

Table B.1.I. Occupational physical activity domain

Methods:

An umbrella review (i.e. a review of reviews) was performed. This review had been a-priori registered in PROSPERO (id. 163090). This umbrella review synthesized and combined relevant data from systematic reviews or meta-analyses.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria:

Reviews were eligible for inclusion in this umbrella review if they met all of the following criteria:

- contained a quantitative assessment of OPA, possibly in combination with LTPA and/or transport-related PA;
- contained an assessment of one or more health-related outcomes (as described in more detail below);
- was published as a full-text systematic review (with meta-analyses, if available) in a peer-reviewed journal;
- described at least 2 studies with either one of the following study designs: intervention studies (such as [randomized]-controlled trials) or longitudinal [prospective or retrospective] observational design studies).

Reviews were excluded if they:

- measured total PA, LTPA or transport-related PA only, or in combination and did not specify the OPA domain;
- focused on sedentary behaviour only (rather than PA);
- focused only on biomechanical (i.e. ergonomic) physical work exposures, rather than energetic (occupational) PA;
- focused on a specific (clinical) population (such as specific samples of people with underlying diseases or pregnant woman);
- published in a language other than English.

Population-Exposure-Control-Outcome

The WHO Guideline Development Group decided for the scope of their guidelines to use PECO (Population-Exposure-Control-Outcome) search questions.

- Population: Adults (aged 18-64 years).
- Exposure: Duration, frequency and/or intensity of OPA, or a compositional score reflecting total volume of OPA.
- Comparison: No OPA, OPA of shorter duration, frequency and/or intensity, no or a smaller compositional score of total volume of OPA.
- Outcomes: Outcomes considered critical or important, according to the WHO PA guidelines committee: all-cause mortality, diabetes mellitus type 2, cancer, osteoarthritis, mental health outcomes, adiposity/(prevention of) body weight gain, cognitive outcomes, sleep duration of quality, hypertension, health-related quality of life.

Search and selection

In order to identify relevant evidence, a search for existing systematic reviews or meta-analyses was conducted. The following databases were searched: Pubmed, Web of Science, Embase and Sportdiscus. The full search strategy can be found in Supplementary material 1. Systematic searches were conducted in December 2019. Searches contained the following keywords: occupational physical activity, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses. The searches were not restricted by publication date. Final search results were exported into Endnote reference manager. To identify additional reviews not found in the database search mentioned above snowball searching was used, by screening reference lists of included articles, and experts in the field were consulted.

Study selection

Two reviewers screened the title and abstract of each reference (BC and ML), following the in- or exclusion criteria for each of the reviews. Discrepancies between the two independent reviewers were resolved in a consensus meeting. In case of no agreement, a third reviewer was consulted (PC). This was done blinded in the online application Rayyan (100). Two reviewers did a full text screening for in- and exclusion criteria (BC and ML). Discrepancies were resolved with the help of the third reviewer (PC).

Assessing Bias in systematic reviews

The included systematic reviews were assessed using AMSTAR 2 (76) (A Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews), which is a 16-point assessment tool for the assessment of the methodological quality of systematic reviews. AMSTAR 2 has good inter-rater agreement, test-retest reliability and content validity (101). Each item was rated High, Moderate, Low or Critically Low. The cut-off values were 100%, $\geq 75\%$, $\geq 50\%$, and below 50%, respectively. Two reviewers used the tool to assess the risk of bias in the included reviews. If rated Critically Low, the review was excluded from further analyses as it was judged to not provide an accurate summary of the available evidence.