|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Randomized Controlled Trials** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Author**  Supplemental Digital Content 3: Summary of results qualitative assessment | **Domain 1:**  **Risk of bias arising from the randomization process**  **(Level of bias)** | **Domain 2a:**  **Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions**  **(Level of bias)** | | | **Domain 2b:**  **Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions**  **(Level of bias)** | **Domain 3: Missing outcome data**  **(Level of bias)** | **Domain 4:**  **Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome**  **(Level of bias)** | **Domain 5:**  **Risk of bias in selection of the reported result**  **(Level of bias)** | **Overall level of bias** |
| Leung et al (2013)18 | Low | Low | | | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Mekki et al (2019)  21 | Low | Low | | | Low | Low | Some concerns  (unblinded outcome assessor) | Low | Some concerns |
| Mkacher et al (2015)  11 | Some concerns  (concealment of allocation sequence unclear) | Low | | | Low | Low | Some concerns  (blinding of outcome assessors is unclear) | Low | High |
| Gloeckl et al (2017)  20 | Low | Low | | | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| Marques et al (2015)27 | Low | Low | | | Low | Low | Some concerns  (unblinded outcome assessors) | Low | Some concerns |
| Beauchamp et al (2013- RCT) 12 | Low | Low | | | Low | Low | Low | Low | Low |
| **Within-group studies** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Author** | **Type of bias** | | **Bias level** | **Description of bias** | | | | | **Overall level of bias** |
| Jácome et al (2014)  22 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Low  Serious | 13.3% drop-out  Evaluators were the same healthcare professionals that delivered the PR-program. | | | | | Serious |
| Beauchamp et al (2010)  19 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Low  Low | 12% drop-out  Evaluators at post-rehab assessment were unaware of baseline test scores | | | | | Low |
| Marques et al (2015-1) 23 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Serious  No information | 35.3% drop-out  No information on whether or not evaluators were aware of baseline scores at post-test | | | | | Serious |
| Marques et al (2015-2)26 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Low  No information | 10% drop-out  No information on whether or not evaluators were aware of baseline scores at post-test | | | | | No information |
| Rinaldo et al (2017) CT 30 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Low  No information | 14.3% drop-out  No information on whether or not evaluators were aware of baseline scores at post-test | | | | | No information |
| Rinaldo et al (2017) EDU 30 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Low  No information | 14.3% drop-out  No information on whether or not evaluators were aware of baseline scores at post-test | | | | | No information |
| Harrison et al (2015) 31 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Serious  Serious | 32.1% drop-out  Evaluators performing post-tests were aware of baseline scores | | | | | Serious |
| Harrison et al (2019) 24 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Serious  No information | High drop-out rates  No information on whether or not evaluators were aware of baseline scores at post-test | | | | | Serious |
| Liu et al (2019) 29 | Bias in measurement of outcome | | Moderate | Evaluator at post-rehab assessment was aware of baseline test scores, but it is unlikely that this influenced the outcomes | | | | | Moderate |
| Mesquita et al (2016) 28 | Bias due to missing data  Bias in measurement of outcome | | Moderate  Moderate | 24% drop-out  Assessors were aware of intervention and baseline test scores, but this only minimally influenced the test results | | | | | Moderate |