Supplemental material

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)

Br J Sports Med

Supplementary Table 4. GRADE summary of quality of evidence

No. of studies (No. of participants in meta-analysis)	Design	Quality assessment					Mean Difference /Difference in Proportions (95% CI)	Quality of evidence
		Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations		
Outcome: Mean difference of days spent in hospital between cancer patients participating in an exercise intervention versus control								
16 studies (995 participants)	RCTs	Serious[1]	Not serious	Not serious	Serious[2]	Not serious	Mean Difference: 1.40 days (95% CI: -2.26 to -0.54 favouring exercise	Low
Outcome: Difference in the proportion of participants with cancer admitted to hospital in exercise intervention and control groups								
5 studies (806 participants)	RCTs	Serious[1]	Not serious	Not serious	Serious[2]	Not serious[3]	Difference in proportions: -0.08 (-0.13 to -0.03) favouring exercise	Low

[1] Some studies had high risk of bias due to their methodology (RoB 2)

[2] Confidence intervals are close to the no difference line

[3] The possibility of publication bias cannot be excluded as it was not measured due to the small number of studies (n=5), but it was/was not considered sufficient to downgrade the quality of evidence