

Table I. Characteristics of included studies

Authors	Participants	Intervention	Follow-up	Outcomes	Main results	Risk of bias
<i>Exercises</i>						
Andersen et al. (18) 2012, Dalager et al. (22) 2015, Gram et al. (24) 2014	Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers $n = 573$ male: 223 female: 350 mean age (SD), 45.8 years (10.2)	Group 1 ($n = 116$): Supervised progressive resisted exercises (front raise, lateral raise, reverse fly, shrug and wrist extension; progression from 20 RM to 8 RM and adjusted for pain levels; 20 weeks), 1 h/week Group 2 ($n = 126$): Supervised progressive resisted exercises, 3 × 20 min/week Group 3 ($n = 106$): Supervised progressive resisted exercises, 9 × 7 min/week Group 4 ($n = 124$): Minimally supervised progressive resisted exercises, 3 × 20 min/week Group 5 ($n = 101$): Control group	20 weeks	Right shoulder pain numerical scale in the past 3 months (10 points scale) Left shoulder pain numerical scale in the past 3 months (10 points scale) DASH (%) Adherence (% of participant who exercised at least 20 min/ week)	Difference between group 5 and: Group 1: 0.56 (95% CI: 0.42 to 1.05) Group 2: 0.36 (95% CI: -0.12 to 0.84) Group 3: 0.43 (95% CI: -0.07 to 0.93) Intervention groups (group 1, 2, 3 combined): 0.45 (95% CI: 0.04 to 0.85) Difference between group 5 and: Group 1: 0.41 (95% CI: -0.03 to 0.85) Group 2: 0.19 (95% CI: -0.24 to 0.62) Group 3: 0.32 (95% CI: -0.12 to 0.77) Intervention groups (group 1, 2, 3 combined): 0.30 (95% CI: -0.06 to 0.67) Difference between group 5 and: Group 1: 4 (95% CI: 1 to 8) Group 2: 7 (95% CI: 3 to 10) Group 3: 2 (95% CI: -1 to 6) Intervention groups (group 1, 2, 3 combined): 4 (95% CI: 2 to 7) Group 1: 49 Group 2: 60 Group 3: 60 Group 4: 47 Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 2 and 3 over group 1 ($p < 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between group 2 and 4 ($p < 0.14$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences within and between groups for compliant participants ($p \geq 0.05$)	11/16
Blangsted et al. (19) 2008	Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers $n = 549$ male: 195 female: 354 mean age (SD): 44.9 years (9.3)	Group 1 ($n = 180$): Supervised resisted exercises (shoulder extension, shoulder abduction, shoulder lift, isometric contraction for flexion, extension and side-bending of the neck, rowing or kayaking machine) 3 × 20 min/week Group 2 ($n = 187$): General physical exercises (general aerobic and strengthening exercises, visit by an instructor 1–4 times a month) Group 3 ($n = 182$): Control group (education)	12 months	Shoulder pain intensity Duration of shoulder symptoms Work Ability Index (0–42)	Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 1 combined with group 2 over group 3 ($p = 0.0318$) Statistically significant difference between groups favouring group 1 combined with group 2 over group 3 ($p = 0.0565$) No statistically significant differences between group 1 combined with group 2 over group 3 ($p = 0.3073$) No statistically significant differences between group 1 and 2 ($p = 0.4220$)	12/16
Horneij et al. (25) 2001	Symptomatic and asymptomatic healthcare workers $n = 282$ male: 0 female: 282 mean age: 44.0 years	Group 1 ($n = 90$): Exercises (individualized programme including: Posture, balance, muscular endurance, functional exercises, stretching exercises, cardiovascular fitness), 20 min, self-exercise and 4 supervised sessions Group 2 ($n = 93$): Stress management training (psycho-social intervention) 1 × /week for 7 weeks and follow-up at 3 and 6 months Group 3 ($n = 99$): Control group	18 months	Improvement of shoulder symptoms (%) 1. 12 months 2. 18 months Aggravation of shoulder symptoms (%) 1. 12 months 2. 18 months	Pre-post difference within groups: 1-Group 1: 32 ($p < 0.05$) Group 2: 33 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 37 ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) 2-Group 1: 27 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 30 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 30 ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) Pre-post difference within groups: 1-Group 1: 12 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 16 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 20 ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) 2-Group 1: 17 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 16 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 18 ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$)	7/16

Jay et al. (26) 2015	Symptomatic laboratory technicians $n=112$ gender: not mentioned mean age (SD): 46.6 years (8.6)	Group 1 ($n=56$): Exercises (elastic resistance band exercises targeting the shoulder girdle and arm/hand, control motor exercises with education on pain de-catastrophizing and fear-avoidance beliefs) 4 x /week and mindfulness session 1 x / week Group 2 ($n=56$): Control (Email with encouragement to participate in the company's on-going health initiatives)	10 weeks	Shoulder pain intensity (11 points scale)	Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: 2.2 (95% CI: 1.6 to 2.9) Group 2: 0.6 (95% CI: 0.1 to 1.2) Difference between groups: 1.6 (95% CI: 0.9 to 2.3) $p=0.0007$	12/16
Jorgensen et al. (27) 2011	Symptomatic and asymptomatic cleaning workers $n=294$ male: 0 female: 294 mean age (SD): 45.0 years (9.2)	Group 1 ($n=95$): Exercises (stabilization exercises of the trunk muscles and shoulder girdle: abdominal bracing, bridge, four point kneeling, horizontal side support, vertical plank, body blade), 1 h/week for 3 months to 1 h/month in the last 6 months Group 2 ($n=99$): Education (cognitive behavioural training on coping in groups), 2 h/2 weeks for 3 months, 2 h/month for 3 months, 1 h/month in for 6 months Group 3 ($n=100$): Control (1 h health check)	12 months	Prevalence of right shoulder pain for >30 days in the past year (%) Prevalence of left shoulder pain for >30 days in the past year (%) Work ability (11 points scale) (SD) Sickness absence (days)	Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 6 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 4 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 0 ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 4 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 1 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: -1 ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) Pre and post treatment: Group 1: 7.6 (2.0); 7.8 (1.9) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 7.5 (2.1); 7.5 (2.1) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 7.3 (2.2); 7.4 (2.4) ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) No statistically significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$)	11/16
Lundblad et al. (30) 1999	Symptomatic female industrial workers $n=58$ male: 0 female: 58 mean age (SD): 33 years (9)	Group 1 ($n=15$): Exercises (stabilization, strength, coordination, endurance, flexibility and rhythm exercises) and education on coping skills Group 2 ($n=20$): Feldenkrais exercises (body awareness, coordination and control) and intervention (education, coping skills) Group 3 ($n=23$): Control group	16 weeks	Mean pain during a shoulder endurance flexion test (10-cm VAS) (SD) Prevalence of shoulder pain in the last 7 days (%) Shoulder-index complaint indices (8 point scale) (SD) Work disability (2 points scale) (SD) Sick leave (%) (SD)	Pre and post treatment: Group 1: 2.15 (3.29); 1.14 (1.43) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 2.29 (3.89); 1.74 (2.32) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 2.23 (3.25); 1.37 (1.86) ($p \geq 0.05$) No significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 0 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 40 ($p < 0.05$) Group 3: 0 ($p \geq 0.05$) No significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 3.1 (1.9); 2.5 (2.0) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 3.3 (1.9); 2.5 (2.0) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 2.4 (2.3); 2.5 (2.2) ($p \geq 0.05$) No significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 1.3 (1.0); 1.3 (1.1) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 1.2 (0.9); 1.0 (1.0) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 1.3 (1.1); 1.2 (1.0) ($p \geq 0.05$) No significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$) Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 6.5 (7.7); 7.6 (12.5) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 5.8 (6.8); 5.7 (5.9) ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 3: 5.9 (7.4); 7.6 (8.1) ($p \geq 0.05$) No significant differences between groups ($p \geq 0.05$)	6/16
Moreira et al. (32) 2015	Symptomatic and asymptomatic workers from a manufacturing company $n=70$ gender: not mentioned mean age (SD): 38.35 years (7.65)	Group 1 ($n=39$): Supervised exercises (stretching exercises of the upper limb, general strength exercises of the lower limb), 10-15 min/session, 3 x /week and stretching and strengthening programme at home Group 2 ($n=31$): Control group	6 months	Shoulder pain intensity Median (interquartile range) (11 points scale) Prevalence of shoulder pain in the last 7 days (%) Prevalence of daily activities limitation in the shoulder region in the last 12 months (%)	Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 4 (7); 4 (5), ($p=0.269$) Group 2: 3 (6); 3 (6), ($p=0.827$) Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: -2.6 ($p=1$) Group 2: -9.7 ($p=0.508$) Difference between group 1 and 2: 7.1 (p -value not reported) Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: -2.6 ($p=1$) Group 2: 3.3 ($p=1$) Difference between group 1 and 2: 5.9 (p -value not reported)	9/16

Pereira et al. (33) 2013	Symptomatic and asymptomatic garment workers <i>n</i> = 61 male: 18 female: 43 mean age (SD): 28.4 years (8.41)	Group 1 (<i>n</i> = 44): Supervised exercises (stretching, muscular endurance, massage) 10 min, 2 × /day, 5 × /week Group 2 (<i>n</i> = 17): Control group	12 weeks	Shoulder pain intensity (11 points scale) (SD) Prevalence of shoulder pain (%)	Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 7.1 (2.2); 4.9 (1.8) (<i>p</i> = 0.038) Group 2: 5.0 (0.0); 5.8 (1.1) (<i>p</i> = 0.923) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> -value not reported) Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: 10 (<i>p</i> = 0.943) Group 2: 15.6 (<i>p</i> = 0.981) Difference between group 1 and 2: 5.6 (<i>p</i> -value not reported)	7/16
Rasotto et al. (36) 2014	Symptomatic metal workers <i>n</i> = 68 male: 68 female: 0 mean age (SD): 41.10 years (7.69)	Group 1 (<i>n</i> = 34): Supervised exercises (stretching and strengthening: low-weight and elastic band shoulder abduction/adduction, shoulder flexion/extension, forward and lateral pushes), 3 × 5 repetitions, 2 × /week for 9 months Group 2 (<i>n</i> = 34): Control group	10 months	Shoulder pain (cm VAS) (SD) 1. 5 months 2. 10 months Shoulder elevation (°) (SD) 1. 5 months 2. 10 months Shoulder abduction (°) (SD) 1. 5 months 2. 10 months	Pre-post difference within groups: 1. Group 1: 0.43 (1.26) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: -0.05 (1.70) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.1037) 2. Group 1: 0.94 (1.09) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: -0.17 (2.02) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.0224) Pre-post difference within groups: 1. Group 1: 5.92 (5.59) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: -1.73 (4.59) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.0005) 2. Group 1: 7.03 (8.39) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: -0.99 (5.66) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.0007) Pre-post difference within groups: 1. Group 1: 16.56 (17.25) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: 5.75 (18.78) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.0106) 2. Group 1: 15.07 (13.58) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: -1.73 (4.59) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.0125)	8/16
Rasotto et al. (35) 2015	Symptomatic workers from a manufacturing company <i>n</i> = 60 male: 0 female: 60 mean age (SD): 39.21 years (6.18)	Group 1 (<i>n</i> = 30): Supervised individualized exercises (stretching and low-weight strengthening exercises or active mobilization in presence of pain) 3 × 5 repetitions, 2 × /week for 6 months Group 2 (<i>n</i> = 30): Control group	6 months	Shoulder pain (10 cm VAS) (SD) Shoulder elevation (°) (SD) Shoulder abduction (°) (SD)	Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 2.39 (2.58); 1.79 (2.15) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: 2.03 (2.20); 2.85 (2.41) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.039) Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 164.91 (7.25); 170.12 (10.12) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: 167.60 (11.48); 167.05 (16.48) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.035) Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 162.99 (13.42); 170.05 (10.12) (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: 161.46 (16.83); 160.20 (26.15) (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 2: (<i>p</i> = 0.003)	9/16
Tsauo et al. (37) 2004	Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers from an airline company <i>n</i> = 178 male: 78 female: 100 mean age (SD): 40.5 years (5.2)	Group 1 (<i>n</i> = 56): Self-exercise (stretching exercises for the neck region and cervical range of motion exercise, 10 × 5 s) during office breaks and 2 h lecture (education on neck and shoulder anatomy and about the exercise programme) Group 2: Group exercise 1 (<i>n</i> = 69): (1 × /day, all sessions supervised by a PT for 2 weeks and continued by themselves after for 2–3 months) and 2 h lecture Group 3: Group exercise 2 (<i>n</i> = 14): (2 × /day, half of the sessions supervised by a PT for 2 weeks and continued by themselves after for 2–3 months) and 2 h lecture Group 4 (<i>n</i> = 39): Control group (2 h lecture)	3 months	Reported soreness in past week in the shoulder region (%)	Pre-post difference within groups : Group 1: 23.1 (<i>p</i> < 0.05) Group 2: 0.6 (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Group 3: 6.0 (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Group 4: -13.2 (<i>p</i> ≥ 0.05) Difference between group 1 and 4: 36.2 (<i>p</i> -value not reported) Difference between group 2 and 4: 13.8 (<i>p</i> -value not reported) Difference between group 3 and 4: 19.2 (<i>p</i> < 0.05)	7/16

Zebis et al. (40) 2011	Symptomatic and asymptomatic laboratory technicians $n=537$ male: 82 female: 455 mean age (SD): 42.0 years (10.5)	Group 1 ($n=282$): Supervised resisted exercises (front raise, lateral raise, reverse fly, shrug, wrist extension) progression from 15 RM to 8–12 RM, 20 min/session, 3 \times /week Group 2 ($n=255$): Control group (advice to stay physically active, consulted 1 \times /week)	20 weeks	Shoulder pain intensity in the last 7 days for symptomatic participants (10 points scale) (SD) Odds ratio for improvement of shoulder pain Odds ratio for prevention of developing shoulder pain	Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 4.8 (1.7); 1.4 (1.7) (p -value not reported) Group 2: 4.7 (1.8); 2.5 (2.6) (p -value not reported) 3.9 (95% CI: 1.7 to 9.4) 0.6 (95% CI: 0.3 to 1.3)	11/16
<i>Ergonomic intervention</i>						
Aghilinejad et al. (17) 2015	Symptomatic and asymptomatic automobile factory workers $n=223$ gender: not mentioned mean age: 30.4 years	Group 1 ($n=79$): Ergonomic intervention (5 h workshop about neck and shoulder complaints and related ergonomic concepts) Group 2 ($n=70$): Ergonomic education (5 h lecture with the same concepts) Group 3 ($n=74$): Ergonomic education (pamphlet with the same concepts) Group 4 ($n=251$): Control group	1 year	Prevalence of shoulder pain in the last week (%) Prevalence of shoulder pain in the last year (%)	Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: 10 ($p=0.002$) Group 2: 5 ($p=0.063$) Group 3: 4 ($p=0.054$) Group 4: not reported Difference between groups: p -value not reported Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: 5 ($p=0.020$) Group 2: 7 ($p=0.066$) Group 3: 5 ($p=0.115$) Group 4: not reported Difference between groups: p -value not reported	8/16
Cook & Burgess-Limerick (21) 2004	Symptomatic and asymptomatic workers from newspaper call centre $n=59$ male: 5 female: 54 mean age (range): 39 years (21–68)	Group 1 ($n=30$): Ergonomic intervention (maintaining forearm position with monitoring for the first h and weekly) Group 2 ($n=29$): Control group (ergonomic intervention according to Australian standards)	12 weeks	Prevalence of shoulder discomfort (%) 1. 6 weeks 2. 12 weeks	1. Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: -1 (p -value not reported) Group 2: -6 (p -value not reported) Difference between groups: 5 ($p=0.36$) 2. Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: 0 (p -value not reported) Group 2: 10 (p -value not reported) Difference between groups: -10 ($p=0.15$)	9/16
Galinsky et al. (23) 2000	Symptomatic and asymptomatic data-entry operators $n=42$ male: 11 female: 31 mean age: 30 years	Group 1 ($n=23$): Supplementary work break (5 min every h and a 15 min, 2 \times /shift) Group 2 ($n=19$): Control group (Regular work break, 15 min, 2 \times /shift)	16 weeks	Discomfort (5 points scale)	Significant differences between groups for post intervention score for left and right shoulders favouring group 1 ($p < 0.01$)	6/16
Ketola et al. (28) 2002	Symptomatic office workers using a video display unit $n=109$ male: 46 female: 63 mean age: 47.9 years	Group 1 ($n=39$): Ergonomic intervention (checklist on workstation organization and workstation adjustments suggested by a physiotherapist) Group 2 ($n=35$): Ergonomic education (1-h training session) Group 3 ($n=35$): Control group (one page pamphlet on musculoskeletal health)	10 months	Musculoskeletal discomfort (5 points scale) (SD) Right shoulder 1. 2 months 2. 10 months Musculoskeletal discomfort (5 points scale) (SD) Left shoulder 1. 2 months 2. 10 months	Post treatment adjusted for baseline: 1. Group 1: 2.2 (0.2) (p -value not reported) Group 2: 2.4 (0.1) (p -value not reported) Group 3: 2.8 (0.2) (p -value not reported) Statistically significant differences favoring group 1 over group 3 ($p=0.022$) No statistically significant differences between group 2 and 3 ($p=0.12$) 2. Group 1: 2.6 (0.2) (p -value not reported) Group 2: 2.5 (0.2) (p -value not reported) Group 3: 2.7 (0.2) (p -value not reported) No statistically significant differences between group 1 and 3 ($p=0.53$) and between 2 and 3 ($p=0.36$) Post treatment adjusted for baseline: 1. Group 1: 1.9 (0.1) (p -value not reported) Group 2: 2.1 (0.1) (p -value not reported) Group 3: 2.4 (0.2) (p -value not reported) Statistically significant differences favoring group 1 over group 3 ($p=0.025$) No statistically significant differences between group 2 and 3 ($p=0.15$) 2. Group 1: 2.2 (0.2) (p -value not reported) Group 2: 2.4 (0.2) (p -value not reported) Group 3: 2.3 (0.2) (p -value not reported) No statistically significant differences between group 1 and 3 ($p=0.61$) and between 2 and 3 ($p=0.86$)	9/16

King et al. (29) 2013	Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers $n=23$ gender: not mentioned mean age: not mentioned	Group 1 ($n=11$): Use of a biofeedback mouse (Hoverstop, Ontario, Canada) Group 2 ($n=12$): Control group	25 weeks	Intensity of shoulder pain (11 points scale) (SD) 1. 5 weeks 2. 25 weeks	Pre- and post-treatment: 1. Group 1: 2.09 (2.18); 0.76 (1.14) Group 2: 1.36 (2.26); 1.11 (1.70) Difference between groups in post treatment score: ($p \geq 0.05$) 2. Group 1: 2.09 \pm 2.18; 0.79 \pm 1.22 Group 2: 1.36 \pm 2.26; 1.58 \pm 2.87 Difference between groups in post treatment score: ($p < 0.05$)	10/16	
Veiersted et al. (38) 2008	Symptomatic and asymptomatic hairdressers $n=38$ male: 0 female: 38 mean age (SD): 29.53 years (5.53)	Group 1 ($n=20$): Ergonomic intervention (oral and written recommendations by an occupational therapist and individualized follow-up) Group 2 ($n=18$): Control group (oral and written recommendations)	1 to 2 months	Prevalence of shoulder complaint (%)	Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 10 ($p \geq 0.05$) Group 2: 2 ($p \geq 0.05$) Difference between groups: 6 (p -value not reported by the authors)	8/16	
Pillastrini et al. (34) 2007	Symptomatic and asymptomatic administrative personnel using a VDT $n=200$ male: 58 female: 142 mean age (SD): 44.3 years (7.6)	Group 1 ($n=100$): Ergonomic intervention (adjustments and alterations to the existing furniture by a physical therapist) and informative brochure Group 2 ($n=100$): Control group (informative brochure)	6 months	Prevalence of shoulder pain (%) Reduction in shoulder pain (Symptoms at baseline to no symptoms at follow-up %) Development of shoulder pain (Symptoms at baseline to no symptoms at follow-up %)	Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 12 ($p=0.02$) Group 2: 2 ($p \geq 0.05$) Difference between groups: 10 (p -value not reported) Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 15.2 Group 2: 4.1 Difference between groups: 11.1 (p -value not reported) O.R. (95% CI): 2.9 (0.3–27.4) $p=0.352$ Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 2.1 Group 2: 3.0 Difference between groups: 0.9 (p -value not reported)	10/16	
Yu et al. (39) 2013	Symptomatic and asymptomatic factory workers $n=1,825$ male: 1,057 female: 768 mean age (SD): 29.0 years (7.3)	Group 1 ($n=848$): Participatory interactive ergonomic intervention (education, workstation inspection, group discussions and action plan for improvement, 5 h) Group 2 ($n=854$): Didactic ergonomic intervention (education, 2 h)	1 year	Prevalence of shoulder pain (%)	Pre-post difference within groups: Group 1: 3.6 ($p=0.111$) Group 2: 2.0 ($p=0.321$) Difference between groups: 1.6 (p -value not reported)	8/16	
<i>Other interventions</i>							
Cheng & Huang (20) 2007	Symptomatic workers with rotator cuff disorder (type of work not mentioned) $n=94$ male: 72 female: 22 mean age (SD): 32.3 years (10.2)	Group 1 ($n=46$): Workplace-based exercises (shoulder stretching 10 \times 15 s, scapular control and rotator cuff strengthening 3 \times 10 reps) and biomechanics and ergonomic education, task modification 3 \times /week Group 2 ($n=48$): Clinic-based exercises (upper limb mobilisation activity, strength and endurance exercises) + work simulation, 3 \times /week	4 weeks	SPADI score Proportion of participants returned to work (%) Shoulder strength and range of motion	Pre- and post-treatment: Group 1: 54.25 \pm 12.07; 40.50 \pm 16.30 Group 2: 52.09 \pm 10.89; 31.54 \pm 13.37 Difference between groups: ($p=0.034$) Pre-post differences within groups: Group 1: 37.5 (p -value not reported) Group 2: 71.7 (p -value not reported) Difference between groups: ($p=0.001$) Statistically significant differences between groups ($p < 0.05$) for shoulder range of motion in flexion, strength in bilateral carrying, arm lift and high near lift. No statistically significant differences between groups for other variables ($p \geq 0.05$)	7/16	
Mehrparvar et al. (31) 2014	Symptomatic and asymptomatic office workers $n=164$ male: 80 female: 84 mean age (SD): 38.68 years (7.74)	Group 1 ($n=83$): Ergonomic intervention (evaluation by occupational medicine specialists, modifications of workstation and equipment according to ergonomic rules) Group 2 ($n=81$): Exercises (supervised work-place exercise programme including stretching exercises focusing on neck, shoulder, wrist, back and low back) 2 \times /day	1 month	Reduction in complaints in shoulder pain (%)	Group 1: \approx 20 ($p < 0.05$) Group 2: \approx 30 ($p < 0.05$) Differences between groups: ($p=0.243$)	9/16	

DASH: Disability in Arms, Shoulders and Hands, Self-reported disability questionnaire. Higher scores indicate a greater level of disability; RM: repetition maximum; CI: confidence interval; Pre-post: pre-intervention to post-intervention; Work Ability Index: perceived work ability, the higher the score, the better the work ability; NMQ: Nordic Musculoskeletal Questionnaire; VDT: video display terminal; SPADI: Shoulder Pain and Disability Index; SD: standard deviation.