**Table3a. Strength of evidence of studies among adults in the work environment**

| **Number of Studies, Participants** | **Domains Pertaining to Strength of Evidence** | | | | | | | | **Strength of evidence** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Risk of Bias** | | **Consistency** | | | **Directness** | | **Precision** |  |
| **BMI change** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Combination** | | **Risk of Bias** | | **Consistency** | **Directness** | | **Precision** | |  |
| 5 interventional trials, n=7,443 | | Moderate risk of bias – three randomized interventions, lack of blinding in studies | | Inconsistent – point estimate favors intervention in 2 trials, and favors control in 3 trial | Direct – goal of all studies but one was prevention of weight gain | | Precise – variability reported in all studies | | Low |
| **Weight change** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Combination** | | **Risk of Bias** | | **Consistency** | **Directness** | | **Precision** | |  |
| 4 interventional trials, n=72,572 | | Moderate risk of bias – two randomized trials, lack of blinding in studies | | Consistent – point estimate favors intervention in all trials | Direct – goal of all studies was prevention of weight gain | | Precise – variability reported in all studies | | Moderate |
| **Waist circumference** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Combination** | | **Risk of Bias** | | **Consistency** | **Directness** | | **Precision** | |  |
| 2 interventional trials, n=829 | | High risk of bias – only one randomized trial, lack of blinding in studies | | Consistent – point estimate favors intervention in both trials | Indirect – goal of one study was prevention of weight gain | | Precise – variability reported in all studies | | Low |
| **Adherence** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Combination** | | **Risk of Bias** | | **Consistency** | **Directness** | | **Precision** | |  |
| 3 interventional trials, n=2,754 | | Moderate risk of bias – all randomized interventions, lack blinding | | Inconsistent – adherence not measured consistently across studies | Indirect – goal of two studies was prevention of weight gain | | Imprecise – variability not reported | | Low |
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