Supplementary Material

Appendix 1: Search strategy

PubMed – 28 Jun. 21
  • Filter systematic review, humans

EMBASE – 22 Jun. 21
((exercis* or sport* or physical activity or train* or aerobic or resistance or physical training or active or move* or rehab*) and (cert or "consensus on exercise reporting template" or tidier or "template for intervention description and replication" or report* or complet* or describ* or replic* or characteristics or design or program) and systematic review).m_titl.

CINAHL & SPORTDiscus – 22 Jun. 21
TI ( exercise or physical activity or fitness ) AND TI ( report* or cert or tidier or "consensus on exercise reporting template" or "template for intervention description and replication" ) AND TI systematic review

PSYCHInfo – 28 Jun. 21
ab(systematic review) AND ab(exercise OR physical activity OR fitness) AND ab(report* OR cert OR tidier OR "consensus on exercise reporting template" OR "template for intervention description and replication")
Filter -systematic review

Appendix 2. Modified AMSTAR 2 tool used in this overview of reviews

1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Yes:</th>
<th>Optional (recommended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Timeframe for follow up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Comparator group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. 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?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Partial Yes:</th>
<th>For Yes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The authors state that they had a written protocol or guide that included ALL the following:</td>
<td>As for partial yes, plus the protocol should be registered and should also have specified:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>review question(s)</td>
<td>a meta-analysis/synthesis plan, if appropriate, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a search strategy</td>
<td>a plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inclusion/exclusion criteria</td>
<td>a plan for investigating causes of heterogeneity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a risk of bias assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Partial Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?

For Yes, the review should satisfy ONE of the following:

- Explanation for including only RCTs
- OR Explanation for including only NRSI
- OR Explanation for including both RCTs and NRSI

4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?

For Partial Yes (all the following): For Yes, should also have (all the following):

- searched at least 2 databases (relevant to research question)
- provided key word and/or search strategy
- justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)
- searched the reference lists / bibliographies of included studies
- searched trial/study registries
- included/consulted content experts in the field
- where relevant, searched for grey literature
- conducted search within 24 months of completion of the review

Yes
Partial Yes
No
5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?

For Yes, either ONE of the following:

- at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include

  Yes  
  No

OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.

6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?

For Yes, either ONE of the following:

- at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies

  Yes  
  No

OR two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.

7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?

For Partial Yes:

- provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review

  For Yes, must also have:

- Justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study

  Yes  
  Partial Yes  
  No

8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?

For Partial Yes (ALL the following):

- described populations
- described interventions
- described comparators
- described outcomes
- described research designs

For Yes, should also have ALL the following:

- described population in detail
- described intervention in detail (including doses where relevant)
- described comparator in detail (including doses where relevant)
- described study’s setting
- timeframe for follow-up

  Yes  
  Partial Yes  
  No
10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?

For Yes

Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review. Note: Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors also qualifies

Yes  No

16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?

For Yes:

The authors reported no competing interests OR

Yes  No

The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest

Appendix 3. Rating overall confidence in the results of the systematic review (AMSTAR 2)

High

- No or one non-critical weakness: the systematic review provides an accurate and comprehensive summary of the results of the available studies that address the question of interest

Moderate

- More than one non-critical weakness*: the systematic review has more than one weakness but no critical flaws. It may provide an accurate summary of the results of the available studies that were included in the review

Low
- One critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses: the review has a critical flaw and may not provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies that address the question of interest.

**Critically low**

- More than one critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses: the review has more than one critical flaw and should not be relied on to provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies.

* Multiple non-critical weaknesses may diminish confidence in the review and it may be appropriate to move the overall appraisal down from moderate to low confidence.

Note: A critical flaw was a rating was deemed a ‘no’ in any of the critical domains, as specified by the AMSTAR 2 guidance document. These domains were Items 2, 4, 7. A non-critical weakness was a no, or partial yes in any other domain.
Appendix 4: Excluded studies, with reasons

Wrong outcomes:


Allen NE, Suriyarachchi GD, Paul SS, et al. Exercise and motor training in people with parkinson's disease: A systematic review of participant characteristics, intervention delivery, retention rates, adherence, and adverse events in clinical trials. *Parkinson's Disease* 2012;2012((Allen, Suriyarachchi, Paul, Song, Canning) Clinical and Rehabilitation Research Group, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Sydney, P.O. Box 170, Lidcombe, Sydney, NSW 1825, Australia(Sherrington) Musculoskeletal Division, George Institute for Global);854328. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2012/854328


Bonafiglia JT, Islam H, Preobrazenski N, et al. Risk of bias and reporting practices in studies comparing VO2max responses to sprint interval vs. continuous training: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Sport and Health Science* 2021;((Bonafiglia, Islam, Preobrazenski, Gurd) School of Kinesiology and Health Studies, Queen's University, Kingston, ON K7L 3N6, Canada) doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2021.03.005


Goff AJ, Page WS, Clark NC. Reporting of acute programme variables and exercise descriptors in rehabilitation strength training for tibiofemoral joint soft tissue
injury: A systematic review. Physical Therapy in Sport 2018;34((Goff) Health and Social Sciences, Singapore Institute of Technology, 10 Dover Drive 138683, Singapore(Page, Clark) Faculty of Sport, Health and Applied Sciences, St Mary’s University, Waldegrave Road, Twickenham TW1 4SX, United Kingdom).227-37. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ptsp.2018.10.012


Sauzet O, Kleine M, Exner A-K, et al. Longitudinal randomised controlled trials in rehabilitation post-stroke: A systematic review on the quality of reporting and use of baseline outcome values. BMC Neurology 2015(Sauzet, Kleine, Exner) AG Epidemiology and International Public Health, School of Public Health, Bielefeld University, PO. Box 10 01 31, Bielefeld, 33501 Germany(Menzel-Begemann) Faculty of Nursing and Health, University of Applied Science, Munster, Leon) doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s12883-015-0344-y


Reporting not primary aim


Not systematic review

Wrong intervention


## Appendix 5: AMSTAR Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Item 1</th>
<th>Item 2</th>
<th>Item 3</th>
<th>Item 4</th>
<th>Item 5</th>
<th>Item 6</th>
<th>Item 7</th>
<th>Item 8</th>
<th>Item 10</th>
<th>Overall Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abell 2015</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Critically Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barros 2020</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartholdy 2019</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berti 2020</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burgess 2021</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlton 2017</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson 2021</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dischiavi 2021</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giagio 2021</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holden 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kattackal 2020</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keene 2020</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knols 2018</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knols 2019</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Critically Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lohse 2018</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mack 2018</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Critically Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major 2019</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Critically Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McEwen 2019</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGregor 2018</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meneses-Echavez 2019</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Result 1</th>
<th>Result 2</th>
<th>Result 3</th>
<th>Result 4</th>
<th>Result 5</th>
<th>Result 6</th>
<th>Result 7</th>
<th>Result 8</th>
<th>Result 9</th>
<th>Result 10</th>
<th>Result 11</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neele 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Critically Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raje 2021</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tew 2016</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Critically Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torres-Pareja 2019</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Critically Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasquez-Araneda 2021</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yamato 2016</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Critically Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang 2021</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ Yes, / Partial yes, - No
Appendix 6: CERT Subgroups

6a. Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT) summary of reviews which included participants with ‘other’ health conditions (n=4). Items names are fully described in Appendix 2. Equip = description of exercise equipment, Quals = description of qualifications of instructor, Group = description of whether exercise performed in group or individually, Superv. = description of whether exercises are supervised and how they are delivered, Adher = description of how adherence is measured and reported, Motiv = description of motivation strategies, Rules = description of rules for determining exercise progression, Prog = description of how exercise was progressed, Replic = description of exercise to enable replication, Home = description of any home program, Non-ex = description of non-exercise components, Adv. Ev = description of type and number of adverse events, Setting = description of setting of exercise, Interv = description of exercise intervention (i.e. sets, reps, duration etc.), Generic = description of whether exercises are generic or tailored, Tailor = description of how exercises are tailored, Starting = description of rule for the starting level of participants, Fidelity = how adherence or fidelity to intervention is measured, Planned = description of the extent to which the intervention was delivered as planned.
6b. Consensus on Exercise Reporting Template (CERT) summary of reviews which included participants with musculoskeletal health conditions (n=10). Items names are fully described in Appendix 2. Equip = description of exercise equipment, Quals = description of qualifications of instructor, Group = description of whether exercise performed in group or individually, Superv. = description of whether exercises are supervised and how they are delivered, Adher = description of how adherence is measured and reported, Motiv = description of motivation strategies, Rules = description of rules for determining exercise progression, Prog = description of how exercise was progressed, Replic = description of exercise to enable replication, Home = description of any home program, Non-ex = description of non-exercise components, Adv. Ev = description of type and number of adverse events, Setting = description of setting of exercise, Interv = description of exercise intervention (i.e. sets, reps, duration etc.), Generic = description of whether exercises are generic or tailored, Tailor = description of how exercises are tailored, Starting = description of rule for the starting level of participants, Fidelity = how adherence or fidelity to intervention is measured, Planned = description of the extent to which the intervention was delivered as planned.
Appendix 7: TIDieR Subgroups

7a. Template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) summary of reviews which included participants with cardiovascular health conditions (n=5). Items names are fully described in Appendix 2. Mater = what (materials), Proced = what (procedures), When = when and how much, Tailor = tailoring, Mods = modifications, How w. (p) = How well (planned), How w. (a) = How well (actual)
7b. Template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) summary of reviews which included participants with musculoskeletal health conditions (n=7). Items names are fully described in Appendix 2. Mater = what (materials), Proced = what (procedures), When = when and how much, Tailor = tailoring, Mods = modifications, How w. (p) = How well (planned), How w. (a) = How well (actual)
7c. Template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) summary of reviews which included participants with neurological health conditions (n=3). Items names are fully described in Appendix 2. Mater = what (materials), Proced = what (procedures), When = when and how much, Tailor = tailoring, Mods = modifications, How w. (p) = How well (planned), How w. (a) = How well (actual)