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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 strategies

Cochrane 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 malignant* 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 Steinert* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylitis 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 onco?log* 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 obses?si* 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.

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s).
15. (neurodegenerative or Huntington* or Parkinson* or lateral sclerosis or multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease or muscular dystrophy or Steinert* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylosis or osteoarthrosis 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?r* 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 aphasis 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 oncolg* or neoplasm* or carcinom* or tuumo?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 Steinert* or facioscapulohumeral or progressive bulbar palsy or myasthenia gravis or Gillian Barre or West Nile or muscular atrophy or Spondylosis or osteoarthrosis 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 paralys* 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 dysthmic 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 osteoarthritis OR stenosis OR herniated OR spinal OR cranial OR aphia 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 paralysis OR quadripleg* OR tetraplegi* OR paraplegi* OR "hearing loss" OR "hearing aid" OR deaf* or blind* or stutter* OR amput* OR gait* OR intestinal OR bowel OR colonic OR renal OR kidney OR diabetes OR diabetic* OR overweight OR underweight OR malnutrition OR malnourished OR overweight OR obese OR arthritis OR rheumat* OR fibromyalgia OR "neck pain" OR "back pain" OR "arm pain" OR thyroid OR hypersensitiv* OR allergy OR anaphyl* OR cancer* OR oncolog* OR neoplasm OR carcinoma OR HIV OR "mental health" OR "depression" OR "anxiety" OR psychosis OR psychot* OR parano* OR schizophrenia OR neurosis OR neurotic* OR delusion* OR bipolar OR anorexia OR bulimia OR neuroasthenia OR dissociative OR autistic* 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 "vocation counsel*" OR "vocation training" OR "vocational rehabilitation" OR "work counsel*" OR "work accommodation" OR "work adjustment" OR "work ability" OR "work disabl*" OR "work rehabilitation" OR "work placement" OR "job counsel*" OR "job accommodation" 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 epilepsy* or seizure*
16. neurodegenerative or Huntington* or Parkinson* or lateral sclerosis or multiple sclerosis or motor neuron disease or muscular dystrophy or Steinert* 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. paralys* 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. gatroenter* 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. hypersensitivity* 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 dysthyemic 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. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation. 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. Physiotherapy. 2017;103 (Supplement 1):e102. | Wrong patient population                       |
| 3. Almalky HA. Employment outcomes for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities: A literature review. Children & Youth Services Review. 2020;109:104656. | Not a systematic review of intervention effectiveness |
| 4. Amayta B, Khan F, Galea M. Rehabilitation for people with multiple sclerosis: An overview of Cochrane Reviews. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 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. Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation. 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. Social Science & Medicine. 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. Health Policy. 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. Supportive Care in Cancer. 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. Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation. 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. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation. 2019;50(1):109-20. | Wrong outcomes                                |
| 11. Bond G, Bdrake R, Luciano A. Employment and educational outcomes in early intervention programmes for early psychosis: a systematic review. Epidemiology and Psychiatric Sciences. 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. Psychiatric Services. 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. Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal. 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. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2013;94(7):1398-420. | Wrong outcomes                                |
| 15. Brouns R, Espinoza AV, Goudman L, Moens M, Verloo J. Interventions to promote work participation after ischaemic stroke: a systematic review. Clinical Neurology and Neurosurgery. 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                                |
|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 17. | Campbell K, Bond GR, Drake RE. Who benefits from supported employment: A meta-analytic study. Schizophrenia Bulletin. 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. Chiropractic and Manual Therapies. 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). Brain Injury, 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. Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. 2014;95(3 Suppl):S201-9. | Wrong outcomes |
| 21. | Chan SKW, Chan HYV, Devlin J, Bastampillai T, Mohan T, Hui CLM, et al. A systematic review of long-term outcomes of patients with psychosis who received early intervention services. International Review of Psychiatry. 2019;31(5/6):425-40. | Wrong intervention |
| 22. | Clayton S, Bambra 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. BMC Public Health. 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. European Journal of Public Health. 2012;22(3):434-9. | Wrong types of studies |
| 24. | Clayton S, Gosling R, Povall S, Misso K, Bambra 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. Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health. 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. Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health. 2007;25(2):261-88. | Wrong patient population |
| 26. | Dafoe WA, Cupper L. Vocational considerations and return to work. Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America. 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. International Journal of Developmental Disabilities. 2019;65(4):220-30. | Wrong types of studies |
| 28. | De Baets S, Calders P, Schalley N, Vermeulen K, Vertrieft S, Van Peteghem L, et al. Updating the evidence on functional capacity evaluation methods: A systematic review. Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation. 2018;28(3):418-28. | Wrong patient population |
| 29. | de Boer A, Taskila TK, Tamminiga SJ, Feuerstein M, Frings-Dresen MHW, Verbeek JH. Interventions to enhance return-to-work for cancer patients. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2015;9:CD007569. | Wrong patient population |
| 30. | de Buck PD, Schoenes JW, Allaire SH, Vliet Vlieland TP. Vocational rehabilitation in patients with chronic rheumatic diseases: A systematic literature review. Seminars in Arthritis and Rheumatism. 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. Employee Relations. 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. Brain Injury. 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. Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation. 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. Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation. 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. Research on Social Work Practice. 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. PloS One. 2019;14(2):e0212208. | Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review |
| 37. | Gussenhoven AH, Jansma EP, Govers ST, Festen JM, Anema JR, Kramer SE. Vocational rehabilitation services for people with hearing difficulties: A systematic review of the literature. Work. 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. Substance Use & Misuse. 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. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 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. BMC Cancer. 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. American Journal of Occupational Therapy. 2017;71(2):7102100040. | Wrong patient population |
| 42. | Ikebuchi E. Support of working life of persons with schizophrenia. Seishin Shinkeigaku Zasshi. 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. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2000;2:CD001984. | Wrong patient population |
| 44. | Khan F, Turner-Stokes L, Nq L, Kilpatrick T, Amaty B. Multidisciplinary rehabilitation for adults with multiple sclerosis. Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 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. South African Journal of Industrial Psychology. 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. Česká a Slovenská Psychiatrie. 2017;113(3):132-9. | Not in English |
| Reference                                                                 | Note                                                                                                                                 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 47. Kurtz MM, Nichols MC. Cognitive rehabilitation for schizophrenia: A review of recent advances. Current Psychiatry Reviews. 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. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health. 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. Work. 2018;59(4):501-34. | Wrong patient population                                                                                                           |
| 50. Lehman AF. Vocational rehabilitation in schizophrenia. Schizophrenia Bulletin. 1995;21(4):645-56. | Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review                                                                       |
| 51. Leverich AE, Acke S, Verbrugghes M, Schmickler MN, De Brouwer C. Efficiency of vocational rehabilitation programs for workers with schizophrenia: A systematic literature review according to the prisma guidelines. Occupational and Environmental Medicine. 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. Disability and Rehabilitation. 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. Disability and Rehabilitation. 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. Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation. 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. Mental Health Review Journal. 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. Substance Use & Misuse. 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. Schizophrenia Bulletin. 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. Schizophrenia Research. 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. Current Opinion in Psychiatry. 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. Autism. 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. Rehabilitation Psychology. 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. PloS One. 2020;15(4):e0230896. | Wrong intervention                                                                                                                |
| 63. Robinson R, Okpo E, Mngoma N. Interventions for improving employment outcomes for workers with HIV. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 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. Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics of North America. 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. Impacts de la combinaison de programmes de soutien à l’emploi et de rééducation cognitive sur le maintien en emploi de personnes souffrant de schizophrénie: Une meta-analyse. 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. Occupational and Environmental Medicine. 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. Spinal Cord. 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. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease. 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. Neurorehabilitation. 2012;31(1):51-62. | Did not meet minimum criteria for being a systematic review |
| 70. | Verhoef JA, Bal MI, Roelofs PD, Borghouts JA, Roebroeck ME, Miedema HS. Effectiveness and characteristics of interventions to improve work participation in adults with chronic physical conditions: a systematic review. Disability and Rehabilitation. 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. Occupational Medicine. 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. Pain. 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/discovering 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
Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in 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?
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?
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?

| Overall confidence in review findings | High confidence |

Gross et al. 2020

**Review question**
Population
Intervention
Comparison
Primary outcome
Secondary outcomes
Setting for interventions
Type of studies included

**Results of search**
Date of last search for the review
No. of studies in review
No. of studies identified relevant to this overview
Total no. of participants in studies relevant to this overview
No. of meta-analysis reported, excluding subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses

**Review methodology**
Did the review have a pre-published method?
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

| Question                                                                 | Answer                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 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 prespecific
- **Setting for interventions**: Healthcare services in the UK
- **Type of studies included**: RCTs and non-randomised controlled trials

#### Results of search

| Parameter                                             | Value                      |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 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

| Question                                                                 | Response |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| 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

| Question                                                                 | Answer                                      |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 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 | People with multiple sclerosis                    |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| Population      | 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 |
| Intervention    | Alternative programmes or usual care              |
| Comparison      | Change in proportion of people with multiple sclerosis in competitive employment; change in proportion of people with multiple sclerosis in supportive employment |
| Primary outcome | 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 |
| 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 | 28/02/2011 |
| 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**

| Question                                                                 | Answer |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 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 | Details |
|-----------------|---------|
| **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        | Secondary education, transition from school to work services, sheltered or supported employment in the community |
| interventions      | 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

| Result                                      | Details                                      |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 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

| Method                                      | Details                                      |
|---------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 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                          |

Levack WMM, Fadyl JK. BMJ Open 2022; 11:e049522. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2021-049522
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

|                                | 4/01/2014 |
|--------------------------------|-----------|
| 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

|                                                      | No |
|------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 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 psychiatric features or other long-lasting psychiatric disorders, with a disability in social functioning or participating in society

**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 included studies | 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?
Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?
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?
Overall confidence in review findings

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**

| Question                                                                 | Answer |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------|
| 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     | -   | ++      | ++       | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |
| Carmona et al. 2017      | ++ | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | -  | -  | ++      | n/a     | -   | ++      | ++       | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| Chan et al. 2015         | ++ | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | +  | +  | ++      | n/a     | -   | ++      | ++       | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |
| Crowther et al. 2001     | ++ | +  | ++ | ++ | ++ | +  | +  | n/a| ++      | n/a     | -   | ++      | ++       | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |
| Dewa et al. 2018         | ++ | -  | -  | -  | ++ | -  | -  | -  | ++      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | n/a      | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| Heffernan and Pilkington 2011 | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | -  | -  | ++      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | n/a      | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |
| Kitoshita et al. 2013    | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | +  | +  | +  | +  | ++      | n/a     | ++ | ++      | ++       | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |
| Marshall et al. 2014     | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | +  | +  | +  | +  | ++      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | n/a      | -   | -   | -   | -   |
| Modini et al. 2016       | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | +  | +  | +  | n/a| ++      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | n/a      | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |
| Muñoz-Murillo et al. 2018| ++| +  | ++ | ++ | ++ | +  | +  | n/a| ++      | n/a     | -   | ++      | ++       | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |
| Suijkerbuijk et al. 2017 | ++| +  | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | +  | +  | n/a    | n/a     | ++ | ++      | ++       | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |
| Westbrook et al. 2012    | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | -  | -  | ++      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | n/a      | ++  | ++  | ++  | ++  |

#### 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 | ++  |
| McCabe et al. 2007*      | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -  | -       | -       | 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      | ++  | ++  | n/a | ++  |
| Taylor et al. 2012       | ++ | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | ++ | ++ | ++      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | n/a      | ++  | ++  | n/a | ++  |
| Westbrook et al. 2012    | -  | -  | -  | -  | +  | +  | ++ | ++ | ++      | n/a     | 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      | ++  | ++  | 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 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Ma et al 2020       | -  | ++ | +  | ++ | +  | ++ | -  | -  | -      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | ++        | ++ | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Pinto et al. 2018   | ++ | +  | +  | +  | ++ | ++ | +  | -  | +      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | -         | n/a | ++ | n/a | ++ | n/a |
| Smith et al. 2017   | -  | ++ | ++ | +  | ++ | ++ | ++ | -  | +      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | ++        | ++ | n/a | ++ | ++ | n/a |
| Tripney et al 2019  | -  | ++ | ++ | +  | ++ | ++ | -  | -  | +      | n/a     | n/a | n/a     | ++        | ++ | n/a | ++ | ++ | n/a |

**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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | Gaining employment | Not reported | Not reported | Relative effect not reported, but described as non-significant at 6 months. | 68(1) | LOW | Study limitations: Described as ‘low risk of bias’, but methodological elements contributing to risk of bias not reported at an individual study level. Imprecision: 95% CI not reported, small sample size 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 |

**Autism spectrum disorder**

| Supported employment vs no support | 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 | Study limitations: 1 NRCT at unclear risk of reporting bias; high risk of selection, performance, and detection bias Imprecision: wide CI, small sample size |

*RR 2.53 (95% CI 1.13 to 5.67)*
| 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\(^31\) | 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\(^10\) | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 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\(^{30}\) | | | | | | MODERATE | 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 |
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| 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 supported employment<sup>30</sup> | Gaining competitive employment | 457 per 1000 | 640 per 1000 | RR 1.40 (95% CI 0.92 to 2.14) | 205(3) | LOW | 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. |
| 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)<sup>*</sup> | 417(6) | LOW | Study limitations: judged to be at overall moderate risk of bias. Imprecision: CI include values favoring either intervention 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 | Gaining competitive employment | 105 per 1000 (8/76) | 259 per 1000 (21/81) | RR 2.46 (95% CI 1.16 to 5.22)* | 157(1) | LOW | 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 | Gaining competitive employment | 105 per 1000 (8/76) | 259 per 1000 (21/81) | RR 2.46 (95% CI 1.16 to 5.22)* | 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.
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.
