> <p>Judgement comment: research staff not blinded in general; therefore, probably also no blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Quote: "First, research staff were not blinded to participant group assignment."</p> <p>Judgement comment: research staff not blinded in general; therefore, probably also no blinding of outcome assessment, and the outcome measurement is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Fig 1   CONSORT diagram."</p> <p>Quote: "Eleven participants dropped out after randomization (six in the intervention group and five in the usual care control group). Two participants, both in the intervention group, were later found to have been ineligible because their average BP measurements were computed in error and were actually below the cutoff."</p> <p>Quote: "An intent-to-treat analysis was performed on all randomized participants. A multilevel, repeated-measures regression analysis was performed to generate full information maximum likelihood estimates of the group-specific average change in SBP and DBP between baseline and the 2-month posttreatment assessments and to estimate and test the differential change between the intervention and usual care groups. Consistent with intent-to-treat principles, all participants who were randomized, including two participants who were subsequently deemed ineligible (described below), were included in the analysis"</p> <p>Quote: "All 92 participants who were randomized were included in the analysis."</p> <p>Quote: "In secondary analyses, we repeated the previous analyses after restricting the sample to those who completed the protocol (i.e., those in the control group who completed the follow-up assessment [n = 41] and those in the intervention group who attended at least six sessions and completed the follow-up assessment [n = 39])."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing outcome data are unlikely to be related to true outcome with relative balance in missing data between groups (dropouts: IG: n = 6, CG: n = 5); per-protocol analysis (i.e., only participants who attended at least 6 sessions in IG) and available case analysis (i.e., only participants who completed follow-up assessment) as well as intent-to-treat analysis</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: trial registration (NCT01262066) available; several reported outcomes (psychosocial variables) were not pre-specified; PRE-SPECIFIED: change in mean office blood pressure, covarying hostility and hostility x time (hostility assessed via Cook-Medley questionnaire); REPORTED: (diastolic/systolic) blood pressure; hostility; depression; burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, personal accomplishment), work strain</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		(skill discretion, decision-making authority, job demands), assertiveness (passive behavior, aggressive, assertive), social support (belonging, appraisal, tangible), ruminative response (depressive rumination, reflection, brooding); perceived stress is pre-specified in the report, but not reported

**Table D12.10**

*Duchemin 2015*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "The study adhered to the CONSORT guidelines for randomized trials 23. Eligible participants were randomized 1:1 using Graphpad software to intervention group or waiting list control group, with stratification by gender and type of work."</p> <p>Quote: "There were no significant differences between the two groups for age (<math>p = 0.9496</math>, <math>t = 0.0638</math>), years of experience (<math>p = 0.9485</math>, <math>t = 0.06512</math>), or years working in the SICU (<math>p = 0.8702</math>, <math>t = 0.1648</math>)."</p> <p>Quote: "On the PSS, only 12% of participants had a score &lt; 10 (low stress), while 37% had a score &gt; 16 (high stress). There was no significant difference between the two groups at baseline (<math>p = 0.0910</math>, <math>t = 1.746</math>)."</p> <p>Quote: "On the DASS stress subscale, 37% had score &gt; 14, the cut-off value for stress, with no significant difference between the two groups (<math>p = 0.1552</math>, <math>t = 1.458</math>)."</p> <p>Quote: "On the Maslach's burnout inventory, the average emotional exhaustion subscale score was <math>23.12 \pm 10.1</math> with 28% of participants having scores &gt; 26 and no difference between intervention and control groups (<math>p = 0.3185</math>, <math>t = 1.0124</math>)."</p> <p>Quote: "The scores were <math>7.78 \pm 5.53</math> for depersonalization and <math>36.5 \pm 7.449</math> for personal accomplishment with no significant difference between the groups (<math>p = 0.685</math>, <math>t = 0.4909</math> and <math>p = 0.3508</math>, <math>t = 0.9477</math> respectively)."</p> <p>Quote: "The average value for all participants was <math>93.6 \pm 15.9</math> units/ml (mean <math>\pm</math> SEM) with no difference between the two groups (<math>p = 0.6812</math>, <math>t = 0.4152</math>). (salivary <math>\alpha</math> amylase)"</p> <p>Quote: "Participants scored the stress level of their work at <math>7.15 \pm 1.89</math> on a scale of 1 to 10 (with 10 being most stressful) at baseline with no significant difference between the two groups (<math>p = 0.8833</math>, <math>t = 0.1480</math>)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (randomisation via software) and there is verified baseline comparability between groups for sociodemographic characteristics (age, years of experience, years working in SICU) and some outcome of interest for the review on the basis of analysis.; baseline comparability between groups in mindfulness and burnout (ProQOL) unclear</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention), but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>



Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "There was no drop-out and all participants completed the 2 sets of assessments." Quote: "Intention to treat "analyses which included all subjects randomized were performed." Judgement comment: no missing outcome data
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but not all of the study's pre-specified outcomes have been reported (for ProQOF and FFMQ only correlations with other outcomes reported but no intervention effects in contrast to other outcomes)

**Table D12.11**

*Fei 2019*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Lot 122 enfermeros incluidos el estudio fron ditidos en el grupo experimental y el grupo control segúnmé to do aleatorio de ta bla numérica, con 61 miembros en da da grupo." [The 122 nurses included in the study were divided into the experimental group and the control group according to a random numerical table method, with 61 members in each group.]</p> <p>Quote: "Como se muestra en la Tabla 2, los 61 enfermeros del grupo control tienen entre 22 y 46 años, con un promedio de 31,74±6,11 años, mientras que los del grupo experimental tienen entre 22 y 45 años, con un promedio de 32,67±6,85. No hay diferencias estadísticamente significativas de la información general entre ambos grupos." [As shown in Table 2, the 61 nurses in the control group are between 22 and 46 years old, with an average of 31.74 ± 6.11 years, while those in the experimental group are between 22 and 45 years old, with an average of 32.67 ± 6.85. There are no statistically significant differences in general information between the two groups.]</p> <p>Quote: "Como se observa en la Tabla 3, no hay diferencia significativa en tensión, pérdida de control y puntaje total en el estrés percibido entre el grupo control y el experimental antes de la intervención (t=-0,099, P=0,921)." [As seen in Table 3, there is no significant difference in tension, loss of control and total score on perceived stress between the control and experimental groups before the intervention ( t = -0.099, P = 0.921).]</p> <p>Quote: "Como puede verse en la Tabla 4, no hay una diferencia significativa en las puntuaciones en las emociones positivas y negativas entre el grupo experimental y el grupo de control antes de la intervención (P&gt; 0,157)." [As can be seen in Table 4, there is no significant difference in the scores on positive and negative emotions between the experimental group and the control group before of the intervention (P&gt; 0.157).]</p> <p>Quote: "Se puede observar en la Tabla 5 que no hay diferencias significativas en la calidad del sueño entre el grupo experimental y el de control antes de la intervención (P&gt;0,05)" [It can be seen in Table 5 that there are no significant differences in sleep quality between the experimental and the control group before the intervention (P&gt; 0.05)]</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (random number table) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics (Table 2) and outcomes of interest (Table 3-5) on the basis of analysis</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (N = 122 analyzed for perceived stress and positive/negative affect; number of participants analyzed for sleep quality not specified; unclear if there were no missing data at all or if missing data were imputed, for example)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified

**Table D12.12***Gelkopf 2008*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	<p>Quote: "From the list of 62 participants, 37 were randomly chosen 2 weeks before the training (using the Excel computer application random number generator) to participate in the ERASE Stress training program."</p> <p>Quote: "Except for a nonsignificant tendency for a higher income level in the experimental group, results suggest no difference between the experimental and control groups on the demographic and exposure variables. This suggests that the groups were of similar backgrounds (see Table 2)."</p> <p>Quote: "Differences between the experimental and control groups showed more personal optimism in the control group, <math>t(68) = 3.4</math>, <math>p &lt; .001</math>; the experimental group showed more rumination, <math>t(68) = 5.2</math>, <math>p &lt; .001</math>, and catastrophizing, <math>t(68) = 4.3</math>, <math>p &lt; .001</math>."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (computer random number generator) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for most sociodemographic characteristics except for income (different results in table 2 and text).; sig. baseline differences in some outcomes of interest (optimism, rumination, catastrophizing) on the basis of analysis</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Of those registered for the ERASE Stress training program, 35 completed the entire 4-day, 30-hr workshop that was given over 2 weekends. Two participants dropped out for personal reasons. All participants who registered for the Befriending seminar completed it."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing outcome data unlikely to be related to true outcome with relative balance in missing data between groups (IG: <math>n = 2</math> for personal</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p>reasons; CG: n = 0); per-protocol analysis (only participants who took part completely in allocated intervention)</p> <p>Judgement comment: no study protocol available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified</p>

**Table D12.13**

*Hosseinnejad 2018*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "Eighty nursing personnel from Shafa Hospital in Rash were recruited and randomly assigned to experimental and control groups." Quote: "Results showed no difference between the two group of intervention and control in terms of demographic characteristics." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, marital status) on the basis of analysis; baseline comparability for outcomes not specified
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Quote: "گروهی دو بالینی کارآزمایی نوع از مطالعه این بود شاهد گروه و آزمون گروه دربرگیرنده" [This study was a double-blind clinical trial that included experimental and control groups] Quote: see also trial registration: blinding: not blinded Judgement comment: according to publication, double-blind clinical trial; however, according to trial registration no blinding occurred; in addition, face-to-face intervention, i.e., blinding probably broken and the outcome is likely to be influenced by the lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (e.g., n = 40 participants randomized to each group; however, number of participants analyzed not stated for each group; unclear if there were any missing data and if missing data were imputed, for example)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Quote: "(IRCT2017091636207N1)" Judgement comment: trial registration available (IRCT2017091636207N1); and the study's pre-specified outcomes seem to have been reported in the pre-specified way; however, in the trial registration the second assessment is specified for a 3-month follow-up (i.e., 3

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		months after the intervention), whereas the publication reports a 1-month follow-up

**Table D12.14***Ireland 2017*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Following the provision of signed consent and the completion of the first testing session, participants were randomly assigned to the intervention (n = 23) or control group (n = 21)."</p> <p>Quote: "A randomized control trial methodology (with 44 intern doctors) was utilized to test this hypothesis."</p> <p>Quote: "Conditions were equivalent pretest in prior with regards to experience with meditation/mindfulness (F = 0.08, p = 0.776, g 2 &lt; 0.01), the appeal of meditation/mindfulness (F = 0.73, p = 0.401, g 2 = 0.02), and expectations of the potential helpfulness of meditation/mindfulness (F &lt; 0.01, p = 0.963, g 2 &lt; 0.01)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability for experience with meditation/mindfulness, appeal of meditation/mindfulness and expectations of mindfulness; insufficient information about baseline comparability (statistical significance) for sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., age, sex) and outcomes of interest (see T1 in Table 1)</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: information received from authors: no withdrawals or exclusions; all participants stayed in the trial for the full length of time
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified



**Table D12.15***ISRCTN69644721*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote (see trial registration): "Participants are then randomly allocated to one of three groups." Quote (see trial registration): "Emergency workers will be randomly allocated to receive one of the following three interventions: 1. The new resilience intervention (...), 2. The digital-only intervention (...), 3. The wait-list condition (...)" Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"; no judgement on baseline comparability in sociodemographic and outcome variables possible based on trial registration
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration, blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (one group includes face-to-face group sessions) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: no judgement possible based on trial registration
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: no judgement possible based on trial registration

**Table D12.16**

*Khoshnazary 2016*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "The people divided two groups. Intervention and control groups in sample random method."</p> <p>Quote: "Results showed that no different between two group of intervention and control about demographic characteristics."</p> <p>Quote: "مداخله <math>329/72 \pm 29/91</math> در یافته های اصلی مرتبط" که از نظر آماری اختلاف هوش هیجانی قبل از مداخله در گروه <math>p=0/501</math> بود. بعد از اجرای و در گروه کنترل <math>326/73 \pm 36/55</math> بود [In the main findings related to the purpose of the study, the mean score of emotional intelligence before intervention in the intervention group was 329.72 (29.91) and in the control group was 326.73 (36.55) which was not statistically significant (<math>p = .501</math>).]</p> <p>Quote: "از مداخله در گروه مداخله <math>b&gt;</math> بین دو گروه وجود داشت" در گروه شاهد <math>57/70 \pm 15/14</math> بود که میانگین نمره تاب آوری قبل از مداخله معناداری بین دو گروه وجود نداشت <math>61/71 \pm 12/47</math> و بعد از اجرای مداخله میانگین نمره تاب آوری در گروه از نظر آماری <math>p=0/098</math> [The mean pre-intervention resiliency score in the intervention group was 61.71 (12.47) and in the control group was 57.70 (15.14) with no statistically significant difference between the two groups (<math>p = 0.098</math>).]</p> <p>Quote: "جمعیت شناختی شامل: <math>b&gt;</math> پژوهش، به شرح زیر می باشد: تاهل (<math>p=0/408</math>)، میزان نتایج مطالعه نشان داد متغیرهای (<math>p=0/501</math>)، پست سازمانی جنس (<math>p=0/08</math>)، سن (<math>p=0/118</math>)، اضافه کاری (<math>p=0/09</math>)، تحصیالت (<math>p=0/369</math>)، سابقه کاری (<math>p=0/194</math>)، در دو (<math>p=0/25</math>)، وضعیت استخدامی (<math>p=0/82</math>)، وجود نداشته <math>b&gt;</math> شیفت کاری (<math>p=0/77</math>)، اشتغال در محلی [The results showed that there were no significant differences between the two groups in demographic variables including sex (<math>p = 0.08</math>), age (<math>p = 0.188</math>), marital status (<math>p = 0.408</math>), educational level (<math>p = 0.369</math>), work experience (<math>p = 0.501</math>), organizational position (<math>p = 0.25</math>), employment status (<math>p = 0.82</math>), overtime (<math>p = 0.09</math>), shift work (<math>p = 0.77</math>) and other employment (<math>p = 0.194</math>).]</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics and outcomes of interest on the basis of analysis</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: control group not further specified; blinding of participants and participants probably not done</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		(face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by the lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "داشتند که سه نفر از گروه <b>یافته ها 33 دوره 3</b> انصراف دادند و در نهایت 73 در این پژوهش 76 نفر شرکت در دو بخش همسان بودن مداخله از ادامه مشارکت در پژوهش با محوریت فرضیه <b>نفر باقی ماندند. یافته های این تحقیق،</b> [The study involved 76 people, with three of the intervention group withdrawing from participation in the study, and 73 remained.] Judgement comment: reasons for missing data likely to be related to true outcome with slight imbalance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 3 withdrawals; CG: n = 0); no reasons specified; per-protocol analysis (i.e., only participants who completed trial, without n = 3 withdrawals in IG)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified

**Table D12.17***Klatt 2015*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "To determine the intervention feasibility/efficacy, we conducted a randomized wait-list control group in Intensive Care Units (ICUs)." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; no information about comparability of groups at baseline or respective analysis
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information on blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires and the self-measurement of breath counts may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "The intervention is well received with 97% retention rate." Judgement comment: insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"; information received from authors: n = 17 participants allocated to each group; for some results, n = 34 participants analysed; however number of potential missing data not stated
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified (pre-specified paired t-tests were reported)

**Table D12.18***Lebares 2018*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "pilot randomized clinical trial of modified MBSR vs an active control was conducted"</p> <p>Quote: "We randomized 21 PGY-1 surgery residents (8 [38%] women) using Wesleyan University's Research Randomizer 54 to either the modMBSR arm (n = 11; 4 [36%] women) or control arm (n = 10; 4 [40%] women), blocking for sex and surgical subspecialty designation."</p> <p>Quote: "Balancing for sex and subspecialty designation, we randomized participants to modified MBSR (n = 12) or an active control (n = 9) using third-party block randomization following described operationalized methods."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (computer-generated randomization: Wesleyan University's Research Randomizer), but there is no information about comparability of groups at baseline or respective analysis (e.g., for sociodemographic characteristics in Table 1 no statistical (non-)significance specified)</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Eligible participants were postgraduate year 1 (PGY-1) surgery residents at UCSF, without a current mindfulness meditation practice who provided written and oral informed consent and were blinded to assignment."</p> <p>Judgement comment: blinding of participants ensured; blinding of personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention), but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Quote: "Eligible participants were postgraduate year 1 (PGY-1) surgery residents at UCSF, without a current mindfulness meditation practice who provided written and oral informed consent and were blinded to assignment."</p> <p>Judgement comment: blinding of participants ensured; blinding of personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "One participant was initially allocated to the active control but did not receive the intervention owing to inadvertently attending the modMBSR training class during week 1. She was therefore reassigned to the modMBSR intervention group."

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		<p>Quote: "Two participants did not have functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) scans analyzed. One was never scanned owing to implanted metal, and the other was scanned but data were incomplete (protocol glitch) and could not be analyzed."</p> <p>Quote: "We randomized 21 PGY-1 surgery residents (8 [38%] women) using Wesleyan University's Research Randomizer 54 to either the modMBSR arm (n = 11; 4 [36%] women) or control arm (n = 10; 4 [40%] women), blocking for sex and surgical subspecialty designation. A participant assigned to the control group mistakenly attended the first modMBSR session, resulting in final participation and analysis of modMBSR (n = 12; 5 [42%] women) and control (n = 9; 3 [33%] women) (Table 1 and Figure 1)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: no missing outcome data for psychological assessment, executive function testing and motor skills testing reported; overall: n = 1 initially allocated to CG did not receive allocated active control due to mistakenly attending an IG session; n = 2 excluded from fMRI, but reasons for missing data are unlikely to be related to true outcome (see reasons for missing data: implanted metal, protocol glitch)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: trial registration (NCT03141190) available and all of the study's pre-specified (primary and secondary) outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way</p>

**Table D12.19***Lin 2019*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "This study utilized a randomized controlled design. Eligible participants were randomized 1:1 using a computer-generated random number table to the intervention group or the wait-list control group."</p> <p>Quote: "No significant differences were observed between the two groups for any of the demographic characteristics (see Table 2)."</p> <p>Quote: "No significant effect of group or time or the Group <math>\times</math> Time interaction on job satisfaction was identified between the two groups (<math>p &gt; .05</math>)"</p> <p>Quote: "The results of the simple effects analysis (independent- samples t tests and one-way ANOVA) were as follows: First, when the time points were fixed, no significant differences in perceived stress, positive affect, negative affect, or resilience were noted between the two groups at baseline (<math>p &gt; .05</math>)"</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (computer-generated random number table) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics (see Table 2; all <math>ps &gt; .07</math>) and most outcome of interest (perceived stress, positive affect, negative affect, resilience; <math>p &gt; .05</math>) on the basis of analysis.; baseline comparability for job satisfaction not exactly specified, but no sig. group effect on job satisfaction in repeated-measures ANOVA reported which provides some evidence for baseline comparability in this outcome too</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online questionnaires); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Quote: "In the intervention group, 11 participants missed the weekly sessions more than twice. In the control group, six participants did not complete the questionnaire, and three participants submitted invalid questionnaires."

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		<p>Quote: "Therefore, the effective sample size was 90, including 44 in the intervention group and 46 in the control group."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome with relative balance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 11 missed weekly sessions more than twice; CG: n = 9 did not complete questionnaires or submitted invalid questionnaires); no reasons for missing data in each group provided; per-protocol analysis (i.e., only participants who did miss less than 2 weekly intervention sessions) and available case analysis (only participants who provided (valid) questionnaires) with n = 90 participants</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified</p>



**Table D12.20***Loiselle 2018*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Random assignment was to the experimental (TM) group (n=21) or the wait-list control group (n=19)."</p> <p>Quote: "Forty academic physicians completed their informed consent, baseline testing and entry interview and were randomly assigned to either the TM (experimental) group (immediate intervention start; n=21) or control group (delayed intervention start; n=19)."</p> <p>Quote: "Analysis of the data did not show any significant difference between the experimental or control groups in either their baseline testing or demographics (all p values &gt;.05)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics (see Table 1; all p's &gt; .123) and outcomes (i.e., baseline testing) on the basis of analysis (see Table 1)</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (questionnaires administered in person by the researcher or as online survey); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	<p>Quote: "Six of the TM group and one of the control group subjects dropped out of the study before the one- month posttest."</p> <p>Quote: "A total of 33 physicians completed both the 1-month and 4-month posttests (TM = 15; control = 18)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data likely to be related to true outcome with imbalance in number of missing data between groups (lost to follow-up: IG: n = 6; CG: n = 1, i.e., did not complete posttest); available case analysis (only participants for whom outcomes were obtained at all assessments)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: trial registration available (NCT03714204); and all of the study's pre-specified (primary

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		and secondary) outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way

**Table D12.21***Luthar 2017*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "The first 40 eligible women were enrolled in the study. Participants were assigned randomly to the ACG intervention group (n = 21) or to the control group (n = 19)" Quote: "With blinded random assignment, of the 21 intervention women, 17 were physicians, and 4 were NP/PAs; among the 19 control mothers, 8 were physicians, 1 was a PhD, and 10 were NP/ PAs. Other than the difference in proportion of NP/PAs and physicians, the intervention and control groups did not differ in demographics, baseline adjustment or cortisol levels." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic variables and outcome variables
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "With blinded random assignment,..." Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (exact method is not described, unclear if allocation was concealed from personnel and/or participants)
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention), but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Quote: "On psychological measures, one participant was missing data on parenting stress at follow-up. On biological measures, pregnancies and maternity leaves precluded draws from one woman throughout, and from two at the follow-up. An additional two could not schedule times to provide samples at follow-up, and two were statistical outliers and removed from the analysis (>2 SD from the mean). Thus, at baseline and after the intervention, there were 39 of 40 the women who had cortisol levels measured at baseline and after the intervention, and 35 of 40 at follow-up."

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome (see reasons for missing data): psychological outcomes: IG: n = 0; CG: n = 1 in parenting stress (information received from authors; here no reasons for missing data reported, but relative balance between IG and CG); biological outcomes: n = 7 missings (due to pregnancy/maternity leave, schedule problems, n = 2 outliers removed from analysis); missing data in biological outcomes not reported for each group separately; available case analysis for cortisol (only participants for whom outcomes were obtained at three time points)</p> <p>Judgement comment: trial registration is available (NCT02540473); not all of the pre-specified (secondary) outcomes were reported and several reported outcomes were not pre-specified: PRE-SPECIFIED: Primary outcome: level of depression (Beck Depression Inventory); Secondary outcomes: Biomarker of stress C-reactive protein, biomarker of stress nerve-growth factor, professional functioning (Maslach Burnout Inventory), perceived social support (Quality of Social Support Scale), parenting stress (Parenting Stress Inventory); REPORTED: level of depression (Beck Depression Inventory); professional functioning (Maslach Burnout Inventory); parenting stress (Parenting Stress Inventory); Global symptoms (Brief Symptom Index); self-compassion (Self-Compassion Scale); feeling loved (4 items); physical affection (3 items); Plasma cortisol (secondary outcome)</p>

**Table D12.22***Mache, Danzer 2015*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Surgeons were randomized into 2 groups (intervention and comparison group). Names of the surgeons were listed in alphabetical order. Random numbers had been assigned to each name. After this, the numbers had been allocated from random number tables to the intervention or control group." Quote: "Baseline data on gender, age, and perceived health indicate only small, insignificant differences between intervention and comparison group." Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (random number tables) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic variables and perceived health.; baseline comparability for outcome variables unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online questionnaires); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Of the 36 participants in the intervention group, 1 surgeon was excluded owing to health reasons (sickness absence). In summation, 35 physicians participated in the intervention group and 33 participated in the comparison group." Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome (only n = 1 exclusion in IG due to health reasons)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but it is clear that the published report includes all expected outcomes, including those that were prespecified

**Table D12.23***Mache, Vitzthum 2015*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "physicians were randomized into an intervention and control group." Quote: "Baseline data on gender, age, and perceived health indicate only small, insignificant differences between the control and the intervention group." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics and perceived health; baseline comparability for outcome variables unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online questionnaires); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Of the 45 participants in the intervention group, three were excluded due to health reasons (operation, accident). In addition, two participants of the control group did not respond to the follow-up questionnaires. In sum, 42 physicians took part in the intervention group, and 43 participated in the control group." Judgement comment: N = 90 randomized (according to information received from authors); in part, reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome with relative balance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 3 exclusions due to health reasons), CG: n = 2 did not complete follow-up (reasons not specified); available case analysis (only participants for whom outcomes were obtained at three time points) and per-protocol analysis (only participants who took part in allocated intervention)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but it is clear that the published report includes all expected outcomes, including those that were prespecified

**Table D12.24**

*Mache 2016*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Quote: "The study was designed as a controlled trial." Quote: "Seventy-six psychiatrists gave their consent to join the self-care training. These physicians were randomised into two groups through a computer-generated algorithm." Quote: "Only small, insignificant differences between intervention and control group have been found in baseline data on gender, age and working experience." Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (computer random number generator) and there is verified baseline comparability between groups for sociodemographic characteristics.; baseline comparability for outcome variables unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Quote: "single-blind trial" Judgement comment: only participants were blinded; no blinding of personnel (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (online questionnaires)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Of the 76 participants four needed to be excluded due to health reasons (sickness absence). In sum, 37 physicians took part in the intervention group (IG) and 35 participated in the control group (CG)." Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome (n = 4 exclusions due to health reasons, IG: n = 1, CG: n = 3); information received from authors: per-protocol analysis (only participants who took part in allocated intervention and were not excluded)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified

**Table D12.25**

*Mache 2017*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "In a two-arm randomized controlled trial junior physicians working in clinic departments of Gynecology and Obstetrics were divided into two groups: (1) intervention group (IG) and (2) control group (CG)."</p> <p>Quote: "second the participants were randomized into two groups (intervention and control group). This procedure was supported by a computer-generated list of numbers."</p> <p>Quote: "The demographic variables including gender, age, years of working experiences are shown in Table 1. 69 % of the physicians in the intervention group were women (n = 26) and 31 % were men (n = 12). The comparison group include 70 % female physicians (n = 28) and 30 % male physicians (n = 12). The average age in the intervention group was 27 years (SD 2.1) with an average time of working experience as a physician of 1 year (SD 1.8). All the gynecologists were employed full- time. Comparing both groups (IG and CG) baseline data on socio-demographic differences indicate insignificant differences."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (computer-generated list of numbers) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics (age, gender, relationship status, work characteristics, place of work).; baseline comparability for outcome variables (see T0 in Table 2) unclear (i.e., statistical significance not specified)</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (method of concealment is not described)</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online surveys); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)</p>
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	<p>Quote: "Fig. 1 Flow chart of the study design"</p> <p>Quote: "Of the 80 junior physicians enrolled, all completed the baseline measures. Two physicians of the IG were</p>



Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		<p>excluded for the follow-up analyses because they participated in less than 80 % of the training sessions."</p> <p>Quote: "As illustrated in Fig. 1, during follow-up 1, 37 of the participants in the IG (98 %) gave responses, and 33 (n = 87 %) gave responses for follow-up 2. Finally, 31 physicians of the IG (82 %) answered the last survey (follow-up 3). Participants who failed to complete the follow-up surveys did not differ in their baseline responses from those who complied with the study protocol."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data likely to be related to true outcome with slight imbalance in missing data between groups (n = 2 excluded in IG due to less than 80% participation in training sessions; follow-up 1: IG: n = 1, CG: n = 5; follow-up 2: IG: n = 5, CG: n = 6; follow-up 3: IG: n = 7, CG: n = 11); per-protocol analysis (i.e., exclusion of physicians participating in less than 80% of training sessions); available case analysis (only participants for whom outcomes were obtained at follow-up assessments)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified</p>

**Table D12.26***Mealer 2014*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "Of the 29 remaining ICU nurses, 14 were randomized to the intervention arm and 15 were randomized to the control arm." Quote: "Measures of PTSD, burnout syndrome, resiliency, and symptoms of anxiety or depression did not differ significantly between the 2 groups" Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for outcome variables; baseline comparability for sociodemographic variables (statistical (non)significance of differences, see Table 1) unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (blinding for data assessed within the intervention via REDCap data management system (e.g., time spent exercising, MBSR practices) and for data analysis, but unclear who delivered the questionnaires to the participants); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Two participants withdrew from the study before the start of the 12-week training period: 1 from the intervention arm and 1 from the control arm. Therefore, 27 participants participated in the 12-week trial (intervention arm, n = 13; control arm, n = 14)." Quote: "No participants dropped out of the study." Quote: "Missing items on scales were inferred by using the mean of the remaining items on the scale." Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome with balance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 1; CG: n = 1 before start of intervention period); reasons not specified; per-protocol analysis (only participants who took part in allocated intervention)

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but it is clear that the published report includes all expected outcomes, including those that were prespecified

**Table D12.27**

*Medisauskaite 2019*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "This was a randomized controlled trial comprising of two independent variables: time and trial group."</p> <p>Quote: "Blindly to the researchers, Qualtrics software randomly assigned doctors to one of 5 trial groups"</p> <p>Quote: "doctors were randomly and blindly assigned to one of 5 trial groups."</p> <p>Quote: "Table 1 shows that there were no significant differences between the two trial groups at baseline, (<math>p &gt; .05</math>; see table 1)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (Qualtrics software).; baseline comparability reported for control group vs trial group 4 (main focus of this publication) and comparison control group and all experimental groups, respectively; MAIN COMPARISON (control group vs trial group 4): verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics and outcome variables of interest on the basis of analysis (see Table 1; <math>p &gt; .05</math>; see Supplement 2 Table 1 for secondary outcome variables in all groups; <math>p &gt; .12</math>); CONTROL GROUP &amp; ALL EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS: verified baseline comparability for most sociodemographic characteristics (except for gender, <math>p = .03</math>) and outcome variables on the basis of analysis (Supplementary material 1, Table 1 and 2)</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Blindly to the researchers, Qualtrics software randomly assigned doctors to one of 5 trial groups"</p> <p>Quote: "doctors were randomly and blindly assigned to one of 5 trial groups."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" ("blindly assigned"; but method of concealment is not described in sufficient detail; unclear if random sequence generation was also concealed from participants)</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of participants and personnel to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (e.g., unclear if online intervention or face-to-face)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Judgement comment: reasons for missing outcome data likely to be related to true outcome, with imbalance in numbers for missing data across groups (IG4: $n = 23$ did not complete intervention, $n = 11$ lost to follow-up, $n = 2$

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p>questionnaire came back after more than 23 days; CG: n = 3 did not complete the questionnaire, n = 19 lost to follow-up); per-protocol analysis (i.e., only participants who completed the intervention(s) and available case analysis (only participants for whom outcomes were obtained, i.e., who completed questionnaires)</p> <p>Quote: "The study protocol was registered before the study began at the US National Institute of Health (Identifier: NCT02838290; ClinicalTrials.gov, 2016)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: trial registration available (NCT02838290) available and all of the study's pre-specified (primary and secondary) outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way (secondary outcomes for all groups reported in Supplementary material 2)</p>

Mirzaeirad 2019

46

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol or trial registration available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified

**Table D12.29**

*Mistretta 2018*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Eligible participants were randomized using a cluster randomization procedure based on schedule availability."</p> <p>Quote: "Once participants agreed upon a time, they were then randomized to either the Mindfulness Based Resilience Training (MBRT) intervention (n = 22), the smartphone resilience intervention app (n = 23), or the control group (n = 15)."</p> <p>Quote: "Results of ANOVA and chi-square analyses (adjusted with Bonferroni correction) comparing groups on demographic characteristics and baseline levels of functioning showed that the groups were comparable on all measures. Furthermore, there were no significant differences in baseline MBI scores when comparing participants based on job roles (data not shown). Thus, randomization was successful in creating groups that were equivalent at baseline."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic variables and outcome variables on the basis of analysis</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done for MBRT intervention (face-to-face intervention); blinding of participants and personnel for smartphone resilience intervention app unclear; review authors judge that the outcome (sleep monitoring via actigraphy) is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done for MBRT intervention (face-to-face intervention); blinding for smartphone resilience intervention app unclear; outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information on possible blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement (sleep monitoring via actigraphy) is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias for MBRT intervention (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)</p>
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Rates of Attrition. Of the 60 participants randomized to groups, 54 (90%) provided post-intervention data, 44 (73%) provided three-month follow-up data, and</p>



Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	<p>74% of participants completed measures at all three time points. The rates of attrition were similar across groups with 27.2% attrition for MBRT, 21.7% attrition for smartphone resilience training, and 33.3% attrition for the control group (<math>p = .76</math>)."</p> <p>Quote: "There were no significant differences in baseline measures or demographics between those who completed the intervention and those who did not."</p> <p>Quote: "One-way ANOVA's [pre-treatment, post-treatment, 3-month follow-up] using intent-to-treat analyses for each group separately revealed that both the MBRT and the Smartphone groups showed improvements over time in key outcomes, whereas the control group showed no evidence of change"</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing outcome data unlikely to be related to true outcome with balance in missing data between groups (IG1: 27.2% attrition, IG2: 21.7%, CG: 33.3%, <math>p = .76</math>); intent-to-treat analysis</p> <p>Judgement comment: trial registration available (NCT02419430); several reported outcomes were not pre-specified; follow-up period pre-specified was not reported; PRE-SPECIFIED: DASS-21 from baseline to 6 months; REPORTED: WHO-5, DASS-21, MBI-HSS, SCS, compassion to others, daily affect, relationship quality, valued action, and sleep monitoring via smartphone app at baseline, postintervention and 3-month follow-up</p>

**Table D12.30***NCT02603133*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote (see trial registration): "The investigators will test the efficacy of the WISER Program in the NICU setting using a stepped-wedge mixed-methods randomized controlled trial (swRCT) at six tertiary care NICUS." Quote (see trial registration): "Two blocks with 3 NICUS will be randomly assigned to one of two intervention cohorts." Quote (see trial registration): "Participants are individually randomized to one of two cohorts." Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"; no judgement on baseline comparability for sociodemographic and outcome variables possible based on trial registration
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Quote (see trial registration): "Masking: None (Open Label)" Judgement comment: open label study; based on trial registration probably no blinding of participants and personnel, but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Quote (see trial registration): "Masking: None (Open Label)" Judgement comment: open label study; based on trial registration probably no blinding of participants and personnel and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Quote (see trial registration): "Masking: None (Open Label)" Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (unclear if 'no masking' refers to outcome assessment), but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Quote (see trial registration): "Masking: None (Open Label)" Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (unclear if 'no masking' refers to outcome assessment); however, due to performance bias (no masking), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: no judgement possible based on trial registration
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: no judgement possible based on trial registration

**Table D12.31***NCT03645798*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote (see trial registration): "A randomized, controlled trial was conducted for 73 Chinese nurses from The Second Xiangya Hospital of Central South University (33 in the experimental group, 40 in the control group)." Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"; no judgement on baseline comparability for sociodemographic and outcome variables possible based on trial registration
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Quote: "Masking: Single (Investigator)" Judgement comment: online intervention (Wechat group) vs normal psychological instruction from hospital; based on trial registration, single-blinded study (i.e., investigators blinded), but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Quote: "Masking: Single (Investigator)" Judgement comment: online intervention (Wechat group) vs normal psychological instruction from hospital; based on trial registration, single-blinded study (i.e., investigators blinded) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration, insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Quote (see trial registration): "102 nurses who met the inclusion criteria were randomly selected for the study. However, only 73 completed the study, with 33 in the experimental group and 40 in the control group." Judgement comment: no judgement possible based on trial registration (number of participants randomized to each group not stated; number of dropouts not specified for each group; n = 73 completed the study, but unclear if only n = 73 were analyzed)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: no judgement possible based on trial registration

**Table D12.32**

*Poulsen 2015*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Participants who completed consent forms and a pre-training questionnaire were randomized using computer-generated random integers to either the experimental (i.e., workshop plus written educational information) or control (i.e., written educational information-only) group"</p> <p>Quote: "Demographic data for experimental and control groups are presented in Table 1. There were no significant differences between the two groups for any background variables, allowing data analysis to proceed without their consideration as potential confounds."</p> <p>Quote: "Participants in both groups were proportionally equivalent for gender, age, marital status and caregiver responsibilities."</p> <p>Quote: "Figure 1a (REQ score) shows these data and indicates that, although they were not statistically significant, the mean scores for the experimental group were higher at baseline than those for the control group."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation (computer-generated random integers) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic variables and one outcome measure (REQ total score).; baseline comparability for other outcomes (perceived sleep quality, satisfaction with self-care practices) unclear</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Quote: "A strength of the current study was the use of a randomized, controlled design with questionnaires that could not be identified by the staff directly involved in the program trainings, or by others involved in data entry or analysis."</p> <p>Judgement comment: probably blinding of data entry and analysis, but insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (i.e., who delivered the questionnaires to participants); due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	<p>by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)</p> <p>Quote: "There were 80 participants in total with 40 being randomized to the experimental arm and 40 in the control arm. There were 10 participants with incomplete datasets, leaving a total of 70 who were evaluable."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data likely to be related to true outcome with imbalance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 10, CG: n = 0); available-case analysis or even complete-case analysis (only participants with complete datasets)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: no study protocol available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified</p>

**Table D12.33**

*Schroeder 2016*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "After completing the baseline measures, participants were randomized 1:1 into the intervention or a waitlist control."</p> <p>Quote: "There were no significant differences between the intervention (n = 17) and waitlist control (n = 16) group on any demographic variables (all Ps &gt;.05)."</p> <p>Quote: "The intervention and control groups did not differ on any outcome measures at baseline (all Ps &gt;.05)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics and outcome variables</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	<p>Quote: "Figure 1 shows the participant flow. A total of 33 physicians provided written consent to enroll in the study, completed the baseline assessment, and were randomized to the MBI or waitlist control. Two participants (1 MBI and 1 waitlist control) withdrew (citing lack of time or scheduling conflicts) after randomization. Two waitlist control group participants withdrew from the study before post-intervention assessment, and 2 MBI participants and 1 waitlist control group participant did not complete 3-month follow-up."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome with relative balance in missing data between groups (over study course: IG: n = 3; CG: n = 4; reasons for missing data unclear for most missing data); per-protocol analysis (only participants who took part in allocated intervention) and available case analysis (only participants for whom outcomes were obtained at three time points)</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified (MPQ only assessed in IG at 3-month follow-up)

**Table D12.34***Smith 2019*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "We conducted a randomized controlled trial (NCT03017469)" Judgement comment: based on trial registration and conference abstract, insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"; based on conference abstract, no information about comparability of groups at baseline or respective analysis
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration and conference abstract, insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration and conference abstract, no blinding of participants and personnel (face-to-face intervention; see trial registration: no masking) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: based on trial registration and conference abstract, insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to performance bias (no masking), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "29 nurses participated (n=16 in the ARISE group and n=13 in the control group)." Judgement comment: based on conference abstract, insufficient information of attrition or exclusions to permit a judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (e.g., unclear if there were any missing data and if missing data were imputed, for example)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: trial registration (NCT03017469) available; no judgement possible based on conference abstract



**Table D12.35***Sood 2011*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "After obtaining the informed consent, physicians were randomly assigned to one of two groups an active arm or a wait-list control arm." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and no apparent baseline differences between randomized groups regarding mean age, gender, baseline stress and resilience measures; verified baseline comparability of groups for some sociodemographic variables (age, gender) and outcome measures (stress, resilience); however, statistical (non)significance not reported and baseline comparability for other variables also unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Quote: "Figure 1. Flow diagram of the progress in a randomized clinical trial to assess the effect of resiliency training among physicians." Quote: "Of the 40 enrolled (all academic clinicians), 32 (80%) physicians completed the study. Eight participants (all in the control arm) declined to participate after randomization and prior to filling out any assessments because of scheduling issues (Fig. 1)." Judgement comment: reasons for missing outcome data likely to be related to true outcome with imbalance in numbers for missing data (only missing data in CG, n = 8); per-protocol analysis with participants who complied with allocated intervention and for whom outcomes were obtained
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but it is clear that the published report includes all expected outcomes, including those that were prespecified

**Table D12.36**

*Sood 2014*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	Quote: "After obtaining informed consent, participants were assigned to one of two groups: an active arm or a wait-list control arm using a simple randomization schedule generated by the Department of Biomedical Statistics and Informatics." Quote: "Mean scores at baseline differed significantly between groups (two-sample t test, $P = 0.021$ )." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (only 'randomization schedule', exact method not described); RCT, but not verified baseline comparability of groups for outcome quality of life; baseline comparability for sociodemographic variables and other outcomes of interest unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "The allocation sequence was available only to the study coordinator and concealed from the researchers involved in recruitment." Judgement comment: investigators enrolling participants could not foresee assignment; unclear, if allocation was also concealed from participants; exact method not described
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Quote: "single-blind trial" Judgement comment: blinding of study personnel not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding; blinding of participants probably ensured (single-blind trial)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Quote: "Subjects were de-identified and assigned a coded study identification number. This code was maintained by the statistician and unavailable to study investigators ensuring blinding of the investigators to the outcome measures." Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (unclear who provided the questionnaires to the participants, e.g., blinded investigators?)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Quote: "Flow diagram of the progress in a randomized clinical trial to assess the effect of SMART program among radiologists." Quote: "Two subjects from each arm completed the baseline questionnaires but did not complete the 12-week questionnaires" Quote: "For the four subjects (two SMART and two Control) who did not complete the week 12 assessments, the

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		<p>baseline values were carried forward to week 12 to provide the most conservative estimate of efficacy."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome with balance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 2, CG: n = 2); baseline-observation-carried-forward (BOCF) for missing outcome data; intent-to-treat analysis</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but it is clear that the published report includes all expected outcomes, including those that were prespecified</p>

**Table D12.37***Stetz 2007*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "Since we depended on students' availability to participate in our study, we were only able to pseudo-randomly assign them to either the control or one of the experimental groups, as defined below." Judgement comment: additional information from author concerning randomization: "Yes, we made a list and computed a number w [with]/SPSS to randomly select."; insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (according to publication Stetz 2008 only pseudo-randomization based on availability; according to information from author: SPSS-generated random numbers); no information about comparability of groups at baseline or respective analysis
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk" (according to the Stetz 2008 publication only, pseudo-randomization based on availability, which would mean high risk of bias)
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants unclear; blinding of study personnel for Virtual Reality training sessions unclear; blinding of personnel for coping training probably not done (staff asks participants to use relaxation techniques while participants are sitting in a chamber), but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants unclear; blinding of study personnel for Virtual Reality training sessions unclear; blinding of personnel for coping training probably not done (staff asks participants to use relaxation techniques while participants are sitting in a chamber); outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (e.g., number and reasons of potential missing data in four groups not stated; unclear how many participants were analyzed)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available; not all of the study's pre-specified outcomes have been reported (compare Stetz 2007 on preliminary results of sample to date: physiological outcomes and presence are pre-specified and partly reported; Stetz 2008 on final results with N = 63 participants: no physiological outcomes are pre-

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		specified or reported; Stetz 2008: depression and positive affect subscale are not reported)

**Table D12.38***Strijk 2011*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "The workers who consented to participate were, after baseline measurements, individually randomized to the intervention or control group using Random Allocation Software (version 1.0, May 2004, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Iran)."</p> <p>Quote: "...baseline characteristics of the study population are presented with no significant differences between the groups in any of these variables."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (randomization software) and there is verified baseline comparability between groups for sociodemographic characteristics.; baseline comparability for outcome variables are unclear</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: see study protocol: "Randomization will be executed, after completing baseline measurements, by an independent researcher (i.e., research assistant) using Random Allocation Software (...)"</p> <p>Judgement comment: participants and investigators enrolling participants could probably not foresee assignment (random sequence generation by independent researcher after baseline assessments, i.e., after participant enrolment was completed)</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Blinding of participants or intervention providers was impossible."</p> <p>Quote: "The research assistant notified each worker to which group he or she had been allocated"</p> <p>Judgement comment: no blinding of participants and personnel (face-to-face intervention), but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Quote: "Blinding of participants or intervention providers was impossible."</p> <p>Quote: "The research assistant notified each worker to which group he or she had been allocated"</p> <p>Judgement comment: no blinding of participants and personnel (face-to-face intervention), and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Low risk	<p>Quote: "The research assistant notified each worker to which group he or she had been allocated and did not reveal the group allocation to the investigator responsible for data analyses."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Quote: "The research assistant notified each worker to which group he or she had been allocated and did not reveal the group allocation to the investigator responsible for data analyses."</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (blinding of data analysis but unclear who distributed the questionnaires to the participants); however, due to performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)</p> <p>Quote: "As presented in the study flow diagram (figure 1), a total of 730 workers completed the baseline questionnaire and were randomized to the intervention (N=367) or control group (N=363)."</p> <p>Quote: "In total, 500 workers completed the questionnaire 12 months after baseline and were, therefore, used for complete cases analyses. In addition, sensitivity analyses with imputed data among the total study population (N=730) were performed."</p> <p>Quote: "All analyses were performed according to the intention-to-treat principle. As possible effects of missing participants should be considered, it is recommended to perform both complete cases and sensitivity analyses with imputed data (41). For the sensitivity analyses, all missing data on the outcome measure were imputed using multiple imputations (MI) based on multivariate imputation by chained equations (42, 43). The MI procedure was performed in PASW (version 18.0, SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL, USA), in which 40 different data sets were generated."</p> <p>Quote: "Effects were analyzed according to the intention-to-treat principle with complete cases (n=575) and imputed data (n=730) using linear regression analyses."</p> <p>Judgement comment: reasons for missing data likely to be related to true outcome with imbalance in missing data between groups (Lost to follow-up 6 months: IG: n = 74, CG: n = 81, compare unknown reasons: IG: 35, CG: 58, compare no interest/motivation: IG: 6, CG: 4; 12 months: IG: n = 117, CG: n = 113, compare unknown reasons: IG: 46, CG: 62, compare no interest/motivation: IG: 11, CG: 6); complete case analysis with complete cases (Strijk 2013: 500 workers who completed questionnaire at baseline and at 12 months; Strijk 2012: 575 workers who completed questionnaire at baseline and at 6 months) and multiple imputation for intent-to-treat analysis (physical activity using accelerometers and VO2max in subsample)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: trial registration (NTR1240) and study protocol (Strijk et al., 2009) available; not all of the pre-specified outcomes have been reported; not all reported outcomes were pre-specified; PRE-SPECIFIED (in trial registration and study protocol): Primary: Vitality and lifestyle behavior (Physical activity, dietary behavior, alcohol consumption, smoking habits); Secondary: work engagement and productivity, general health status (also RAND-36), quality of life, sick leave and cost-effectiveness; in addition in study protocol: Body Mass Index (BMI), waist circumference combined with 2-km UKK walking test; REPORTED: Primary: vitality (UWES), vitality (RAND-36);</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		Secondary: work engagement, productivity, sick leave; reported, but not specified if primary or secondary outcome: physical activity (SQUASH, accelerometers), aerobic fitness (2-km UKK walking test for VO2max), dietary behavior (fruit intake), mental health, need for recovery from work



**Table D12.39***Tierney 1997*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "Subjects were assigned randomly to one of three groups." Quote: "To determine whether there was a significant difference among the three groups at baseline, an analysis of variance was performed for the hardiness scores and subscales of all three groups at baseline. Table 1 shows that no significant difference existed among the three groups." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for outcomes of interest on the basis of analysis; baseline comparability for sociodemographic characteristics is unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient reporting of attrition/exclusions to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk" (e.g., unclear if there were any missing data in the three groups and if missing data were imputed, for example)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified

**Table D12.40**

*Varker 2012*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Eighty individuals (35 male, 45 female) aged between 18 and 63 years (M age = 28.4, SD age = 10.4), were recruited from the general population through advertisements, and were randomly allocated (Deville, 2007) to one of two conditions: inoculation or control"</p> <p>Quote: "There were no significant differences between the two groups in the distribution of age, gender, previous exposure to similar styles of video, history of trauma, prior consultation for emotional problems, blood phobia, anticipatory anxiety regarding what they were about to be shown, and group allocation sizes. Measures completed at Time 2 following the presentation of the video revealed no significant differences between each of the groups in the extent to which participants physically or mentally distracted themselves while viewing the video, the seriousness with which they rated the accident, nor levels of participant empathy with either the accident victims or the emergency workers. Overall, these results suggest that no significant differences existed within the group compositions (Inoculation vs Pragmatic Training Control) before the experimental phase."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic variables; baseline comparability for outcome variables unclear</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding</p>
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	<p>Quote: "All data was collected by pencil-and-paper tests within a booklet that the 'therapist' did not see and, hence, the 'therapist' was blind to responses."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (therapists were blind to responses but unclear if therapists were also the outcome assessors who distributed the questionnaires); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	<p>by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)</p> <p>Quote: "Eighty individuals (35 male, 45 female) aged between 18 and 63 years (M age = 28.4, SD age = 10.4), were recruited from the general population through advertisements, and were randomly allocated (Deville, 2007)"</p> <p>Quote: "Originally there were 82 participants who attended the first session, however 2 participants failed to attend the second session and were, therefore, excluded. As such, the attrition rate was very low at just 2.4%."</p> <p>Quote: "With respect to negative affect, descriptive statistics of the DASS21 showed one case to be an outlier, as indicated by a z score over 3.29 (<math>p &lt; .001</math>; Tabachnik &amp; Fidell, 2001), therefore this person was dropped from the DASS21 analysis."</p> <p>Quote: "The memory analysis was conducted for 78 participants, as 2 participants failed to complete the memory components of the post-video and follow-up questionnaires (1 control participant and 1 inoculation participant)."</p> <p>Judgement comment: n = 2 excluded (not specified which group and no reasons reported); n = 1 excluded in DASS-21 analysis (outlier; not specified which group); n = 2 missings (IG: 1, CG: 1) in memory (failed to complete memory components of assessment); available case analysis (only participants who took part in video session and for whom outcomes were obtained)</p>
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	<p>Judgement comment: no study protocol available, but not all of the study's pre-specified outcomes have been reported (perceived social support)</p>

**Table D12.41***Villani 2013*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "Participants were randomly allocated into two groups (15 participants for each condition)." Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; no information about comparability of groups at baseline or respective analysis
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: self-help intervention via mobile phones; insufficient information about blinding of participants and personnel to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: information received from authors: no dropout from N = 30 participants
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available but it is clear that the published reports include all expected outcomes, including those that were pre-specified (job content and perceived stress only assessed at pre-intervention and no outcomes)

**Table D12.42***West 2014*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	<p>Quote: "Participants were randomized in a concealed fashion into 2 groups via a computer-generated algorithm. Randomization was stratified by sex and specialty (general internal medicine or other internal medicine specialty) using permuted blocks."</p> <p>Quote: "Baseline characteristics of the 2 trial groups were generally similar, with no statistically significant differences observed, although the intervention arm had slightly higher rates of high emotional exhaustion and overall burnout."</p> <p>Quote: "Because of baseline differences across groups for several variables, all analyses were adjusted for levels of distress at study onset."</p> <p>Judgement comment: The investigators describe a random component in the sequence generation process (computer-generated algorithm) and there is verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic characteristics and outcomes of interest on the basis of analysis.</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Participants were randomized in a concealed fashion into 2 groups via a computer-generated algorithm."</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"; exact method of concealment not specified; unclear if random sequence generation was concealed from personnel and/or participants</p>
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: Insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online questionnaires); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	<p>Quote: "Of the 37 participants in each arm of the study, 34 (91.9%) provided survey responses."</p> <p>Quote: "The changes in each well-being metric from study baseline to study end, as well as at 3 and 12 months following the study, were analyzed according to the intent-to-treat principle using generalized estimating equations to account for the repeated-measures design."</p>

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
		Judgement comment: reasons for missing data unlikely to be related to true outcome with relative balance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 2 withdrawals, CG: n = 0; no reasons reported); no imputation of missing data (information received from authors); per-protocol analysis (with participants who took part in allocated intervention, i.e., without n = 2 participants in IG who withdrew consent) and available case analysis (with participants for whom outcomes were obtained)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Judgement comment: trial registration available ( <a href="https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01159977">https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01159977</a> ); several reported outcomes were not pre-specified; PRE-SPECIFIED in trial registration: job satisfaction, burnout; AND: not all of the pre-specified outcomes (pre-specified in the publication) were reported; PRE-SPECIFIED in publication: job satisfaction, perceived stress, quality of life, empowerment and engagement at work, burnout, mental and physical wellbeing, fatigue, empathy; REPORTED: all outcomes except for mental and physical well-being, fatigue and empathy

**Table D12.43***West 2015*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Quote: "We conducted a randomized controlled trial of a 6-month intervention involving 12 biweekly one-hour meetings of self-formed groups of 6–8 academic internal medicine physicians, termed COMPASS Groups (COLleagues Meeting to Promote And Sustain Satisfaction)." Quote: "At baseline, no statistically significant differences were observed between the study groups for any well-being variable." Judgement comment: based on conference abstract, insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability for well-being (i.e., outcome) variables; baseline comparability for sociodemographic characteristics unclear
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: based on conference abstract, insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgement of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: based on conference abstract, blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: based on conference abstract, insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment; however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Judgement comment: information received from authors: reasons for missing data likely to be related to true outcome with imbalance in missing data between groups (IG: n = 13, CG: 5); available case analysis
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: no study protocol available; based on conference abstract, all of the study's pre-specified outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way

**Table D12.44**

*Wild 2016*

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	<p>Quote: "Our evaluation is a randomized controlled trial in which participants (N=430) were randomly allocated in a 3:1 ratio to receive Mind's resilience intervention (N=317) or a control online intervention (N=113)."</p> <p>Quote: "All N=430 participants were randomized in a 3:1 ratio to receive the resilience intervention or the control intervention in four phases across nine sites in England. Random allocation was stratified by site and gender."</p> <p>Quote: "There were no significant differences on any of the demographic (age, previous trauma, number of years of education, service, marital status, gender, qualifications, ethnicity) and baseline measures between participants receiving the group or online conditions."</p> <p>No obvious differences in outcome variables between resilience and control groups at baseline to suggest unbalanced groups (compare repeated measures ANOVAs with three levels (baseline, post-intervention and follow-up) for resilience, well-being, self-efficacy, ability to problem solve and reach goals, nine coping behaviors in response to stress (e.g., active coping), rumination, maladaptive responses to intrusive memories (e.g., suppression), levels of social participation, feeling supported at home and work, severe stress (PTSD), depression, anxiety, alcohol use, and the number of days off per week.</p> <p>Judgement comment: insufficient information about random sequence generation to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"; RCT and verified baseline comparability of groups for sociodemographic variables and most outcome measures; baseline comparability in 'confidence in managing mental health' unclear</p>
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about allocation concealment to permit judgment of "Low risk" or "High risk"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: blinding of participants and personnel probably not done (face-to-face intervention) and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Objective outcomes	Unclear risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) Subjective outcomes	High risk	Judgement comment: insufficient information about blinding of outcome assessment (online questionnaires/secure digital program); however, due to potential performance bias (no blinding of participants), the review authors judge that the participants' responses to questionnaires may be affected by the lack of blinding (i.e., knowledge and beliefs about intervention they received)



Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Judgement comment: reasons for missing data likely to be related to true outcome with imbalance in missing data (postintervention IG: n = 61; CG: n = 21; 3-month follow-up: IG: n = 35; CG: n = 13); fewer participants in IG received the allocated intervention compared to CG (IG: 279/317, 88% vs CG: 105/113, 92.9%); reasons for missing data not provided for each group; unclear how many participants were analyzed
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Judgement comment: trial registration available (ISRCTN79407277); all of the study's pre-specified (primary and secondary) outcomes that are of interest in the review have been reported in the pre-specified way