

Vocational interventions to help adults with long-term health conditions or disabilities gain and maintain paid work: an overview of systematic reviews - Supplementary File

By William M. M. Levack¹ (PhD), Joanna K. Fadyl² (PhD)

Correspondence to: William Levack, Rehabilitation Teaching and Research Unit, Department of Medicine, University of Otago, Mein St, Newtown, PO Box 7343, Wellington, 6242, New Zealand.
Email: william.levack@otago.ac.nz.

Content

Appendix A: Criteria for inclusion of systematic reviews	3
Participants	3
Interventions.....	3
Comparator(s)/control.....	4
Types of systematic reviews	4
Context.....	4
Outcomes.....	4
Appendix B: Electronic search strategies.....	5
Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (Wiley) search strategy	5
MEDLINE (OvidSP) search strategy	5
EMBASE (OvidSP) search strategy.....	7
PsychINFO (OvidSP) search strategy.....	10
AMED (OvidSP) search strategy	12
CINAHL (EBSCOhost) search strategy.....	15
Proquest Dissertations and Theses database search strategy	18
Evidence Search (NICE) search strategy.....	18
Business Source Complete search strategy	18
Appendix C: Table of reasons for exclusion of reviews on full-text screening	22
Appendix D: Characteristics of included reviews (ordered by first author)	27
Brinchmann et al. 2020.....	27
Carmona et al. 2017.....	28
Chan et al. 2015	29
Crowther et al. 2001	30
Dewa et al. 2018	31
Graham et al. 2016.....	32
Gross et al. 2020	33
Hedley et al. 2017	34
Heffernan and Pilkington 2011	35

Jetha et al. 2019	36
Khan et al. 2009	37
Kinoshita et al. 2013.....	38
Ma et al. 2020	39
Marshall et al. 2014	40
McCabe et al. 2007	41
Modini et al. 2016.....	42
Muñoz-Murillo et al. 2018	43
Nevala et al. 2019	44
Pinto et al. 2018.....	45
Roels et al. 2016.....	47
Smith et al. 2017	48
Suijkerbuijk et al. 2017.....	49
Sweetland et al. 2012.....	50
Taylor et al. 2012	51
Tripney et al. 2019	52
Westbrook et al. 2012.....	53
Appendix E: Overview authors' judgements about each AMSTAR-2 review quality item, with reviews grouped by health condition.....	55
Appendix F: Extended version of Table 2 - Summary of findings on employment interventions for various health conditions.....	58

Appendix A: Criteria for inclusion of systematic reviews

Participants

We included any systematic review about adults (16 years or older) with a long-term health condition and/or disability, who were not employment or who had only recently been employed (e.g. within three months of a new job placement). For the purpose of this review we considered someone with a long-term health condition to be a person living with the effects of an illness or health condition that is to continue for the foreseeable future. Disability is an umbrella term for impairments, activity limitations, or participation restrictions that arise as “an interaction between health conditions (diseases, disorders, injuries, traumas, etc.) and contextual factors... both personal and environmental” (World Health Organization, 2001, p. 8). Broad categories of long-term conditions considered in scope for this overview include, but not limited to: musculoskeletal, neurological, cardiac, respiratory, congenital & paediatric, sensory, endocrine & metabolic, skin and subcutaneous, or mental health conditions.

Interventions

We included any systematic review on vocational interventions to assist people with chronic health conditions or disability, who were not in work, to gain and sustain paid employment. For the purposes of this overview vocational interventions included the following:

- Training or education to prepare people to apply for employment (e.g. preparation of resumes; development of work skills; training in employment interview techniques; motivational and behavioural interventions to help people increase their self-efficacy for employment and engage in work)
- Vocational counselling to help people identify their work skills and aptitudes, seek work, or find and apply for jobs
- Provision of support for people to apply for jobs or to actively seek employment in other ways
- Identification of barriers to employment (e.g. workplace, transport, or attitudinal barriers) and implementation of supports and/or strategies to reduce or remove those barriers (e.g. providing adapted transport)
- Job development (e.g. working with employers to create non-standard or modified positions)
- Job placement schemes
- Provision of support for people newly in employment
- Job coaching (short or long-term) to develop skills and strategies to manage a job
- Community development specifically focused on creating employment opportunities for people living with long-term conditions and/or disabilities (e.g. development of business initiatives that need employees with lived experience of disability).

We excluded work-readiness training where the training was not intended to end in employment. We also excluded general primary, secondary, or tertiary education that had not been designed specifically for people with long-term health conditions or disability. We excluded stay-at-work interventions for people who were currently employed and who needed to maintain that employment in the context of a newly acquired health condition or disability. We excluded reviews that primarily focus on helping people to gain or maintain unpaid occupational roles and activities.

Comparator(s)/control

We included any systematic reviews that collated or synthesised evidence from studies which included a no intervention control, an attention control (i.e. a Hawthorne control), or a comparison to 'usual care' as defined by the study authors. We also included any systematic reviews that included studies compare two different approaches to vocational rehabilitation.

Types of systematic reviews

We included any systematic reviews of controlled trials including parallel design randomised controlled trials (RCTs), cluster RCTs, pseudo-randomised controlled trials, and non-randomised controlled trials. We excluded reviews that did not report an explicit review objective or question, search strategy, inclusion criteria, quality assessment methods and data extraction plan.

Context

For the purposes of this overview, we considered reviews of any vocational intervention regardless of where the intervention had been delivered, provided the aim of the intervention was to help adults with long-term health conditions and/or disability gain and maintain paid employment.

Outcomes

We included systematic reviews that investigated the following primary or secondary outcomes:

Primary outcomes:

- Work placement in either full- or part-time paid employment.
- Successful maintenance of new employment

We aimed to collect data on maintenance of new employment using count data (e.g. number of people maintaining employment at 6 months) and continuous data (e.g. duration of time employment has been maintained at by the end of a study) as reported by the review authors. We considered employment to be successfully maintained if paid employment had been continuously sustained over a period of time regardless of whether or not that employment was in the same job. We considered any gap greater than 4 weeks between jobs to be non-continuous employment. Where the type of work itself required alternative measures of maintenance (e.g. for indigenous practices or seasonal workers), we planned to report on the measures given by study authors.

Secondary outcomes:

- Proportion of full time employment
- Satisfaction of employers with employment outcomes or work performance
- Satisfaction of participants with employment outcomes
- Pay rates
- Cost of vocational interventions
- Cost of ongoing work support
- Quality of life

Appendix B: Electronic search strategiesCochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (Wiley) search strategy

1. Rehabilitation, Vocational
2. Occupational adj (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)
3. Occupational adj (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)
4. Work adj (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or rehabilitation)
5. Job adj (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or modification or trial or placement or development or coaching or creation)
6. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5

MEDLINE (OvidSP) search strategy

1. exp Chronic Disease/
2. exp Disabled Persons/
3. (disable* or disabil* or impairment or handicap).mp.
4. ((persistent or long* term or ongoing or degenerative or chronic or progressive) adj3 (disease* or ill* or condition* or insufficienc* or disorder* or impair*)).tw.
5. exp cardiovascular diseases/
6. (heart disease* or heart failure or myocardial ischemia or coronary disease* or coronary artery disease* or myocardial infarction or hypertension or high blood pressure).tw.
7. sickle cell.mp.
8. exp lung diseases obstructive/
9. (obstructive lung disease* or obstructive pulmonary disease* or copd or asthma or bronchitis).tw.
10. exp emphysema/
11. exp pulmonary emphysema/
12. emphysema.tw.
13. (cystic fibrosis or respiratory distress).mp.
14. exp nervous system diseases/
15. (brain adj (disease* or damage* or injur*)).tw.
16. (cerebrovascular or brain ischemia or cerebral infarction or carotid artery disease* or stroke or epilep* or seizure*).tw.
17. (neurodegenerative or Huntington* or Parkinson* or lateral sclerosis or multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease or muscular dystrophy or Steinerts* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive

bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylosis or osteoarthritis or scoliosis or spinal stenosis or herniated nucleus pulposus or spinal arachnoiditis or cranial hemorrhage or cranial haemorrhage or aneurysm* or aphasia or dysarthria or apraxia or dystonia or ataxia or paraparesis or regional pain syndrome or neuropathy or neuritis or supranuclear palsy or Steele-Richardson-Olszewski or multi system atrophy or myositis or encephalitis or meningitis or clinical isolated syndrome).tw.

18. (paralys* or quadriplegi* or tetraplegi* or paraplegi*).tw.

19. ((communication or learning or consciousness or perpetual or speech or voice or vision or hearing or psychomotor) adj disorder*).tw.

20. (hearing loss or hearing aid* or deaf* or blind* or stutter* or amput*).tw.

21. down* syndrome.tw.

22. cerebral palsy.tw.

23. exp gastrointestinal diseases/

24. (gastroenter* or intestinal or bowel or colonic).tw.

25. renal insufficiency/

26. ((renal or kidney) adj (failure* or insufficienc*)).tw.

27. diabetes mellitus/

28. (diabetes or diabetic*).tw.

29. exp nutrition disorders/

30. (underweight or malnutrition or malnourished or overweight or obes*).tw.

31. exp arthritis/

32. exp rheumatic diseases/

33. (arthritis or osteoarthritis or rheumati* or fibromyalgia).tw.

34. ((back or neck) adj pain).tw.

35. exp thyroid diseases/

36. thyroid.tw.

37. exp hypersensitivity/

38. (hypersensitivit* or allerg* or intolerance or anaphyla*).mp.

39. exp neoplasms/

40. (cancer* or oncolog* or neoplasm* or carcinom* or tumo?r* or malignan* or leuk?emia).tw.

41. exp hiv infections/

42. (hiv infect* or hiv disease*).tw.

43. exp mental disorders/

44. exp behavioral symptoms/
45. ((mental* or psychiatr* or psychological*) adj (ill* or disorder* or disease* or distress* or disab* or problem* or health* or patient* or treatment)).tw.
46. ((personality or mood or dysthymic or cognit* or anxiety or stress or eating or adjustment or reactive or somatoform or conversion or behavior or perception or psycho* or impulse control or development* or attention deficit or hyperactivity or conduct or motor skills or movement or tic or substance related) adj disorder*).tw.
47. (psychos#s or psychotic* or paranoi* or schizo* or neuros#s or neurotic* or delusion* or depression or depressive or bipolar or mania or manic or obsessi* or compulsi* or panic or phobic or phobia or anorexia or bulimia or neurastheni* or dissociative or autis* or Asperger* or Tourette or dyslex* or affective or borderline or narcissis* or suicid* or self injur* or self harm or adhd).tw.
48. (((substance or drug or alcohol) adj abuse) or "substance use" or "illegal drug use" or addict* or alcoholism or (problem* adj1 drinking)).tw.
49. or/1-48
52. exp Rehabilitation, Vocational/
53. (occupational adj (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)).tw.
54. (vocational adj (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)).tw.
55. (work adj (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or rehabilitation)).tw.
56. (job adj (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or modification or trial or placement or development or coaching or creation)).tw.
57. or/52-54
58. systematic review.mp.
59. exp Meta-analysis/
60. (metaanalysis or meta-analysis).mp.
61. or/58-60
62. 49 and 55 and 59

EMBASE (OvidSP) search strategy

1. exp chronic disease/
2. exp disabled person/
3. (disable* or disabil* or impairment or handicap).mp.
4. ((persistent or long* term or ongoing or degenerative or chronic or progressive) adj3 (disease* or ill* or condition* or insufficienc* or disorder* or impair*)).tw.

5. exp cerebrovascular accident/
6. (heart disease* or heart failure or myocardial ischemia or coronary disease* or coronary artery disease* or myocardial infarction or hypertension or high blood pressure).tw.
7. sickle cell.mp.
8. exp lung diseases obstructive/
9. (obstructive lung disease* or obstructive pulmonary disease* or copd or asthma or bronchitis).tw.
10. exp emphysema/
11. exp pulmonary emphysema/
12. emphysema.tw.
13. (cystic fibrosis or respiratory distress).mp.
14. exp nervous system diseases/
15. (brain adj (disease* or damage* or injur*)).tw.
16. (cerebrovascular or brain ischemia or cerebral infarction or carotid artery disease* or stroke or epilep* or seizure*).tw.
17. (neurodegenerative or Huntington* or Parkinson* or lateral sclerosis or multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease or muscular dystrophy or Steinerts* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylosis or osteoarthritis or scoliosis or spinal stenosis or herniated nucleus pulposus or spinal arachnoiditis or cranial hemorrhage or cranial haemorrhage or aneurysm* or aphasia or dysarthria or apraxia or dystonia or ataxia or paraparesis or regional pain syndrome or neuropathy or neuritis or supranuclear palsy or Steele-Richardson-Olszewski or multi system atrophy or myositis or encephalitis or meningitis or clinical isolated syndrome).tw.
18. (paralys* or quadriplegi* or tetraplegi* or paraplegi*).tw.
19. ((communication or learning or consciousness or perpetual or speech or voice or vision or hearing or psychomotor) adj disorder*).tw.
20. (hearing loss or hearing aid* or deaf* or blind* or stutter* or amputation*).tw.
21. down* syndrome.tw.
22. cerebral palsy.tw.
23. exp gastrointestinal diseases/
24. exp heart disease/
25. (gastroenter* or intestinal or bowel or colonic).tw.
26. exp kidney failure/
27. ((renal or kidney) adj (failure* or insufficienc*)).tw.
28. exp diabetes mellitus/

29. (diabetes or diabetic*).tw.
30. exp nutrition disorders/
31. (underweight or malnutrition or malnourished or overweight or obes*).tw.
32. exp arthritis/
33. exp rheumatic diseases/
34. (arthritis or osteoarthritis or rheumati* or fibromyalgia).tw.
35. ((back or neck) adj pain).tw.
36. exp thyroid diseases/
37. thyroid.tw.
38. exp hypersensitivity/
39. (hypersensitivit* or allerg* or intolerance or anaphyla*).mp.
40. exp neoplasms/
41. (cancer* or oncolog* or neoplasm* or carcinom* or tumo?r* or malignan* or leuk?emia).tw.
42. exp hiv infections/
43. (hiv infect* or hiv disease*).tw.
44. exp mental disease/
45. ((mental* or psychiatr* or psychological*) adj (ill* or disorder* or disease* or distress* or disab* or problem* or health* or patient* or treatment)).tw.
46. ((personality or mood or dysthymic or cognit* or anxiety or stress or eating or adjustment or reactive or somatoform or conversion or behavior or perception or psycho* or impulse control or development* or attention deficit or hyperactivity or conduct or motor skills or movement or tic or substance related) adj disorder*).tw.
47. (psychos#s or psychotic* or paranoi* or schizo* or neuros#s or neurotic* or delusion* or depression or depressive or bipolar or mania or manic or obsessi* or compulsi* or panic or phobic or phobia or anorexia or bulimia or neurastheni* or dissociative or autis* or Asperger* or Tourette or dyslex* or affective or borderline or narcissis* or suicid* or self injur* or self harm or adhd).tw.
48. (((substance or drug or alcohol) adj abuse) or "substance use" or "illegal drug use" or addict* or alcoholism or (problem* adj1 drinking)).tw.
49. or/1-48
50. (occupational adj (medicine or counsel?ing or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)).tw.
51. (vocational adj (medicine or counsel?ing or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)).tw.
52. (work adj1 (training or counsel?ing or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or activities or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or rehabilitation)).tw.

53. (job adj1 (training or counsel?ing or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or activities or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or modification or trial or placement or development or coaching or creation)).tw.

54. or/50-53

55. 49 and 54

56. exp vocational rehabilitation/

57. 55 or 56

58. systematic review.mp.

59. exp Meta-Analysis/

60. (metaanalysis or meta-analysis).mp.

61. or/58-60

62. 57 and 61

PsychINFO (OvidSP) search strategy

1. exp Chronic Illness/

2. exp Disabilities/

3. (disable* or disabil* or impairment or handicap).mp.

4. ((persistent or long* term or ongoing or degenerative or chronic or progressive) adj3 (disease* or ill* or condition* or insufficienc* or disorder* or impair*)).tw.

5. exp Cardiovascular Disorders/

6. (heart disease* or heart failure or myocardial ischemia or coronary disease* or coronary artery disease* or myocardial infarction or hypertension or high blood pressure).tw.

7. sickle cell.mp.

8. exp Lung Disorders/

9. (obstructive lung disease* or obstructive pulmonary disease* or copd or asthma or bronchitis).tw.

10. emphysema.tw.

11. (cystic fibrosis or respiratory distress).mp.

12. exp Nervous System Disorders/

13. (brain adj (disease* or damage* or injur*)).tw.

14. (cerebrovascular or brain ischemia or cerebral infarction or carotid artery disease* or stroke or epilep* or seizure*).tw.

15. (neurodegenerative or Huntington* or Parkinson* or lateral sclerosis or multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease or muscular dystrophy or Steinerts* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylosis or osteoarthritis or scoliosis or spinal stenosis or herniated nucleus pulposus or spinal arachnoiditis or cranial hemorrhage or cranial haemorrhage or aneurysm* or aphasia or dysarthria or apraxia or dystonia or ataxia or paraparesis or regional pain syndrome or neuropathy or neuritis or supranuclear palsy or Steele-Richardson-Olszewski or multi system atrophy or myositis or encephalitis or meningitis or clinical isolated syndrome).tw.
16. (paralys* or quadriplegi* or tetraplegi* or paraplegi*).tw.
17. ((communication or learning or consciousness or perpetual or speech or voice or vision or hearing or psychomotor) adj disorder*).tw.
18. (hearing loss or hearing aid* or deaf* or blind* or stutter* or amput*).tw.
19. down* syndrome.tw.
20. cerebral palsy.tw.
21. exp Gastrointestinal Disorders/
22. (gastroenter* or intestinal or bowel or colonic).tw.
23. exp Kidney Diseases/
24. ((renal or kidney) adj (failure* or insufficienc*).tw.
25. exp Diabetes Mellitus/
26. (diabetes or diabetic*).tw.
27. exp nutritional deficiencies/
28. (underweight or malnutrition or malnourished or overweight or obes*).tw.
29. exp Arthritis/
30. exp rheumatoid arthritis/
31. (arthritis or osteoarthritis or rheumati* or fibromyalgia).tw.
32. ((back or neck) adj pain).tw.
33. exp Thyroid Disorders/
34. thyroid.tw.
35. exp Food Allergies/
36. (hypersensitivit* or allerg* or intolerance or anaphyla*).mp.
37. exp Neoplasms/
38. (cancer* or oncolog* or neoplasm* or carcinom* or tumo?* or malignan* or leuk?emia).tw.
39. exp AIDS/ or exp HIV/
40. (hiv infect* or hiv disease*).tw.

41. exp Mental Disorders/
42. exp Behavior Problems/
43. ((mental* or psychiatr* or psychological*) adj (ill* or disorder* or disease* or distress* or disab* or problem* or health* or patient* or treatment)).tw.
44. ((personality or mood or dysthymic or cognit* or anxiety or stress or eating or adjustment or reactive or somatoform or conversion or behavior or perception or psycho* or impulse control or development* or attention deficit or hyperactivity or conduct or motor skills or movement or tic or substance related) adj disorder*).tw.
45. (psychos#s or psychotic* or paranoi* or schizo* or neuros#s or neurotic* or delusion* or depression or depressive or bipolar or mania or manic or obsessi* or compulsi* or panic or phobic or phobia or anorexia or bulimia or neurastheni* or dissociative or autis* or Asperger* or Tourette or dyslex* or affective or borderline or narcissis* or suicid* or self injur* or self harm or adhd).tw.
46. (((substance or drug or alcohol) adj abuse) or "substance use" or "illegal drug use" or addict* or alcoholism or (problem* adj1 drinking)).tw.
47. or/1-46
48. exp Vocational Rehabilitation/
49. (occupational adj (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)).tw.
50. (vocational adj (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)).tw.
51. (work adj (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or rehabilitation)).tw.
52. (job adj (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or modification or trial or placement or development or coaching or creation)).tw.
53. or/48-52
54. systematic review.mp.
55. exp Meta Analysis/
56. (metaanalysis or meta-analysis).mp.
57. or/54-56
58. 47 and 53 and 57

AMED (OvidSP) search strategy

1. exp Chronic Disease/
2. exp Disabled/
3. (disable* or disabil* or impairment or handicap).mp.

4. ((persistent or long* term or ongoing or degenerative or chronic or progressive) adj3 (disease* or ill* or condition* or insufficienc* or disorder* or impair*)).tw.
5. cardiovascular diseases
6. (heart disease* or heart failure or myocardial ischemia or coronary disease* or coronary artery disease* or myocardial infarction or hypertension or high blood pressure).tw.
7. sickle cell.mp.
8. exp lung diseases obstructive/
9. (obstructive lung disease* or obstructive pulmonary disease* or copd or asthma or bronchitis).tw.
10. exp emphysema/
11. exp pulmonary emphysema/
12. emphysema.tw.
13. (cystic fibrosis or respiratory distress).mp.
14. nervous system diseases
15. (brain adj (disease* or damage* or injur*)).tw.
16. (cerebrovascular or brain ischemia or cerebral infarction or carotid artery disease* or stroke or epilep* or seizure*).tw.
17. (neurodegenerative or Huntington* or Parkinson* or lateral sclerosis or multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease or muscular dystrophy or Steinerts* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylosis or osteoarthritis or scoliosis or spinal stenosis or herniated nucleus pulposus or spinal arachnoiditis or cranial hemorrhage or cranial haemorrhage or aneurysm* or aphasia or dysarthria or apraxia or dystonia or ataxia or paraparesis or regional pain syndrome or neuropathy or neuritis or supranuclear palsy or Steele-Richardson-Olszewski or multi system atrophy or myositis or encephalitis or meningitis or clinical isolated syndrome).tw.
18. (paralys* or quadriplegi* or tetraplegi* or paraplegi*).tw.
19. ((communication or learning or consciousness or perpetual or speech or voice or vision or hearing or psychomotor) adj disorder*).tw.
20. (hearing loss or hearing aid* or deaf* or blind* or stutter* or amput*).tw.
21. down* syndrome.tw.
22. cerebral palsy.tw.
23. gastrointestinal diseases
24. (gastroenter* or intestinal or bowel or colonic).tw.
25. renal insufficiency
26. ((renal or kidney) adj (failure* or insufficienc*)).tw.
27. diabetes mellitus/

28. (diabetes or diabetic*).tw.
29. exp nutrition disorders/
30. (underweight or malnutrition or malnourished or overweight or obes*).tw.
31. exp arthritis/
32. rheumatic diseases
33. (arthritis or osteoarthritis or rheumati* or fibromyalgia).tw.
34. ((back or neck) adj pain).tw.
35. hyroid diseases
36. thyroid.tw.
37. exp hypersensitivity/
38. (hypersensitivit* or allerg* or intolerance or anaphyla*).mp.
39. exp neoplasms/
40. (cancer* or oncolog* or neoplasm* or carcinom* or tumo?r* or malignan* or leuk?emia).tw.
41. exp hiv infections/
42. (hiv infect* or hiv disease*).tw.
43. exp mental disorders/
44. behavioral symptoms
45. ((mental* or psychiatr* or psychological*) adj (ill* or disorder* or disease* or distress* or disab* or problem* or health* or patient* or treatment)).tw.
46. ((personality or mood or dysthymic or cognit* or anxiety or stress or eating or adjustment or reactive or somatoform or conversion or behavior or perception or psycho* or impulse control or development* or attention deficit or hyperactivity or conduct or motor skills or movement or tic or substance related) adj disorder*).tw.
47. (psychos#s or psychotic* or paranoi* or schizo* or neuros#s or neurotic* or delusion* or depression or depressive or bipolar or mania or manic or obsessi* or compulsi* or panic or phobic or phobia or anorexia or bulimia or neurastheni* or dissociative or autis* or Asperger* or Tourette or dyslex* or affective or borderline or narcissis* or suicid* or self injur* or self harm or adhd).tw.
48. (((substance or drug or alcohol) adj abuse) or "substance use" or "illegal drug use" or addict* or alcoholism or (problem* adj1 drinking)).tw.
49. or/1-48
50. exp Rehabilitation, Vocational/
51. (occupational adj (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)).tw.
52. (vocational adj (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)).tw.

53. (work adj (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or rehabilitation)).tw.

54. (job adj (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or modification or trial or placement or development or coaching or creation)).tw.

55. or/50-54

56. systematic review.mp.

57. exp Meta-analysis/

58. (metaanalysis or meta-analysis).mp.

59. or/56-58

60. 49 and 55 and 59

CINAHL (EBSCOhost) search strategy

1. (MH "Employment+")

2. (MH "Work+")

3. (MH "Rehabilitation, Vocational+")

4. S1 OR S2 OR S3

5. (MH "Chronic Disease+")

6. (MH "Disabled+")

7. TX disable* or disabil* or impairment or handicap

8. TX ((persistent or long* term or ongoing or degenerative or chronic or progressive) N1 (disease* or ill* or condition* or insufficienc* or disorder* or impair*))

9. (MH "Cardiovascular Diseases+")

10. TX heart disease* or heart failure or myocardial ischemia or coronary disease* or coronary artery disease* or myocardial infarction or hypertension or high blood pressure

11. TX sickle cell

12. (MH "Lung Diseases, Obstructive+")

13. TX obstructive lung disease* or obstructive pulmonary disease* or copd or asthma or bronchitis

14. TX cystic fibrosis or respiratory distress

15. (MH "Nervous System Diseases+")

16. TX brain N1 (disease* or damage* or injur* or tumour or tumor)

17. TX cerebrovascular or brain ischemia or cerebral infarction or carotid artery disease* or stroke or epilep* or seizure*

18. TX neurodegenerative or Huntington* or Parkinson* or lateral sclerosis or multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease or muscular dystrophy or Steinerts* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylosis or osteoarthritis or scoliosis or spinal stenosis or herniated nucleus pulposus or spinal arachnoiditis or cranial hemorrhage or cranial haemorrhage or aneurysm* or aphasia or dysarthria or apraxia or dystonia or ataxia or paraparesis or regional pain syndrome or neuropathy or neuritis or supranuclear palsy or Steele-Richardson-Olszewski or multi system atrophy or myositis or encephalitis or meningitis or clinical isolated syndrome
19. TX paralyt* or quadriplegi* or tetraplegi* or paraplegi*
20. TX communication or learning or consciousness or perpetual or speech or voice or vision or hearing or psychomotor) N1 disorder*
21. TX hearing loss or hearing aid* or deaf* or blind* or stutter* or amputation*
22. TX down* syndrome
23. TX cerebral palsy
24. (MH "Gastrointestinal Diseases+")
25. TX gastroenter* or intestinal or bowel or colonic
26. (MH "Renal Insufficiency+")
27. TX (renal or kidney) N1 (failure* or insufficienc*)
28. (MH "Diabetes Mellitus+")
29. TX diabetes or diabetic*
30. (MH "Nutrition Disorders+")
31. TX underweight or malnutrition or malnourished or overweight or obes*
32. (MH "Arthritis+")
33. (MH "Rheumatic Diseases+")
34. TX arthritis or osteoarthritis or rheumati* or fibromyalgia
35. TX (back or neck) N1 pain
36. (MH "Thyroid Diseases+")
37. TX thyroid
38. (MH "Hypersensitivity+")
39. TX hypersensitivit* or allerg* or intolerance or anaphyla*
40. (MH "Neoplasms+")
41. TX cancer* or oncolog* or neoplasm* or carcinom* or tumo?r* or malignan* or leuk?emia
42. (MH "Human Immunodeficiency Virus+")
43. TX hiv infect* or hiv disease*

44. (MH "Mental Disorders+")
45. (MH "Behavioral Symptoms+")
46. TX (mental* or psychiatr* or psychological*) N1 (ill* or disorder* or disease* or distress* or disab* or problem* or health* or patient* or treatment)
47. TX (personality or mood or dysthymic or cognit* or anxiety or stress or eating or adjustment or reactive or somatoform or conversion or behavior or perception or psycho* or impulse control or development* or attention deficit or hyperactivity or conduct or motor skills or movement or tic or substance related) N1 disorder*
48. TX psychos* or psychotic* or paranoi* or schizo* or neuros* or neurotic* or delusion* or depression or depressive or bipolar or mania or manic or obsessi* or compulsi* or panic or phobic or phobia or anorexia or bulimia or neurastheni* or dissociative or autis* or Asperger* or Tourette or dyslex* or affective or borderline or narcissis* or suicid* or self injur* or self harm or adhd
49. TX ((substance or drug or alcohol) N1 abuse) or substance use or illegal drug use or addict* or alcoholism or (problem* N1 drinking)
50. (MH "Occupational Health+")
51. (MH "Stress, Occupational+")
52. TX occupational N1 (medicine or health or status or counseling or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)
53. TX vocational N1 (medicine or health or status or counseling or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)
54. TX work N1 (status or training or counseling or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or activities or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or rehabilitation)
55. S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR S14 OR S15 OR S16 OR S17 OR S18 OR S19 OR S20 OR S21 OR S22 OR S23 OR S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27 OR S28 OR S29 OR S30 OR S31 OR S32 OR S33 OR S34 OR S35 OR S36 OR S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 OR S41 OR S42 OR S43 OR S44 OR S45 OR S46 OR S47 OR S48 OR S49
56. S50 OR S51 OR S52 OR S53 OR S54
57. S55 AND S56
58. S4 OR S57
59. TX systematic review
60. (MH "Meta Analysis")
61. TX metaanalysis or meta-analysis
62. (MH "Systematic Review")
63. S59 OR S60 OR S61 OR S62
64. S58 AND S63 Limiters - Exclude MEDLINE records

Proquest Dissertations and Theses database search strategy

all((chronic OR disabl* OR disabil* OR impairment* OR handicap OR disease OR injury OR disorder OR syndrome "long term health" OR cardiovascular OR myocardial OR heart failure OR hypertension OR "high blood pressure" OR "sickle cell" OR COPD OR asthma OR bronchitis OR emphysema OR cystic fibrosis OR "respiratory distress" OR "brain damage" OR cerebrovascular OR ischemia OR infarction OR stroke OR epilep* OR seizure* OR neurodegenerative OR Huntington* OR Parkinson* OR sclerosis OR dystrophy OR facioscapulohumeral OR palsy OR "myathenia gravis" OR "Gillian Barre" OR spondylo* OR osteoarth* OR scoliosis OR stenosis OR herniated OR spinal OR cranial OR aphasia OR dysarthria OR apraxia OR dystonia OR ataxia OR paraparesis OR neuropathy OR neuritis OR "Steele-Richardson-Olszewski" OR myositis OR encephalitis OR meningitis OR "clinical isolated syndrome" OR paralys* OR quadriplegi* OR tetraplegi* OR paraplegi* OR "hearing loss" OR "hearing aid" OR deaf* or blind* or stutter* or amput* OR gatroenter* OR intestinal OR bowel OR colonic OR renal OR kidney OR diabetes OR diabetic* OR underweight OR malnutrition OR malnourished OR overweight OR obes* OR arthritis OR rheumati* OR fibromyalgia OR "neck pain" OR "back pain" OR "arm pain" OR thyroid OR hypersensitivi* OR allerg* OR anaphyla* OR cancer* OR oncolog* OR neoplasm* OR carcinom* OR HIV OR "mental health" OR "depression" OR "anxiety" OR psychosis OR psychotic* OR paranoi* OR schizo* OR neurosis OR neurotic* OR delusion* OR bipolar OR anorexia OR bulimia OR neurastheni* OR dissociative OR autis* OR Asperger* OR Tourette OR dyslex* OR suicid* OR "self harm" OR ADHD OR "substance abuse" OR "drug abuse" OR "alcohol abuse" OR "illegal drug use" or addict* or alcoholism) AND ("occupational counsel*" OR "occupational training" OR "occupation rehabilitation" OR "vocation counsel*" OR "vocational training" OR "vocational rehabilitation" OR "work counsel*" OR "work accommodation" OR "work adjustment" OR "work ability" OR "work disabil*" OR "work rehabilitation" OR "work placement" OR "job counsel*" OR "job accomodation" OR "job adjustment" OR "job modification" OR "job trial" OR "job placement" OR "job coaching" OR "job creation") AND ("systematic review" OR "meta-analysis" OR "metaanalysis"))

Evidence Search (NICE) search strategy

Vocational Rehabilitation

Business Source Complete search strategy

1. Chronic Disease
2. Disabled Persons
3. disable* or disabil* or impairment or handicap
4. persistent or long* term or ongoing or degenerative or chronic or progressive (disease* or ill* or condition* or insufficienc* or disorder* or impair*)
5. cardiovascular diseases
6. heart disease* or heart failure or myocardial ischemia or coronary disease* or coronary artery disease* or myocardial infarction or hypertension or high blood pressure
7. sickle cell
8. lung diseases obstructive

9. obstructive lung disease* or obstructive pulmonary disease* or copd or asthma or bronchitis
10. emphysema
11. pulmonary emphysema
12. cystic fibrosis or respiratory distress
13. nervous system diseases
14. brain (disease* or damage* or injur*)
15. cerebrovascular or brain ischemia or cerebral infarction or carotid artery disease* or stroke or epilep* or seizure*
16. neurodegenerative or Huntington* or Parkinson* or lateral sclerosis or multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease or muscular dystrophy or Steinerts* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylosis or osteoarthritis or scoliosis or spinal stenosis or herniated nucleus pulposus or spinal arachnoiditis or cranial hemorrhage or cranial haemorrhage or aneurysm* or aphasia or dysarthria or apraxia or dystonia or ataxia or paraparesis or regional pain syndrome or neuropathy or neuritis or supranuclear palsy or Steele-Richardson-Olszewski or multi system atrophy or myositis or encephalitis or meningitis or clinical isolated syndrome
17. paraly* or quadriplegi* or tetraplegi* or paraplegi*
18. communication or learning or consciousness or perpetual or speech or voice or vision or hearing or psychomotor disorder*
19. hearing loss or hearing aid* or deaf* or blind* or stutter* or amput*
20. down* syndrome
21. cerebral palsy
22. gastrointestinal diseases
23. gastroenter* or intestinal or bowel or colonic
24. renal insufficiency
25. (renal or kidney) (failure* or insufficienc*)
26. diabetes mellitus
27. diabetes or diabetic*
28. nutrition disorders
29. underweight or malnutrition or malnourished or overweight or obes*
30. arthritis
31. rheumatic diseases
32. arthritis or osteoarthritis or rheumati* or fibromyalgia
33. back pain or neck pain

34. thyroid diseases
35. thyroid
36. hypersensitivity
37. hypersensitivit* or allerg* or intolerance or anaphyla*
38. neoplasms
39. cancer* or oncolog* or neoplasm* or carcinom* or tumo?r* or malignan* or leuk?emia
40. hiv infections
41. hiv infect* or hiv disease*
42. mental disorders
43. behavioral symptoms
44. mental* or psychiatr* or psychological* (ill* or disorder* or disease* or distress* or disab* or problem* or health* or patient* or treatment)
45. personality or mood or dysthymic or cognit* or anxiety or stress or eating or adjustment or reactive or somatoform or conversion or behavior or perception or psycho* or impulse control or development* or attention deficit or hyperactivity or conduct or motor skills or movement or tic or substance related adj disorder*
46. psychos#s or psychotic* or paranoi* or schizo* or neuros#s or neurotic* or delusion* or depression or depressive or bipolar or mania or manic or obsessi* or compulsi* or panic or phobic or phobia or anorexia or bulimia or neurastheni* or dissociative or autis* or Asperger* or Tourette or dyslex* or affective or borderline or narcissis* or suicid* or self injur* or self harm or adhd
47. ((substance or drug or alcohol) abuse) or "substance use" or "illegal drug use" or addict* or alcoholism or (problem* drinking)
48. S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR S14 OR S15 OR S16 OR S17 OR S18 OR S19 OR S20 OR S21 OR S22 OR S23 OR S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27 OR S28 OR S29 OR S30 OR S31 OR S32 OR S33 OR S34 OR S35 OR S36 OR S37 OR S38 OR S39 OR S40 OR S41 OR S42 OR S43 OR S44 OR S45 OR S46 OR S47
49. Rehabilitation, Vocational
50. occupational (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)
51. vocational (counsel* or training or intervention* or rehabilitation)
52. work (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or rehabilitation)
53. job (counsel* or intervention* or accommodation or adjustment or ability or disabil* or retention or maintenance or modification or trial or placement or development or coaching or creation)
54. S49 OR S50 OR S51 OR S52 OR S53
55. systematic review

56. Meta-analysis
57. metaanalysis or meta-analysis
58. S55 OR S56 OR S57
59. S48 AND S54 AND S58

Appendix C: Table of reasons for exclusion of reviews on full-text screening

Citation	Reason for exclusion
1. Al-Rashaida M, Lopez-Paz JF, Amayra I, Lazaro E, Martinez O, Berrocoso S, et al. Factors affecting the satisfaction of people with disabilities in relation to vocational rehabilitation programs: A literature review. <i>Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation</i> . 2018;49(1):97-115.	Wrong outcomes
2. Alexander L, Cooper K, Mitchell D. Effectiveness of vocational rehabilitation on work participation in adults with musculoskeletal disorders: An umbrella review. <i>Physiotherapy</i> . 2017;103 (Supplement 1):e102.	Wrong patient population
3. Almalky HA. Employment outcomes for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities: A literature review. <i>Children & Youth Services Review</i> . 2020;109:104656	Not a systematic review of intervention effectiveness
4. Amatya B, Khan F, Galea M. Rehabilitation for people with multiple sclerosis: An overview of Cochrane Reviews. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i> . 2019(1):CD012732.	Overview, not a systematic review
5. Audhoe SS, Hoving JL, Sluiter JK, Frings-Dresen MH. Vocational interventions for unemployed: effects on work participation and mental distress. A systematic review. <i>Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation</i> . 2010;20(1):1-13.	Wrong patient population
6. Bambra C, Whitehead M, Hamilton V. Does 'welfare-to-work' work? A systematic review of the effectiveness of the UK's welfare-to-work programmes for people with a disability or chronic illness. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i> . 2005;60(9):1905-18.	Wrong types of studies
7. Bartys S, Frederiksen P, Bendix T, Burton K. System influences on work disability due to low back pain: An international evidence synthesis. <i>Health Policy</i> . 2017;121(8):903-12.	Wrong patient population
8. Bilodeau K, Tremblay D, Durand MJ. Exploration of return-to-work interventions for breast cancer patients: a scoping review. <i>Supportive Care in Cancer</i> . 2017;25(6):1993-2007.	Not a systematic review of intervention effectiveness
9. Blas AJT, Beltran KMB, Martinez PGV, Yao DPG. Enabling work: Occupational therapy interventions for persons with occupational injuries and diseases: A scoping review. <i>Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation</i> . 2018;28(2):201-14.	Wrong patient population
10. Bloom J, McLennan V, Dorsett P. Occupational bonding after spinal cord injury: A review and narrative synthesis. <i>Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation</i> . 2019;50(1):109-20.	Wrong outcomes
11. Bond G, Drake R, Luciano A. Employment and educational outcomes in early intervention programmes for early psychosis: a systematic review. <i>Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences</i> . 2015;24(5):446-57.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
12. Bond G, Drake R, Pogue J. Expanding individual placement and support to populations with conditions and disorders other than serious mental illness. <i>Psychiatric Services</i> . 2019;70(6):488-98.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
13. Bond GR, Drake RE, Becker DR. An update on randomized controlled trials of evidence-based supported employment. <i>Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal</i> . 2008;31(4):280-90.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
14. Brasure M, Lamberty GJ, Sayer NA, W NN, MacDonald R, Ouellette J, et al. Participation after multidisciplinary rehabilitation for moderate to severe traumatic brain injury in adults: A systematic review. <i>Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</i> . 2013;94(7):1398-420.	Wrong outcomes
15. Brouns R, Espinoza AV, Goudman L, Moens M, Verlooy J. Interventions to promote work participation after ischaemic stroke: a systematic review. <i>Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery</i> . 2019;185:105458	Wrong patient population
16. Burstrom B, Nylen L, Clayton S, Whitehead M. How equitable is vocational rehabilitation in Sweden? A review of evidence on the	Wrong outcomes

implementation of a national policy framework. <i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i> . 2011;33(6):453-66.	
17. Campbell K, Bond GR, Drake RE. Who benefits from supported employment: A meta-analytic study. <i>Schizophrenia Bulletin</i> . 2011;37(2):370-80.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
18. Cancelliere C, Donovan J, Stochkendahl MJ, Biscardi M, Ammendolia C, Myburgh C, et al. Factors affecting return to work after injury or illness: Best evidence synthesis of systematic reviews. <i>Chiropractic and Manual Therapies</i> . 2016;24:32.	Wrong patient population
19. Cancelliere C, Kristman V, Cassidy JD, Hincapie C, Cote P, Boyle E, et al. A systematic review of return-to-work after mild traumatic brain injury: Results of the International Collaboration on MTBI Prognosis (ICoMP). <i>Brain Injury</i> . 2014;28 (5-6):635.	Wrong outcomes
20. Cancelliere C, Kristman VL, Cassidy JD, Hincapie CA, Cote P, Boyle E, et al. Systematic review of return to work after mild traumatic brain injury: results of the International Collaboration on Mild Traumatic Brain Injury Prognosis. <i>Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation</i> . 2014;95(3 Suppl):S201-9.	Wrong outcomes
21. Chan SKW, Chan HYV, Devlin J, Bastiampillai T, Mohan T, Hui CLM, et al. A systematic review of long-term outcomes of patients with psychosis who received early intervention services. <i>International Review of Psychiatry</i> . 2019;31(5/6):425-40.	Wrong intervention
22. Clayton S, Bamba C, Gosling R, Povall S, Misso K, Whitehead M. Assembling the evidence jigsaw: insights from a systematic review of UK studies of individual-focused return to work initiatives for disabled and long-term ill people. <i>BMC Public Health</i> . 2011;11:170.	Wrong types of studies
23. Clayton S, Barr B, Nylen L, Burstrom B, Thielen K, Diderichsen F, et al. Effectiveness of return-to-work interventions for disabled people: a systematic review of government initiatives focused on changing the behaviour of employers. <i>European Journal of Public Health</i> . 2012;22(3):434-9.	Wrong types of studies
24. Clayton S, Gosling R, Povall S, Misso K, Bamba C, Whitehead M. 015 Pathways to work? Insights from a systematic review of the UK's return to work initiatives for disabled and chronically ill people. <i>Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health</i> . 2010;64(Suppl 1):A6.	Wrong types of studies
25. Corbiere M, Shen J. A systematic review of psychological return-to-work interventions for people with mental health problems and/or physical injuries. <i>Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health</i> . 2007;25(2):261-88.	Wrong patient population
26. Dafoe WA, Cupper L. Vocational considerations and return to work. <i>Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America</i> . 1995;6(1):191-204.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
27. Damianidou D, Arthur-Kelly M, Lyons G, Wehmeyer ML. Technology use to support employment-related outcomes for people with intellectual and developmental disability: an updated meta-analysis. <i>International Journal of Developmental Disabilities</i> . 2019;65(4):220-30.	Wrong types of studies
28. De Baets S, Calders P, Schalley N, Vermeulen K, Vertriest S, Van Peteghem L, et al. Updating the evidence on functional capacity evaluation methods: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation</i> . 2018;28(3):418-28.	Wrong patient population
29. de Boer A, Taskila TK, Tamminga SJ, Feuerstein M, Frings-Dresen MHW, Verbeek JH. Interventions to enhance return-to-work for cancer patients. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i> . 2015;9:CD007569.	Wrong patient population
30. de Buck PD, Schoones JW, Allaire SH, Vliet Vlieland TP. Vocational rehabilitation in patients with chronic rheumatic diseases: A systematic literature review. <i>Seminars in Arthritis and Rheumatism</i> . 2002;32(3):196-203.	Wrong patient population

31. Dibben P, Wood G, O'Hara R. Do return to work interventions for workers with disabilities and health conditions achieve employment outcomes and are they cost effective? A systematic narrative review. <i>Employee Relations</i> . 2018;40(6):999-1014.	Wrong patient population
32. Donker-Cools B, Daams J, Wind H, Frings-Dresen M. Effective return-to-work interventions after acquired brain injury: A systematic review. <i>Brain Injury</i> . 2016;30(2):113-31.	Wrong outcomes
33. Ellenkamp JJ, Brouwers EP, Embregts PJ, Joosen MC, van Weeghel J. Work environment-related factors in obtaining and maintaining work in a competitive employment setting for employees with intellectual disabilities: A systematic review. <i>Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation</i> . 2016;26(1):56-69.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
34. Fadyl J, McPherson KM. Approaches to vocational rehabilitation after traumatic brain injury – a review of the evidence. <i>Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation</i> . 2009;24(3):195-212	Not a systematic review of intervention effectiveness
35. Fong CJ, Murphy KM, Westbrook JD, Markle MM. Psychological interventions to facilitate employment outcomes for cancer survivors: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Research on Social Work Practice</i> . 2018;28(1):84-98.	Wrong patient population
36. Frederick DE, VanderWeele TJ. Supported employment: Meta-analysis and review of randomized controlled trials of individual placement and support. <i>PLoS One</i> . 2019;14(2):e0212208.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
37. Gussenhoven AH, Jansma EP, Goverts ST, Festen JM, Anema JR, Kramer SE. Vocational rehabilitation services for people with hearing difficulties: A systematic review of the literature. <i>Work</i> . 2013;46(2):151-64.	Wrong patient population
38. Harrison J, Krieger MJ, Johnson HA. Review of individual placement and support employment intervention for persons with substance use disorder. <i>Substance Use & Misuse</i> . 2020;55(4):636-43.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
39. Hegewald J, Wegewitz UE, Euler U, van Dijk JL, Adams J, Fishta A, et al. Interventions to support return to work for people with coronary heart disease. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i> . 2019;3:CD010748.	Wrong patient population
40. Hoving JL, Broekhuizen MLA, Frings-Dresen MHW. Return to work of breast cancer survivors: a systematic review of intervention studies. <i>BMC Cancer</i> . 2009;9:117.	Wrong patient population
41. Hunter EG, Gibson RW, Arbesman M, D'Amico M. Systematic review of occupational therapy and adult cancer rehabilitation: Part 2. Impact of multidisciplinary rehabilitation and psychosocial, sexuality, and return-to-work interventions. <i>American Journal of Occupational Therapy</i> . 2017;71(2):7102100040.	Wrong patient population
42. Ikebuchi E. Support of working life of persons with schizophrenia. <i>Seishin Shinkeigaku Zasshi</i> . 2006;108(5):436-48.	Not in English
43. Karjalainen K, Malmivaara A, van Tulder M, Roine R, Jauhiainen M, Hurri H, et al. Multidisciplinary rehabilitation for fibromyalgia and musculoskeletal pain in working age adults. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i> . 2000;2:CD001984.	Wrong patient population
44. Khan F, Turner-Stokes L, Ng L, Kilpatrick T, Amatya B. Multidisciplinary rehabilitation for adults with multiple sclerosis. <i>Cochrane database of systematic reviews</i> . 2007;2:CD006036.	Wrong outcomes
45. Kim M, Mpofu E, Brock K, Millington M, Athanasou J. Cognitive-behavioural therapy effects on employment-related outcomes for individuals with mental illness: A systematic review. <i>South African Journal of Industrial Psychology</i> . 2014;40(2):1-6.	Wrong patient population
46. Kondratova L, Winkler P. Supported employment of people with severe mental illness - the Czech and international experience: A narrative synthesis. <i>Česká a Slovenská Psychiatrie</i> . 2017;113(3):132-9.	Not in English

47. Kurtz MM, Nichols MC. Cognitive rehabilitation for schizophrenia: A review of recent advances. <i>Current Psychiatry Reviews</i> . 2007;3(3):213-21.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
48. Lamore K, Dubois T, Rothe U, Leonardi M, Girard I, Manuwald U, et al. Return to work interventions for cancer survivors: A systematic review and a methodological critique. <i>International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health</i> . 2019;16(8):1343	Wrong patient population
49. Lefever M, Decuman S, Perl F, Braeckman L, Van de Velde D. The efficacy and efficiency of disability management in job-retention and job-reintegration. A systematic review. <i>Work</i> . 2018;59(4):501-34.	Wrong patient population
50. Lehman AF. Vocational rehabilitation in schizophrenia. <i>Schizophrenia Bulletin</i> . 1995;21(4):645-56.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
51. Leverich AE, Acke S, Verbrugge M, Schmickler MN, De Brouwer C. Efficiency of vocational rehabilitation programs for workers with schizophrenia: A systematic literature review according to the prisma guidelines. <i>Occupational and Environmental Medicine</i> . 2018;75 (Suppl. 2):A612-A3.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
52. Lidal IB, Huynh TK, Biering-Sorensen F. Return to work following spinal cord injury: A review. <i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i> . 2007;29(17):1341-75.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
53. Lindsay S, L RH, Fellin M. A systematic review of mentorship programs to facilitate transition to post-secondary education and employment for youth and young adults with disabilities. <i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i> . 2016;38(14):1329-49.	Wrong outcomes
54. Lockett H, Waghorn G, Kydd R. A framework for improving the effectiveness of evidence-based practices in vocational rehabilitation. <i>Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation</i> . 2018;49(1):15-31.	Wrong outcomes
55. Lockett H, Waghorn G, Kydd R, Chant D. Predictive validity of evidence-based practices in supported employment: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Mental Health Review Journal</i> . 2016;21(4):261-81.	Not a systematic review of intervention effectiveness
56. Magura S, Marshall T. The effectiveness of interventions intended to improve employment outcomes for persons with substance use disorder: An updated systematic review. <i>Substance Use & Misuse</i> . 2020:1-7.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
57. Metcalfe JD, Drake RE, Bond GR. Economic, labor, and regulatory moderators of the effect of individual placement and support among people with severe mental illness: A systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Schizophrenia Bulletin</i> . 2018;44(1):22-31.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
58. Mueser K. Supported employment, social skills training, and first episode psychosis. <i>Schizophrenia Research</i> . 2010;117 (2-3):107.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
59. Mueser KT, Drake RE, Bond GR. Recent advances in supported employment for people with serious mental illness. <i>Current Opinion in Psychiatry</i> . 2016;29(3):196-201.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
60. Nicholas DB, Attridge M, Zwaigenbaum L, Clarke M. Vocational support approaches in autism spectrum disorder: A synthesis review of the literature. <i>Autism</i> . 2015;19(2):235-45.	Not a systematic review of intervention effectiveness
61. Nützi M, Trezzini B, Medici L, Schwegler U. Job matching: An interdisciplinary scoping study with implications for vocational rehabilitation counseling. <i>Rehabilitation Psychology</i> . 2017;62(1).	Not a systematic review of intervention effectiveness
62. Ponka D, Agbata E, Kendall C, Stergiopoulos V, Mendonca O, Magwood O, et al. The effectiveness of case management interventions for the homeless, vulnerably housed and persons with lived experience: A systematic review. <i>PLoS One</i> . 2020;15(4):e0230896.	Wrong intervention
63. Robinson R, Okpo E, Mngoma N. Interventions for improving employment outcomes for workers with HIV. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i> . 2015(5):CD010090.	Wrong patient population

64. Schall C, Wehman P, Avellone L, Taylor JP. Competitive integrated employment for youth and adults with autism: Findings from a scoping review. <i>Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America</i> . 2020;29(2):373-97.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
65. Sauve G, Lepage M, Corbiere M. Impacts of vocational programs integrating cognitive remediation on job tenure in schizophrenia: A meta-analysis. <i>Impacts de la combinaison de programmes de soutien a l'emploi et de remediation cognitive sur le maintien en emploi de personnes souffrant de schizophrénie: Une meta-analyse</i> . 2019;177(6):534-43.	Not in English
66. Tamminga SJ, de Boer AGEM, Verbeek JHAM, Frings-Dresen MHW. Return-to-work interventions integrated into cancer care: a systematic review. <i>Occupational and Environmental Medicine</i> . 2010;67(9):639-48.	Wrong patient population
67. Trenaman LM, Miller WC, Escorpizo R. Interventions for improving employment outcomes among individuals with spinal cord injury: A systematic review. <i>Spinal Cord</i> . 2014;52(11):788-94.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
68. Twamley EW, Jeste DV, Lehman AF. Vocational rehabilitation in schizophrenia and other psychotic disorders: A literature review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. <i>Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease</i> . 2003;191(8):515-23.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
69. Tyerman A. Vocational rehabilitation after traumatic brain injury: Models and services. <i>Neurorehabilitation</i> . 2012;31(1):51-62.	Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review
70. Verhoef JA, Bal MI, Roelofs PD, Borghouts JA, Roebroek ME, Miedema HS. Effectiveness and characteristics of interventions to improve work participation in adults with chronic physical conditions: a systematic review. <i>Disability and Rehabilitation</i> . 2020:1-16	Wrong patient population
71. Wainwright E, Wainwright D, Coghill N, Walsh J, Perry R. Resilience and return-to-work pain interventions: systematic review. <i>Occupational Medicine</i> . 2019;69(3):163-76	Wrong intervention
72. Waterschoot FPC, Dijkstra PU, Hollak N, De Vries HJ, Geertzen JHB, Reneman MF. Dose or content? Effectiveness of pain rehabilitation programs for patients with chronic low back pain: A systematic review. <i>Pain</i> . 2014;155(1):179-89.	Wrong patient population

Appendix D: Characteristics of included reviews (ordered by first author)**Brinchmann et al. 2020****Review question**

Population	People with mental illness, excluding drug and alcohol problems
Intervention	Individual Placement and Support with moderate to high fidelity, excluding modified or enhanced versions of Individual Placement and Support
Comparison	Traditional vocational services or services as usual
Primary outcome	Competitive employment defined as permanent jobs paying commensurate wages available to anyone
Secondary outcomes	No additional outcomes specified
Setting for interventions	Mental health treatment services
Type of studies included	RCTs

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	9/10/2019
No. of studies in review	27
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	27 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	6651
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	1

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Downs and Black's checklist
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Yes
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes

Overall confidence in review findings	Moderate confidence
---------------------------------------	---------------------

Carmona et al. 2017

Review question

Population	People with schizophrenia spectrum disorder (schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder and schizophreniform disorder), excluding people with only one first psychotic episode
Intervention	Interventions to support gaining employment with a minimum duration of 6 months, including pay and job placement, job-related social skills training, neurocognitive rehabilitation and cognitive-behavioral intervention
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	Proportion of people in employment and job tenure (hours worked or weeks worked)
Secondary outcomes	Wages earned from competitive employment
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	31/12/2015
No. of studies in review	25
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	25 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	2364
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	7

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	The authors developed their own scale for quantifying methodology quality into a single score, derived from prior publications
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	No
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Yes
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No

If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes
Overall confidence in review findings	Moderate confidence

Chan et al. 2015

Review question

Population	People diagnosed with schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder or bipolar affective disorder
Intervention	Computer-assisted cognitive remediation
Comparison	Usual vocational rehabilitation services or other clinical intervention, such as enriched supported therapy
Primary outcome	Proportion of people in competitive or non-competitive employment
Secondary outcomes	Total days of work in a year; total annual earnings
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	1/09/2014
No. of studies in review	9
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	9 (8 RCTs; 1 non-randomised controlled trial)
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	740
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	3

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes for RCTs; no for non-randomised controlled trials
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Yes for RCTs; no for non-randomised controlled trials
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No

If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes
Overall confidence in review findings	Moderate confidence

Crowther et al. 2001

Review question

Population	People with severe mental health conditions (schizophrenia and schizophrenia-like disorders; bipolar disorder; or depression with psychotic features)
Intervention	Three types of vocational intervention: 1) pre-vocational training, 2) supported employment, 3) enhanced approaches (pre-voc training or support employment plus an additional motivational strategy)
Comparison	Standard care
Primary outcome	Proportion of people in full or part-time competitive employment
Secondary outcomes	Proportion of people in any form for employment; proportion of people in any form of employment or education; average hours worked in competitive employment per month; average monthly earning; proportion of people lost to follow up; proportion of people not participating in the programme; proportion of people admitted to hospital; proportion of people living in community; any other clinical outcomes; average monthly programme costs; average monthly healthcare costs
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	31/12/1998
No. of studies in review	18
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	18 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	2539
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	5

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool

Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes, partially
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Yes
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes
Overall confidence in review findings	High confidence

Dewa et al. 2018

Review question

Population	People with severe mental illnesses not in employment
Intervention	Augmented individual placement and support programmes
Comparison	Standard individual placement and support programmes
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Any type of employment outcome, including employment rate, job tenure, wages or income
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	31/12/2015
No. of studies in review	5
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	5 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	519
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool

Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Low confidence

Graham et al. 2016

Review question

Population	Working aged adults with non-penetrating TBI, engaged in either full-time or part-time employment at the time of injury, and unemployed or on medical leave at the time of receipt of intervention
Intervention	Any intervention to assist working-aged adults with TBI to return to competitive employment
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	Proportion of people in competitive employment, defined as full-time or part-time for 45 days or more
Secondary outcomes	Length of time to competitive employment; hours worked
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	7/11/2015
No. of studies in review	3
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	3 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	220
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes

Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	High confidence

Gross et al. 2020

Review question

Population	People with disabilities
Intervention	Multifaceted interventions, defined as interventions which target two or more individual or environmental characteristics in different domains related to community participation
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	Community participation outcomes very broadly defined, but including integrated competitive employment
Secondary outcomes	Increased self-determination, improved health, improved QOL, increased family support, activities in the home, social networking.
Setting for interventions	Community-based services
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	12/31/2016
No. of studies in review	15
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	The authors reported insufficient information on the characteristic of included studies to estimate the number relevant to this overview
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	Not reported
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	Total number of meta-analysis conducted unclear. Two meta-analyses relevant to this overview were reported however.

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes
---	-----

Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	An adapted version of the National Technical Assistance Center on Transition's Quality Indicator Checklists for Group Experimental studies
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	No
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	No
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes
Overall confidence in review findings	Low confidence

Hedley et al. 2017

Review question

Population	People with autism spectrum disorder including autism, Asperger's disorder or pervasive developmental disorder not otherwise specified, with and without intellectual disability, 18 years or older
Intervention	Any employment-related intervention, vocational programmes or implementation of employment-related supports
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Not stated
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	31/10/2015
No. of studies in review	50
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	6 (2 RCTs; 4 non-randomised controlled trials)
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	315
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	No specific approach to critical appraisal reported
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	No for RCTs; no for non-randomised controlled trials
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Critically low confidence

Heffernan and Pilkington 2011**Review question**

Population	People with mental health illness
Intervention	Individual placement and support programmes
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	Proportion of people gaining employment
Secondary outcomes	Any other vocation-related outcome reported by trial authors; not pre-specific
Setting for interventions	Healthcare services in the UK
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	Not reported
No. of studies in review	5
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	2 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	Not stated
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence's quality appraisal checklist
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes, partially for RCTs; Yes, partially for non-randomised controlled trials
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Low confidence

Jetha et al. 2019**Review question**

Population	Young people (18-35 years) with chronic disabling health conditions, including mental health, intellectual, physical, or speech/hearing/visual disabilities
Intervention	Any intervention designed to explicitly impact work participation
Comparison	Any comparator group
Primary outcome	Work participation
Secondary outcomes	No additional outcomes specified
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	7/31/2018
No. of studies in review	10
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	7 (5 RCTs; 2 non-randomised controlled trials)
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	2389
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	The authors used 25-item quality assessment tool derived from a prior review
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Moderate confidence

Khan et al. 2009**Review question**

Population	People with multiple sclerosis
Intervention	Any vocational rehabilitation programmes, including but not limited to individual and group programmes, general programmes and specialist multiple sclerosis programmes, structured multidisciplinary and multi-agency interventions, clinic or community based counselling, planning for disclosure and accommodation, and work place accommodations
Comparison	Alternative programmes or usual care
Primary outcome	Change in proportion of people with multiple sclerosis in competitive employment; change in proportion of people with multiple sclerosis in supportive employment
Secondary outcomes	Rate of return to work in days; change in proportion of people with multiple sclerosis on disability pension; improvement of work ability in people with multiple sclerosis; costs of programmes; cost effectiveness
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	28/02/2011
No. of studies in review	2

No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	1 non-randomised controlled trial
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	37
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0
Review methodology	
Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes, partially for RCTs; No for non-randomised controlled trials
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Low confidence

Kinoshita et al. 2013

Review question

Population	People with severe mental health illness, not in employment
Intervention	Any supported employment programmes, including individual placement and support programmes and augmented supported employment
Comparison	Other vocational approaches and treatment as usual
Primary outcome	Number of days in competitive employment
Secondary outcomes	Days in competitive employment (medium term); days in any form of paid employment (such as competitive employment, transitional employment, or sheltered employment with wage); earnings in the first year of employment; job tenure (weeks/work/person: for competitive employment and any paid employment); time to first competitive employment
Setting for interventions	Not stated

Type of studies included	RCTs
Results of search	
Date of last search for the review	28/02/2010
No. of studies in review	14
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	14 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	2265
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	10
Review methodology	
Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Yes
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes
Overall confidence in review findings	High confidence

Ma et al. 2020

Review question

Population	Adults (16 years or older) with childhood onset disabilities including acquired brain injury, cerebral palsy and spina bifida
Intervention	Vocational interventions, including pre-vocational training and supported employment.
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	Vocational outcomes: number of clients in competitive employment, mean weekly/monthly hours of competitive employment, mean weekly/monthly earning.
Secondary outcomes	Quality of life and community integration

Setting for interventions	Post-acute rehabilitation settings
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials
Results of search	
Date of last search for the review	6/4/2018
No. of studies in review	17
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	7 (4 RCTs; 3 non-randomised controlled trials)
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	703
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0
Review methodology	
Did the review have a pre-published method?	Partially
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes for RCTs; Yes for non-randomised controlled trials
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Low confidence

Marshall et al. 2014

Review question

Population	People with mental disorders or with co-occurring mental and substance use disorders
Intervention	Supported employment
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Not stated

Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs
Results of search	
Date of last search for the review	31/12/2012
No. of studies in review	17
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	17 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	4518
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0
Review methodology	
Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	The authors developed their own approach to quantifying strength of evidence for the purposes of this review
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	No
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Critically low confidence

McCabe et al. 2007

Review question

Population	People with moderate to severe brain injury (at least 50% of the study population)
Intervention	Any treatment or intervention related to acquired brain injury.
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Not stated

Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials
Results of search	
Date of last search for the review	31/12/2004
No. of studies in review	38
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	2 non-randomised controlled trials
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	Incomplete data
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0
Review methodology	
Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Physiotherapy Evidence Database (PEDro) rating scale for RCTs and Downs and Black's checklist for non-randomised controlled trials.
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Critically low confidence

Modini et al. 2016

Review question

Population	People with severe mental health conditions (schizophrenia and schizophrenia-like disorders; bipolar disorder; or depression with psychotic features)
Intervention	Individual placement and support programmes with moderate to high fidelity as measured by the Individual Placement and Support Fidelity Scale

Comparison	"Traditional" vocational services
Primary outcome	Proportion of people in competitive employment within 1 years and within 1-2 years, defined as a permanent job paying commensurate wages that is available to anyone
Secondary outcomes	No other outcomes specified
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	31/01/2015
No. of studies in review	17
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	17 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	4216
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	1

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Downs and Black's checklist
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes, partially
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Yes
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes
Overall confidence in review findings	Moderate confidence

Muñoz-Murillo et al. 2018

Review question

Population	Working aged adults with mental health illness, both in and out of employment
------------	---

Intervention	Employment interventions, not otherwise defined
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Proportion of people in employment, returning to work, on sick leave, maintaining a job, or obtaining a job
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	1/04/2016
No. of studies in review	18
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	4 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	559
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence's quality appraisal checklist
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes, partially
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Low confidence

Nevala et al. 2019

Review question

Population	Adults (16-68 years) with intellectual disabilities
Intervention	Any rehabilitation intervention

Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	Employment, work performance
Secondary outcomes	No additional outcomes
Setting for interventions	Secondary education, transition from school to work services, sheltered or supported employment in the community
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	2/28/2019
No. of studies in review	38
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	1 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	49
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Checklist by van Tulder and colleagues
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Partially
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Critically low confidence

Pinto et al. 2018
Review question

Population	Any people seen in health care settings (including primary care centres, hospitals, emergency departments, community health centres, health centres in prisons, walk-in clinics)
------------	--

Intervention	Any interventions to help patients gain employment, not otherwise defined. (Not specified further in the protocol, but in the final review this includes: Supported employment; individual placement and support; integrated medical and vocational programmes; clubhouse model programmes; and "other")
Comparison	Another primary healthcare service or usual care without vocational interventions in place
Primary outcome	Proportion of people in employment
Secondary outcomes	No other outcomes specified
Setting for interventions	Health care settings, defined as locations where the main purpose was to deliver health services, including primary care centers, hospitals, emergency departments, community health centers, health centers in prisons, and walk-in clinics
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	26/01/2017
No. of studies in review	88
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	Not clear
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	Not stated
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool for RCTs and a 9-point scale developed by the WorldHealth Organization and Johns Hopkins for the cohort studies
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Moderate confidence

Roels et al. 2016**Review question**

Population	People with spinal cord injury
Intervention	Any type of intervention to improve vocational reintegration following spinal cord injury, including those focused on physical function, education, environmental adaptations, employment activities including workplace adjustments
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Proportion of people in employment; duration of employment; proportion of people using wheelchairs for mobility
Setting for interventions	Hospital, outpatients, and community settings
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	4/01/2014
No. of studies in review	15
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	1 RCT
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	201
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes, partially
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study	n/a

bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?

Overall confidence in review findings	Critically low confidence
---------------------------------------	---------------------------

Smith et al. 2017

Review question

Population	People with disabilities (not otherwise defined)
Intervention	Any interventions to increase work participation, not otherwise defined
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Not stated
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	31/12/2015
No. of studies in review	46
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	Not clear
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	Not stated
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	No specific approach to critical appraisal reported
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes for RCTs; no for non-randomised controlled trials
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a

Overall confidence in review findings	Low confidence
---------------------------------------	----------------

Suijkerbuijk et al. 2017

Review question

Population	Working aged adults with severe mental illness (schizophrenia or other psychotic disorders, bipolar disorder, depression with psychotic features or other long-lasting psychiatric disorders, with a disability in social functioning or participating in socie
Intervention	Prevocational training, transitional employment, supported employment, or augmented supported employment
Comparison	No intervention or psychiatric care only
Primary outcome	Proportion of participants in competitive employment, defined as work in the competitive labour market for which an individual is compensated at or above minimum wage
Secondary outcomes	Number of weeks in competitive employment; number of days to first competitive employment; percentage of people who obtained non-competitive employment; quality of life; mental health symptoms; dropout rates; hospital admissions
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	11/11/2016
No. of studies in review	48
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	48 RCTs
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	8743
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	38

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	Yes

Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	Yes
Overall confidence in review findings	High confidence

Sweetland et al. 2012

Review question

Population	People with multiple sclerosis
Intervention	Vocational rehabilitation interventions, not otherwise defined
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Not stated
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	28/02/2010
No. of studies in review	89
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	Not clear
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	Not stated
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	Not clear

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	No
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	No
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	A 10-point quality rating scale developed by the National Service Framework for Long-term Conditions in the UK
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	No
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a

Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	No
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Critically low confidence

Taylor et al. 2012

Review question

Population	People aged 13 to 30 with autism spectrum disorder or their family members
Intervention	Any type of vocational interventions, including interventions targeting job skills, work placement interventions, sheltered workshops, and supported employment
Comparison	No treatment, placebo interventions, and comparative interventions
Primary outcome	No primary outcome specified
Secondary outcomes	Measure of autism and comorbid symptoms including sleep, anxiety, hyperactivity, and challenging behavior (eg, irritability/agitation); vocational outcome; independence outcomes; family-related outcomes
Setting for interventions	Any setting including educational, residential, and clinic
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	31/12/2011
No. of studies in review	32
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	2 non-randomised controlled trial
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	51
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	No specific approach to critical appraisal reported
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in	Yes, partially

individual studies that were included in the review?	
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Moderate confidence

Tripney et al. 2019

Review question

Population	Adults (16-65 years) with physical and/or sensory impairments associated with disability living in low- or middle-income countries; either in work or out of work
Intervention	Any intervention with the means to help disabled adults enter, reenter, or maintain employment
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	Employment status (including gaining employment, returning to work from sick leave, increasing work hours, job retention, promotion, change in job role/function); income (including weekly or monthly earnings, pay rate, profit if self-employed)
Secondary outcomes	Work-related outcomes, including (but not limited to): attitudes to work, job search skills, job-related self-efficacy/confidence, career management skills, work readiness, job applications, job interviews; plus non-work related outcomes, including educational outcomes, health outcomes, functional limitations, health care utilization, quality of life.
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	12/31/2013
No. of studies in review	14
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	2 non-randomised controlled trials
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	371
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0

Review methodology

Did the review have a pre-published method?	Yes
---	-----

Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Partially
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	The authors developed their own approach to evaluating quality of evidence for the purpose of this review
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	Yes
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	High confidence

Westbrook et al. 2012

Review question

Population	Working aged adults with autism spectrum disorder, seeking employment
Intervention	Any type of vocational interventions including social, behavioral, and/or cognitive dimensions related to the acquisition and maintenance of employment, structured interventions designed to support employment placement (e.g. providing guidance in completion of applications, resumes, engaging in interviews, training of work skills and social skills for work environments), employment supports, or working directly with employers in the structuring of work and work setting for individuals with autism spectrum disorder
Comparison	Not stated
Primary outcome	Proportion of people in employment (including competitive, integrated or supported employment; excluding sheltered work or non-integrated work), duration of employment, and retention of employment
Secondary outcomes	No other outcomes specified
Setting for interventions	Not stated
Type of studies included	RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

Results of search

Date of last search for the review	31/12/2008
No. of studies in review	2

No. of studies identified relevant to this overview	2 non-randomised controlled trials
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview	101
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses	0
Review methodology	
Did the review have a pre-published method?	No
Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?	Yes, partially
Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?	Yes
Method for assessment of risk of bias of included studies	Cochrane Handbook's risk of bias tool
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?	No
If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	n/a
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?	Yes
If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	n/a
Overall confidence in review findings	Moderate confidence

Appendix E: Overview authors' judgements about each AMSTAR-2 review quality item, with reviews grouped by health condition

Mental health conditions																		
Included Review	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9-RCT	Q9-NRCT	Q10	Q11-RCT	Q11-NRCT	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Brinchmann et al 2020	++	+	++	-	++	-	-	-	++	n/a	-	++	n/a	++	++	++	++	++
Carmona et al. 2017	-	-	-	+	-	-	++	+	-	n/a	-	++	n/a	++	-	++	++	-
Chan et al. 2015	++	-	-	+	++	++	-	+	++	-	++	++	-	++	-	-	++	++
Crowther et al. 2001	++	+	-	+	++	++	++	+	+	n/a	-	++	n/a	-	++	++	++	++
Dewa et al. 2018	++	-	-	+	++	-	-	+	++	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	na	++
Heffernan and Pilkington 2011	-	-	-	-	++	++	-	+	+	+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	na	++
Kitoshita et al. 2013	++	++	-	+	++	++	++	+	++	n/a	++	++	n/a	++	++	++	++	++
Marshall et al. 2014	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	na	++
Modini et al. 2016	++	++	-	-	++	-	++	+	+	n/a	-	++	n/a	++	++	++	++	++
Muñoz-Murillo et al. 2018	-	-	-	-	-	++	++	-	+	+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	na	++
Suijkerbuijk et al. 2017	++	++	++	+	++	++	++	++	++	n/a	++	++	n/a	++	++	++	++	++
Westbrook et al. 2012	-	-	-	+	++	++	++	-	+	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	na	++
Traumatic brain injury																		
Included Review	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9-RCT	Q9-NRCT	Q10	Q11-RCT	Q11-NRCT	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Graham et al. 2016	++	++	-	+	++	++	++	++	++	n/a	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	++
McCabe et al. 2007*	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	-	++	+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	n/a	-
Multiple sclerosis																		
Included Review	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9-RCT	Q9-NRCT	Q10	Q11-RCT	Q11-NRCT	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Khan et al. 2009	-	+	-	+	-	++	-	+	+	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	++
Sweetland et al. 2012	-	-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	n/a	++
Autism spectrum disorder																		
Included Review	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9-RCT	Q9-NRCT	Q10	Q11-RCT	Q11-NRCT	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Hedley et al. 2017	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	++	n/a	++
Taylor et al. 2012	++	-	-	+	++	++	++	+	-	+	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	++
Westbrook et al. 2012	-	-	-	+	++	++	++	-	+	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	++
Intellectual disability																		
Included Review	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9-RCT	Q9-NRCT	Q10	Q11-RCT	Q11-NRCT	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Nevala et al 2019	-	-	++	-	++	-	-	+	+	+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	n/a	++
Spinal cord injury																		
Included Review	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9-RCT	Q9-NRCT	Q10	Q11-RCT	Q11-NRCT	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Roels et al. 2016	-	-	++	-	++	++	-	-	+	+	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	++	n/a	++

Any long-term conditions (not disease specific)																		
Included Review	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Q6	Q7	Q8	Q9-RCT	Q9-NRCT	Q10	Q11-RCT	Q11-NRCT	Q12	Q13	Q14	Q15	Q16
Gross et al 2020	-	++	++	+	++	++	-	-	-	-	-	-	n/a	-	++	-	++	++
Jetha et al 2019	++	-	-	+	++	-	-	-	++	++	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	++
Ma et al 2020	-	+	-	-	++	++	-	+	++	++	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	++	n/a	++
Pinto et al. 2018	++	+	-	+	++	++	++	+	++	+	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	-	-	n/a	++
Smith et al. 2017	-	-	-	-	-	++	-	-	++	-	-	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	-	n/a	++
Tripney et al 2019	-	++	++	+	-	-	+	-	++	++	++	n/a	n/a	n/a	++	++	n/a	++

++ Fully met
 + Partially met
 - Not met
 n/a Not applicable

RCT = randomized controlled trials; NRCT = non-randomized controlled trials; n/a = not applicable

- Q1 Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome)?
- Q2 Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?
- Q3 Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?
- Q4 Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?
- Q5 Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?
- Q6 Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?
- Q7 Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?
- Q8 Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?
- Q9-RCT Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review (for RCTs)?
- Q9-NRCT Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review (for NRCTs)?
- Q10 Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?
- Q11-RCT If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results (for RCTs)?
- Q11-NRCT If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results (for NRCTs)?
- Q12 If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?
- Q13 Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?
- Q14 Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?

- Q15 If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?
- Q16 Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?

Reference: Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *bmj*. 2017;358:j4008.

Appendix F: Extended version of Table 2 - Summary of findings on employment interventions for various health conditions

Intervention and comparison	Outcome	Assumed risk with comparator (outcome data from review)	Corresponding risk with intervention (outcome data from review)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Number of participants (trials)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
Acquired or traumatic brain injury							
Artificial intelligent virtual reality-based training vs psycho-educational training ²⁷	Gaining competitive employment	400 per 1000 (8/20)	200 per 1000 (4/20)	RR 2.10 (95% CI 0.75 to 5.59)*	50(1)	VERY LOW	Study limitations: 1 RCT at unclear risk of selection bias; high risk of performance, detection, reporting, and attrition bias Imprecision: CI include values favoring either intervention; small sample size
Supported employment with cognitive symptom management and therapy vs supported employment ²⁷	Gaining competitive employment	520 per 1000 (13/21)	520 per 1000 (13/21)	RR 1.00 (0.62 to 1.61)*	50(1)	VERY LOW	Study limitations: 1 RCT at unclear risk of selection bias; high risk of performance, detection, and reporting bias Imprecision: CI include values favoring either intervention; small sample size
Inpatient interdisciplinary neurorehabilitation & vocational rehabilitation vs home-based rehabilitation ²⁷	Gaining competitive employment	50/53	60/67	RR 0.95 (95% CI 0.85 to 1.05)*	120(1)	VERY LOW	Study limitations: 1 RCT at unclear risk of selection bias; high risk of performance, detection, and reporting bias Imprecision: CI include values favoring either intervention

Intervention and comparison	Outcome	Assumed risk with comparator (outcome data from review)	Corresponding risk with intervention (outcome data from review)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Number of participants (trials)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
Intensive cognitive rehabilitation program vs standard neurorehabilitation program ³⁷	Gaining employment	Not reported	Not reported	Relative effect not reported, but described as non-significant at 6 months.	68(1)	LOW	<p>Study limitations: Described as 'low risk of bias', but methodological elements contributing to risk of bias not reported at an individual study level.</p> <p>Imprecision: 95% CI not reported, small sample size</p> <p>Other: Reduced certainty that all relevant studies were included in the meta-analysis due to limited information about pre-published methods and lack of transparency regarding the exclusion of reviews at the full text screening stage</p>
Autism spectrum disorder							
Supported employment vs no support ⁴⁵	Gaining competitive employment	250 per 1000 (5/20)	633 per 1000 (19/30)	RR 2.53 (95% CI 1.13 to 5.67)*	50(1)	LOW	<p>Study limitations: 1 NRCT at unclear risk of reporting bias; high risk of selection, performance, and detection bias</p> <p>Imprecision: wide CI, small sample size</p>

Intervention and comparison	Outcome	Assumed risk with comparator (outcome data from review)	Corresponding risk with intervention (outcome data from review)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Number of participants (trials)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
Intellectual disability							
Supported employment vs sheltered work ⁴¹	Gaining competitive employment	0 per 1000 (0/25)	208 per 1000 (5/24)	RR 11.44 (95% CI 0.67 to 196.30)*	49(1)	VERY LOW	Study limitations: 1 RCT at unclear risk of attrition bias; high risk of selection, performance and detection bias; unclear risk of bias from co-interventions Imprecision: CI include values favoring either intervention; small sample size, few employment events
Multiple sclerosis							
Structured vocational rehabilitation programme vs minimal telephone contact and written information ³⁶	Gaining competitive employment	286 per 1000 (4/14)	304 per 1000 (7/23)	RR 1.07 (95% CI 0.38 to 2.99)*	47(1)	VERY LOW	Study limitations: 1 NRCT at high risk of selection, performance, and detection bias Imprecision: CI include values favoring either intervention; small sample size
Severe mental health conditions							
Augmented supported employment vs. psychiatric care ³⁰	Gaining competitive employment	187 per 1000	712 per 1000	RR 3.81 (95% CI 1.99 to 7.31)	256(1)	MODERATE	Study limitations: 1 RCT at unclear risk of selection bias; high risk of performance, detection, and attrition bias

Intervention and comparison	Outcome	Assumed risk with comparator (outcome data from review)	Corresponding risk with intervention (outcome data from review)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Number of participants (trials)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
Augmented supported employment vs transitional employment ³⁰	Gaining competitive employment	223 per 1000	845 per 1000	RR 3.79 (95% CI 2.34 to 6.14)	212(2)	LOW	Study limitations: judged to be at overall high risk of bias
Augmented supported employment vs pre-vocational training ³⁰	Gaining competitive employment	263 per 1000	794 per 1000	RR 3.02 (95% CI 1.88 to 4.87)	193(2)	LOW	Study limitations: judged to be at overall moderate risk of bias Inconsistency: Moderate level of heterogeneity
Supported employment vs psychiatric care ³⁰	Gaining competitive employment	187 per 1000	509 per 1000	RR 2.72 (95% CI 1.55 to 4.76)	2238(1)	LOW	Study limitations: 1 RCT at unclear risk of selection bias; high risk of performance and detection bias Inconsistency: loop-specific inconsistencies within the network analysis
Supported employment vs transitional ³⁰	Gaining competitive employment	223 per 1000	604 per 1000	RR 2.71 (95% CI 1.80 to 4.06)	87(4)	MODERATE	Study limitations: judged to be at overall moderate risk of bias
Supported employment vs	Gaining competitive employment	263 per 1000	568 per 1000	RR 2.16 (95% CI 1.59 to 2.93)	1569(9)	VERY LOW	Study limitations: judged to be at overall moderate risk of bias

Intervention and comparison	Outcome	Assumed risk with comparator (outcome data from review)	Corresponding risk with intervention (outcome data from review)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Number of participants (trials)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
pre-vocational training ³⁰							Inconsistency: loop-specific inconsistencies within the network analysis Publication bias: small study effects
High fidelity individual placement and support vs traditional vocational services/service as usual ²⁴	Gaining competitive employment	Not reported	Not reported	RR 2.07 (95% CI 1.82 to 2.35)	6651 (27)	MODERATE	Including studies with participants who have moderate as well as severe mental health conditions. Study limitations: Studies excluded based on total study quality score, but methodology elements contributing to risk of bias not reported at an individual study level. Inconsistency: Moderate level of heterogeneity Publication bias: small study effects Other: Reduced certainty that all relevant studies were

Intervention and comparison	Outcome	Assumed risk with comparator (outcome data from review)	Corresponding risk with intervention (outcome data from review)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Number of participants (trials)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
							included in the meta-analysis due to limited information about pre-published methods, including search strategy, and lack of transparency regarding the exclusion of reviews at the full text screening stage Stability of positive effects: adjusting for publication bias and subgroup analyses by country-specific welfare and work policies altered the effect size, but the effect sizes remain positive in favor of individual placement and support.
Augmented supported employment vs supported employment ³⁰	Gaining competitive employment	457 per 1000	640 per 1000	RR 1.40 (95% CI 0.92 to 2.14)	205(3)	LOW	Study limitations: judged to be at overall moderate risk of bias Imprecision: CI include values favoring either intervention
Cognitive remediation plus a vocational intervention vs	Competitive employment	193 per 1000 (40/207)	348 per 1000 (73/210)	RR 1.66 (95% CI 1.00 to 2.74)*	417(6)	LOW	Inconsistency: Moderate level of heterogeneity Imprecision: CI reaches line of no effect

Intervention and comparison	Outcome	Assumed risk with comparator (outcome data from review)	Corresponding risk with intervention (outcome data from review)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Number of participants (trials)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
vocational intervention alone							Other: Reduced certainty that all relevant studies were included in the meta-analysis due to lack of pre-published protocol, limitations in the search strategy, and lack of transparency regarding the exclusion of reviews at the full text screening stage
Spinal cord injury							
Supported employment vs "treatment as usual" at the intervention site ⁴³	Gaining competitive employment	105 per 1000 (8/76) ^Ω	259 per 1000 (21/81)	RR 2.46 (95% CI 1.16 to 5.22) ^{*Ω}	157(1)	LOW	Study limitations: 1 RCT at unclear risk of attrition; high risk of performance and detection bias Other: Reduced certainty that all relevant studies were included in the meta-analysis due to lack of pre-published protocol, limitations in the search strategy, and lack of transparency regarding the exclusion of reviews at the full text screening stage

CI = confidence interval; GRADE: Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation; NRCT = non-randomized controlled trial; OR = odds ratio; RR = risk ratio; RCT = randomized controlled trial

* Calculated from values provided in the review

^Ω Data excludes the group of participants who received “treatment as usual” from a secondary observational site as these participants were not randomly allocation to this treatment group

