

Study ID	Gupta 2013		Han 2015		Parthasarathy 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PN	Alternate allocation, pseudoRCT	NI	No mention of the randomisation method	NI	No details given as to how randomisation sequence was generated.
	N	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	py	Sealed envelopes were used for randomisation
	NI	No baseline characteristics presented	N	No evidence of a problem with balance for baseline characteristics.	PY	Limited baseline characteristics presented, baseline measures of outcomes appear comparable.
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to potential issues in the randomisation process and lack of information to assess in this domain.	Some concerns	Some concerns due to lack of information provided in the randomisation process.	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided regarding the randomisation process and baseline characteristics.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers

Study ID	Gupta 2013		Han 2015		Parthasarathy 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	No reported deviations or drop outs	N	No reported deviations or drop outs	N	No reported deviations or drop outs
	NA		NA		PN	
	NA		NA		NA	
	PY	No information provided regarding the analysis methdos used, ITT analysis is interpreted	PY	No information provided regarding the analysis methdos used, ITT analysis is interpreted	NI	No information provided regarding the analysis methdos used, ITT analysis is interpreted
	NA		NA		NA	
	Some concerns	Some concerns regarding the lack of information provided for the method of analysis.	Some concerns	Some concerns regarding the lack of information provided for the method of analysis.	Some concerns	Some concerns regarding the lack of information provided for the method of analysis.
Bias due to missing outcome data	NI	No information on the rate of drop out in the trial.	NI	No information on the rate of drop out in the trial.	NI	No information on the rate of drop out in the trial.
	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of any potentially missing outcome data.	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of any potentially missing outcome data.	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of any potentially missing outcome data.
	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.

Study ID	Gupta 2013		Han 2015		Parthasarathy 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided on potential drop out.	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided on potential drop out.	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided on potential drop out.
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measurement used	N	Validated outcome measurement used	N	Validated outcome measurement used
	N	The outcome was measured using the same instruments and time points between the intervention groups.	N	The outcome was measured using the same instruments and time points between the intervention groups.	N	The outcome was measured using the same instruments and time points between the intervention groups.
	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.
	Y	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. Given that they signed up for the study, it is plausible that they would have some belief in the efficacy of treatment.	Y	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. Given that they signed up for the study, it is plausible that they would have some belief in the efficacy of treatment.	Y	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. Given that they signed up for the study, it is plausible that they would have some belief in the efficacy of treatment.
	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.

Study ID	Gupta 2013		Han 2015		Parthasarathy 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of blinding of participants and the self-reported outcome.	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of blinding of participants and the self-reported outcome.	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of blinding of participants and the self-reported outcome.
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Armat 2020		Bazzano 2018		de Manincor 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer generated random number sequence	Y	Randomisation conducted using an online tool randomizer.org	Y	Computer generated random number sequence
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	Y	Randomisation was conducted by administrative staff independent of the research team and concealed using sealed envelopes
	N	There are no significant differences between the intervention groups at baseline reported.	N	Baseline characteristics appear broadly comparable between the two groups. The yoga group were significantly more excited to participate in yoga, unclear whether this survey was conducted prior to randomisation/revealing which intervention the student would receive.	PY	There are no significant differences between the intervention groups at baseline reported. 6 participants (all in the yoga group) excluded post-randomisation due to not meeting eligibility criteria causes some concerns.
	Some concerns	Some concerns regarding the lack of information on allocation concealment	Some concerns	Some concerns regarding the excitement to participate in yoga. Not considered to be due to the randomisation process.	Some concerns	Some concerns relating to the differential rate of post-randomisation exclusion, suggesting that there may have been some issues with baseline characteristics.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers

Study ID	Armat 2020		Bazzano 2018		de Manincor 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	Two participants switched from the control to the yoga group after randomisation "on their insistence"	N	No reported deviations or drop outs	N	5 participants in each group dropped out. This is not considered to be likely due to the trial context.
	Y	The switch likely occurred due to excitement to participate in yoga, which may plausibly have affected the outcome	NA		NA	
	N	Switch only occurred from control to yoga (not the other way)	NA		NA	
	N	While the publication reports that both per-protocol and ITT analysis were performed, it appears that only the per protocol results are presented.	Y	ITT analysis is specified	Y	ITT analysis is specified
	PN	A relatively small number of patients switched from the control to the intervention group.	NA		NA	
	High	High risk due to the inappropriate method of analysis and the deviations from the intended intervention.	Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PN	Outcome data was missing for 3 participants in the yoga group and 1 in the control group.	NI	No information on the rate of drop out in the trial.	N	5 participants in each group dropped out prior to the primary analysis.
	N	Insufficient analysis was presented to assess whether the result was biased by missing data.	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of any potentially missing outcome data.	N	LOCF should not be assumed to correct for missing outcome data. No sensitivity analyses presented.
	Y	Participants in the yoga group were excluded due to non-attendance. It is plausible that this missingness is selectively based on the outcome.	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.	PY	No information was provided describing reasons for drop out. It is considered plausible that some of these drop outs could be related to the outcome.

Study ID	Armat 2020		Bazzano 2018		de Manincor 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	Rate of drop out is similar between groups. Considered unlikely to seriously impact the result.	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.	PN	Rate of drop out is similar between groups. Considered unlikely to seriously impact the result.
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided on reasons for drop out or non-attendance.	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided on potential drop out.	Some concerns	Some concerns relating to the drop outs in both groups, with no information to assess whether this was related to the outcome.
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measurement used	N	Validated outcome measurement used	N	Validated outcome measurement used
	N	The outcome was measured using the same instruments and time points between the intervention groups.	N	The outcome was measured using the same instruments and time points between the intervention groups	N	The outcome was measured using the same instruments and time points between the intervention groups
	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.	Y	Students were aware of their intervention status and self-reported their outcomes	Y	Students were aware of their intervention status and self-reported their outcomes
	Y	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. Given that they signed up for the study, it is plausible that they would have some belief in the efficacy of treatment.	Y	Given that students in the yoga group were more likely to report that they were excited to participate in yoga, it is considered possible that they would be biased in their reporting of the outcome	Y	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. Given that they signed up for the study, it is plausible that they would have some belief in the efficacy of treatment.
	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	Y	Given that students in the yoga group were more likely to report that they were excited to participate in yoga, it is considered likely that they would be biased in their reporting of the outcome	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.

Study ID	Armat 2020		Bazzano 2018		de Manincor 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of blinding of participants and the self-reported outcome.	High	High risk due to the self-reported outcome and lack of blinding of participants who were excited to participate in yoga	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of blinding of participants and the self-reported outcome.
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Shaikh 2013	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random number table produced a code card for each participant
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment, but it is specified that participants drew a random code card to receive their group assignment which may have sufficiently concealed allocation from the study providers
	PN	Limited baseline characteristics presented, baseline measures of outcomes appear comparable.
	Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers

Study ID	Shaikh 2013	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	No reported deviations or drop outs
	NA	
	NA	
	Y	ITT analysis is specified
	NA	
	Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	NI	No information on the rate of drop out in the trial.
	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of any potentially missing outcome data.
	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.

Study ID	Shaikh 2013	
	Judgement	Comments
	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided on potential drop out.
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measurement used
	N	The outcome was measured using the same instruments and time points between the intervention groups.
	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.
	Y	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. Given that they signed up for the study, it is plausible that they would have some belief in the efficacy of treatment.
	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.

Study ID	Shaikh 2013	
	Judgement	Comments
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of blinding of participants and the self-reported outcome.
Bias in selection of the reported result	No pre-specified analysis plan available	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Culver 2015		Davis 2020		Huberty 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	Randomisation sequence not specified.	Y	Randomization was performed using a formula set up in a REDCap database.	Y	A list of randomized participant numbers were generated using randomizer.org
	Y	The research team was blinded to the baseline scores during the randomization procedures	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	Y	The list was concealed from members of the research team and revealed only when it had been assigned to a participant
	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment
	N	None reported.	Y	33/245 lost to follow up. Some reasons were related to trial context (too busy to consistently participate, moved away, experienced worsening of physical/mental condition, declined to proceed)	Y	13/90 lost to follow up. Some reasons may be related to trial context (did not continue to participate in yoga, did not complete the post intervention surveys, mood, time, and stress).

Study ID	Culver 2015		Davis 2020		Huberty 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NA	Not applicable.	Y	Patients with medical reasons, or who declined to proceed after randomisation possibly linked to outcomes	Y	Patients with medical reasons, or who declined to proceed after randomisation possibly linked to outcomes
	NA	Not applicable.	Y	Deviations were balanced	Y	Deviations were balanced
	PY	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis	N	Participants who completed 7 or fewer HYP/WLP sessions or did not complete surveys were excluded. Not a protocol specified exclusion criterion.	PY	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis
	NA	Not applicable.	PN	Given that deviations were balanced, the impact is unlikely to be substantial	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns	
	N	37/61 lost to follow up	N	33/245 lost to follow up	N	13/90 lost to follow up
	NI	None reported	NI	None reported	NI	None reported

Study ID	Culver 2015		Davis 2020		Huberty 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about group assignment. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about group assignment. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about group assignment. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results
	NI	A significant proportion of participants were lost to follow up which is likely to have influenced the final results . As drops out were even between both groups, it is unclear how this would impact the final results	PN	Missingness of the data not likely related to its true value given that drop out were balanced between groups	PN	Missingness of the data not likely related to its true value given that drop out were balanced between groups
	High		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving
	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement

Study ID	Culver 2015		Davis 2020		Huberty 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan
	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Jindani 2015		Martin 2015		Quinones 2015	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random number generator	Y	Participants were randomly assigned through the use of the Excel random numbers function (Microsoft Corp, Redmond, WA)	Y	Participants were randomly assigned by computerized randomization
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.
	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment. Researchers who performed statistical analyses were blinded to the assignment of the participants.
	Y	30/80 lost to follow up. Some reasons may be related to trial context (scheduling conflicts, health reasons, personal reasons).	N	None reported	Y	10/100 lost to follow up. These reasons are likely to be related to the trial context (change in location).

Study ID	Jindani 2015		Martin 2015		Quinones 2015	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	Patients with scheduling conflicts, health reasons and personal reasons after randomisation possibly linked to outcomes	NA	Not applicable.	PN	Patients leaving the group due to the change in location is unlikely to be linked to the outcomes
	N	All participants who dropped out were in the intervention arm	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	PY	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis	NA	Intent-to-treat	PY	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	High		Low		Some concerns	
	N	30/80 lost to follow up.	Y	Data available for all randomised participants	N	10/100 lost to follow up.
	NI	None reported	NA	Not applicable.	N	None reported

Study ID	Jindani 2015		Martin 2015		Quinones 2015	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about group assignment. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	NA	Not applicable.	PN	Patients leaving the group due to the change in location is unlikely to be linked to the outcomes
	PY	Missingness of the data considered probably related to true value, given that it was unbalanced between groups.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	High		Low		Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving
	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement

Study ID	Jindani 2015		Martin 2015		Quinones 2015	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No statistical analysis plan provided	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start
	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Reddy 2013		Reinhardt 2018		Seppala 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random allocation was determined using the Microsoft Excel random numbers function	Y	Random assignment via a web-based random sampling service	Y	Computer-generated randomization list
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	PN	Details about concealing allocation sequence not fully reported. Potentially participants were unaware of their allocation prior to randomisation, however, it is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Study coordinator was not blinded. Unclear if participants were blinded or not.
	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment.
	NI	12/38 lost to follow up. Reasons for dropping out were not provided	Y	25/51 lost to follow up. Some of these reasons are likely to be related to the trial context (schedule conflicts, anticipating that the study would be too triggering of their PTSD symptoms)	Y	3/21 lost to follow up. Some of these reasons are likely to be related to the trial context (dislike intervention), some deviations from the intended intervention likely arose due to the trial context,

Study ID	Reddy 2013		Reinhardt 2018		Seppala 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NI	Insufficient information provided	PY	Reason possibly linked to outcomes	PY	Reason possibly linked to outcomes
	Y	Deviations were balanced	N	More participants dropped out in the intervention arm (16 vs 6)	Y	Deviations were balanced
	PY	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis.	PY	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis.	Y	Intent-to-treat analysis using the maximum likelihood estimation
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Some concerns		High		Some concerns	
	N	12/38 lost to follow up.	N	25/51 lost to follow up	N	3/21 lost to follow up.
	PN	Although there was a marginally significant difference in baseline PCL scores, with noncompleters having higher scores (M = 59.20) than did completers	PN	Analysis of baseline differences in CAPS were evaluated using a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) of completer status	PN	To address the issue of missing and unusable data, an intent-to-treat analysis was implemented using maximum likelihood estimation

Study ID	Reddy 2013		Reinhardt 2018		Seppala 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about group assignment. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about group assignment. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about group assignment. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results
	PN	Missingness of the data not likely related to its true value given that drop out were balanced between groups	PN	Missingness of the data not likely related to its true value given that drop out were balanced between groups	PN	Missingness of the data not likely related to its true value given that drop out were balanced between groups
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving
	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement

Study ID	Reddy 2013		Reinhardt 2018		Seppala 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start
	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Telles 2010		Van Der Kolk 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Standard random number table	NI	Method of randomisation not specified
	PY	The two groups were then designated by a person from the research institution co-ordinating who picked up folded pieces of paper on which the name of the group was written. This person was not an experimenter, or a yoga teacher, and had no other part in the trial.	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported.
	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both group
	Low		Some concerns	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment. All assessments were blind.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment. All raters were blind to treatment condition.
	N	None reported	NI	None reported

Study ID	Telles 2010		Van Der Kolk 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Intent-to-treat analysis	Y	Hierarchical linear and nonlinear modeling with restricted maximum likelihood estimation to conduct multilevel regression analyses to examine change over time in outcomes as a function of treatment condition. This approach allowed the authors to analyse the intention-to-treat (ITT) sample without the use of missing data algorithms.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Some concerns	
	Y	Yes	N	4/64 lost to follow up. There were no significant differences in dropout rates between the treatment groups, yoga (n=1, 1.6%) and control (n=3, 4.7%).
	NA	Not applicable.	NI	Not indicated

Study ID	Telles 2010		Van Der Kolk 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about group assignment. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Missingness of the data not likely related to its true value given that drop out were balanced between groups
	Low		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	N	All primary outcomes were subjective and the outcome assessors were blinded	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving
	NA	Not applicable.	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement

Study ID	Telles 2010		Van Der Kolk 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA	Not applicable.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Low		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start
	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain	PN	No evidence of selection of results based on multiple eligible outcome measurements with the outcome domain
	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain appear to correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns	
	Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Bressington 2019		Buttner 2015		Chu 2017	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random number generator	Y	Block randomisation with varying block size to ensure the PI could not predict allocation	Y	Computer generation allocation
	NI	Authors do not report on allocation concealment	PY	It is noted that the PI could not predict allocation	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment
	N	No statistical difference between baseline characteristics	N	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups. Significant difference in ages is noted (control participants were older) but this is not considered to be due to an issue with randomisation.	N	No significant differences reported
	Some concerns		Low		Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers
	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice.	PN	The only reported deviations include non completion by some participants. This is considered in-line with what would occur in usual practice.	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	NA
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	NA

Study ID	Bressington 2019		Buttner 2015		Chu 2017	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	Y	Intent-to-treat	PY	ITT is specified but mITT is interpreted as the analysis excludes one participant who did not complete baseline measurements.	Y	Intent-to-treat is specified
	NA	Not applicable.	NA		NA	NA
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	19/23 (83%) randomised to yoga completed the intervention, all 27 in control completed intervention (1 lost at 3 months follow up)	N	5 participants in the yoga group (18%) and 2 in the control group (7%) were missing outcome data.	N	6/26 participants (23%) did not complete the intervention
	PN	The authors state that the GEE approach can accommodate missing data, however no further detail is provided.	PY	Drop-out status was examined as a moderator of treatment effect, which did not vary as a function of attrition.	PN	Last observation carried forward should not be assumed to account for missing data. Those who discontinued did not differ on baseline characteristics compared to those who remained
	PY	Reasons for drop out are provided and do not appear to be related to the outcome	NA		PY	Reasons for missing data do not appear to be related to the outcome

Study ID	Bressington 2019		Buttner 2015		Chu 2017	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	Reasons for drop out are provided and do not appear to be related to the outcome	NA		PN	Reasons for missing data do not appear to be related to the outcome
	Some concerns		Low		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes
	PY	It is possible that assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received, as subjective outcomes (depression, anxiety and stress) were self-reported.	Y	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. Given that they signed up for the study, it is plausible that they would have some belief in the efficacy of treatment.	PY	The primary outcome (depression severity) is subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received

Study ID	Bressington 2019		Buttner 2015		Chu 2017	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns		Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of blinding of participants and the self-reported outcome.	Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Falsafi 2016		Janakiramaiah 2000		Kinser 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Yes, random number generator	NI	No mention of how the randomisation sequence was generated	Y	Random number generator
	NI	Authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	Authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	Authors do not report on allocation concealment
	NI	Baseline characteristics per treatment arm not available	N	No significant differences reported at baseline	N	No significant difference in baseline characteristics
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers
	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice.	N	No reported deviations	PY	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered greater than what would occur in usual practice
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	PY	High proportion of participants who dropped out prior to commencing the intervention, leaving those who remain more motivated than those who discontinued.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	N	Substantially more deviations occurred in the control group.

Study ID	Falsafi 2016		Janakiramaiah 2000		Kinser 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	Y	Intent-to-treat (modified)	Y	Intent-to-treat is interpreted	N	Per protocol, participants who did not receive the allocated intervention were excluded from the analysis, despite having outcome data available
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	Y	Large proportion of participants were inappropriately excluded
	Low		Low		High	substantial rate of deviations which were uneven between groups.
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	23/30 (77%) yoga, 21/30 (70%) mindfulness and 21/30 (70%) control received allocated treatment	PY	No reported drop outs or missing data	N	12/15 (80%) yoga and 6/12 (50%) control received allocated treatment
	N	Excluded from the analysis post randomisation. No adjustment for missingness was presented.	NA	Not applicable.	N	No evidence that the analysis corrected for bias - as majority dropped out before receiving any of the intervention and study instruments
	PN	Documented reasons are unrelated to participants health status	NA	Not applicable.	PY	Documented reasons are unrelated to participants health status but may have been related to motivation to complete the intervention

Study ID	Falsafi 2016		Janakiramaiah 2000		Kinser 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	Documented reasons are unrelated to participants health status	NA	Not applicable.	PN	Reasons for noncompletion are provided and do not seem to be related to the outcome
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to the large proportion of missing data. Missingness is balanced between treatment arms.	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns due to the large proportion of missing data
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes
	PY	It is possible that assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received, as subjective outcomes (depression, anxiety and stress) were self-reported.	PY	It is possible that assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received, as subjective outcomes (depression, anxiety and stress) were self-reported.	PY	It is possible that assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received, as subjective outcomes (depression, anxiety and stress) were self-reported.

Study ID	Falsafi 2016		Janakiramaiah 2000		Kinser 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Kumar 2019		Prathikanti 2017		Ravindran 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer generated random numbers	Y	Stratified block randomisation	Y	computer number generator 2:1
	NI	Authors do not report on allocation concealment	Y	Yes	PY	Blinded investigator performed the randomisation
	N	No significant differences	N	No significant differences	N	No significant differences
	Some concerns		Low		Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers
	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	PY	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered greater than what would occur in usual practice
	NA	NA	NA	NA	PY	Some participants withdrew from the study to receive alternative treatment
	NA	NA	NA	NA	Y	Deviations roughly balanced between groups.

Study ID	Kumar 2019		Prathikanti 2017		Ravindran 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	Y	Per protocol as participants who were discharged from hospital were excluded from the analysis	Y	Intent-to-treat is specified	Y	Intent-to-treat (modified)
	Y	Given that the study included psychiatric inpatients, excluding participants who were discharged could substantially impact the results	NA	NA	NA	NA
	High	inappropriate method of analysis	Low		Some concerns	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	40/44 (90%) yoga and 40/43 (93%) control received allocated treatment	N	15/20 (75%) yoga, 10/18 (56%) completed the intervention	N	Week 8: 32/53 (60%) yoga, 11/19 (58%) psychotherapy; Week 16: 21/53 (40%) yoga, 8/19 (42%) psychotherapy.
	N	No analysis for missing data presented	N	Last observation carried forward should not be assumed to account for missing data	N	Last observation carried forward should not be assumed to account for missing data
	Y	Participants who were discharged from hospital were excluded	PY	It is considered possible that drop outs could have occurred due to the true value of the outcome.	PY	It is considered possible that drop outs could have occurred due to the true value of the outcome.

Study ID	Kumar 2019		Prathikanti 2017		Ravindran 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	Y	Participants who were discharged from hospital were excluded	PN	Reasons for drop out are provided and in most cases do not appear related to the outcome.	Y	Reasons for drop out are provided and may have been related to the true value of the outcome (alternative treatments, lack of efficacy)
	High	inappropriate exclusion of participants who were discharged, which is considered to be highly likely related to the outcome	Some concerns	Some concerns relating to the proportion of missing outcome data and the lack of analysis presented to assess the impact of missingness	High	High risk due to the large proportion of missing data which was likely related to the outcome
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	PY	Half of the subjective outcomes clinician-rated (blinded), 1/2 patient-rated
	PY	It is possible that assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received, as subjective outcomes (depression and anxiety) were self-reported.	PY	It is possible that assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received, as subjective outcomes (depression and anxiety) were self-reported.	PY	It is possible that assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received, as subjective outcomes (depression and anxiety) were self-reported.

Study ID	Kumar 2019		Prathikanti 2017		Ravindran 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	No pre-specified analysis plan is available	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Sarubin 2014		Shahidi 2011		Sharma 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PN	quasi randomsied	Y	Computer generation allocation	PN	quasi randomsied
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment
	N	No significant differences	N	No significant differences	N	No significant differences reported
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers
	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	N	No reported deviations
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Study ID	Sarubin 2014		Shahidi 2011		Sharma 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	N	The study mentions the ITT set, however it appears that an as-treated group is analysed. 30 participants were allocated to the yoga and controlgroup, but the number of drop outs from each arm is unclear, and N=31 participants were analysed in the control group, raising concerns	Y	Modified ITT is interpreted	Y	Intent-to-treat is interpreted
	Y	8/30 participants in the yoga group not included in the analysis. Co-intervention not balanced between groups	NA	NA	NA	NA
	High		Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Data missing for 12% of participants	N	10/70 participants (14%) did not complete the study	Y	No drop out/missing data reported
	NA	No analysis for missing data is presented	N	No analysis to account for missing data is presented	NA	NA
	PY	It is considered possible that drop outs could have occurred due to the true value of the outcome.	NI	No reasons for missing data are presented	NA	NA

Study ID	Sarubin 2014		Shahidi 2011		Sharma 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	Reasons for drop out do not appear related to the outcome	NI	No reasons for missing data are presented	NA	NA
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	PY	While the time point of outcome measurement is not specified in weeks (rather it is 10 sessions) it is considered likely that participants would have measured the outcome at similar time points between groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes
	PY	The primary outcome (depression) is subjective was ranked by experienced psychiatrists or psychologist	PY	The primary outcome (depression severity) is subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received	PY	The key outcomes such as depression and anxiety were subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received

Study ID	Sarubin 2014		Shahidi 2011		Sharma 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	Experienced psychiatrists, unlikely to be biased in reporting outcome	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Sharma 2015		Tolahunase 2018b		Tolahunase 2018a	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Blocked randomisation	Y	Computer generated random numbers	Y	Dynamic allocation randomisation
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	PY	Blinded research assistant created the randomisation allocation schedule	N	A research assistant not otherwise involved in the study created the randomization allocation schedule.
	N	No significant differences reported	N	No significant differences	N	No significant differences
	Some concerns		Low		Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers
	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Not applicable.

Study ID	Sharma 2015		Tolahunase 2018b		Tolahunase 2018a	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	Y	Intent-to-treat is specified	Y	Intent-to-treat is specified	Y	Intent-to-treat is specified
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	PN	10/13 (77%) of yoga and 12/12 (100%) completed the entire treatment phase	PN	26/29 (90%) of yoga and 28/29 (97%) completed the entire treatment phase	PN	70/89 (79%) of yoga and 74/89 (83%) completed the entire treatment phase
	PN	Last observation carried forward should not be assumed to account for missing data	PY	Last observation carried forward should not be assumed to account for missing data	N	No analysis presented to adjust for missing data
	PY	Reasons for missing data include participants leaving the study (reported as being unrelated to the study protocol) and a medication change (which could plausibly be due to the outcome)	PY	Reasons for missing data do not appear to be related to the outcome	PY	Reasons for missing data could plausibly be related to the outcome (personal choice, herbal treatment, cost contact)

Study ID	Sharma 2015		Tolahunase 2018b		Tolahunase 2018a	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	Reasons for the majority of non-completers do not appear to be related to the outcome	PN	Reasons for missing data do not appear to be related to the outcome	PY	Reasons for missing data could plausibly be related to the outcome (personal choice, herbal treatment, cost contact)
	Some concerns		Some concerns		High	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	PY	Interviewers were blind to treatment assignment, but participants report their own symptoms	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes
	PY	The key outcomes such as depression and anxiety were subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received	PY	The primary outcome (depression severity) is subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received	PY	The primary outcome (depression severity) is subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received

Study ID	Sharma 2015		Tolahunase 2018b		Tolahunase 2018a	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Uebelacker 2017		Wahbeh 2019		Weinstock 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer generated random numbers	PN	quasi-randomised	Y	Randomly assigned in a 1:1 ratio, stratified by baseline depression severity, with randomly chosen blocks of size 4 or 6
	PY	"Study staff had no way of knowing to which arm the next participant would be randomised"	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment
	N	No significant difference between treatment arms	N	No significant differences	N	No significant differences
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers
	N	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	N	No reported deviations	PN	1/9 in yoga group and 3/8 in bibliotherapy group did not complete the study. This is high, but in-line with what is considered usual practice
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.

Study ID	Uebelacker 2017		Wahbeh 2019		Weinstock 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	Y	Intent-to-treat	Y	Intent-to-treat (modified)	PY	mITT is interpreted
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	18/122 participants (15%) did not complete the week 10 outcome assessment.	Y	1 participant did not attend the retreat due to illness	N	4/18 participants (22.22%) missing data
	Y	Multiple imputation used to account for missing data	NA	NA	N	No analysis is presented to assess the impact of missing data.
	NA	NA	NA	NA	PY	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.

Study ID	Uebelacker 2017		Wahbeh 2019		Weinstock 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NI	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.
	Low		Low		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	PY	Interviewers were blind to treatment assignment, but participants report their own symptoms	PN	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants who self-reported outcomes	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.
	PY	It is possible that assessment of the outcome could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received, as subjective outcomes (depression and anxiety) were self-reported.	PY	The primary outcome (depression severity) is subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received	PY	The primary outcome (depression severity) is subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received

Study ID	Uebelacker 2017		Wahbeh 2019		Weinstock 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Whiddon 2011		Woolery 2004	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PN	No information on the randomisation sequence is reported	PN	No information on the randomisation sequence is reported
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment
	NI	No baseline characteristics presented	PN	Minimal baseline characteristics presented. Independent t-test reported no difference between groups.
	High		Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers
	N	No reported deviations	PN	The only reported deviations include non completion by some participants. This is considered in-line with what would occur in usual practice.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.

Study ID	Whiddon 2011		Woolery 2004	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	PY	ITT is interpreted	PY	mITT is interpreted
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	No drop outs or missing data reported	N	5 participants (18%) dropped out and are missing outcome data
	NA	NA	N	No analysis is presented to assess the impact of missing data.
	NA	NA	PY	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.

Study ID	Whiddon 2011		Woolery 2004	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA	NA	NI	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.
	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns due to the missing outcome data and lack of appropriate analysis methods to account for missingness.
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.	Y	Subjects were aware of their intervention and self-reported outcomes.
	PY	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. Given that they signed up for the study, it is plausible that they would have some belief in the efficacy of treatment.	PY	Knowledge of the intervention could have influenced outcome reporting if participants had strong belief in the efficacy of yoga. GNo difference in 'interest in learning yoga' or 'expected benefits from yoga' reported between the two groups.

Study ID	Whiddon 2011		Woolery 2004	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Afonso 2012		Sobano 2013		Tapas 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	N	Randomisation sequence not specified.	Y	Randomisation sequence used was the sealed envelope technique	N	Randomisation sequence not specified.
	N	Not specified, unlikely to have occurred.	NI	Not specified, unlikely to have occurred.	NI	Not specified, unlikely to have occurred.
	PN	Baseline data was not provided but the pretreatment results showed no significant differences apart from the passive-stretching group which had a significantly lower score for the exhaustion phase of stress when compared with the control group, but not with the yoga group	PN	Baseline data was not provided but the pretreatment results showed no significant differences between groups	NI	Baseline data was not provided
	High		Low		High	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment
	PY	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (living too far from the location where the procedure was conducted, a lack of time availability and no interest in the intervention)	N	There were no reported deviations from the protocol	N	There were no reported deviations from the protocol

Study ID	Afonso 2012		Sobano 2013		Tapas 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	N	Most participants did not complete the intervention due to reasons which may have been influenced by the trial context (lived too far from the location where the procedure was conducted, not interested in participating). Drop out were higher in the passive stretching and Yoga group compared to the control groups	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	PY	mITT analysis performed on participants completing the study as per randomised intervention. The participants that withdrew from the trial were not analysed, however no information is given regarding whether they had been randomised to an intervention group.	PY	ITT	PY	Limited information provided on drop outs. Assumed ITT.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	N	Not applicable.
	High		Low		Low	
	N	17/61 (28%) participants were lost to follow up	Y	No participants were lost to follow up	NI	Unclear if any participants were lost to follow up

Study ID	Afonso 2012		Sobano 2013		Tapas 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	The passive-stretching group had a significantly lower score for the exhaustion phase of stress when compared with the control group, but not with the yoga group; however, no other differences were detected among the groups in the pretreatment stage	NA	Not applicable.	N	Unclear if any participants were lost to follow up
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NI	Unclear if any participants were lost to follow up
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NI	Unclear if any participants were lost to follow up
	Low		Low		High	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	Most primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving
	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	

Study ID	Afonso 2012		Sobano 2013		Tapas 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	N	No data analysis plan provided
	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N = no, PN = partial no; NI = no information; NA = not applicable

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	John 2007		Kumar 2019 (i)		Latha 1992	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random number generator	Y	Computer generated	PN	Quasi-randomised, alternate allocation assumed
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment. Randomisation occurred after a run-in period.	Y	Sealed opaque envelopes to conceal allocation	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment
	N	No significant difference between baseline characteristics	N	No significant difference between baseline characteristics	NI	No useful baseline information available to compare
	Some concerns		Low		High	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	NI	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of research staff and carers	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of assessors	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of assessors
	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is not expected to be due to the trial context.	PY	The only reported deviations are noncompletion by some participants. This is considered greater than what would occur in usual practice	N	No reported deviations
	NA	NA	PY	A substantial proportion of participants (29%) did not complete the protocol	NA	NA
	NA	NA	Y	Deviations balanced between groups	NA	NA
	Y	Intent-to-treat (modified) is interpreted	Y	Intent-to-treat and per protocol	Y	Intent-to-treat is interpreted

Study ID	John 2007		Kumar 2019 (i)		Latha 1992	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Missing outcome data for 7/72 participants (10%)	PN	Data is available for 71% of participants in both the intervention (57/80) and control group (57/80). Reasons why participants were lost to follow up are reported	PY	Although unclear, it is assumed that all 20 participants treated the study
	N	No analysis is presented to account for the affect of missing data	N	Last observation carried forward should not be assumed to account for missing data	NA	NA
	PY	Some of the reasons provided could plausibly be linked to the outcome	PY	Some participants discontinued due to freedom from headaches, which is linked to the outcome	NA	NA
	PN	Reasons for drop out are provided and do not appear related in the majority of cases	PN	Reasons for drop out are provided and appear unrelated to the outcome for the majority of participants	NA	NA
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
	N	Validated outcome measurement used	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PY	The authors provide limited information on the measurement instrument (rating scale)
	N	The outcome was measured using the same instruments and time points between the intervention groups	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.

Study ID	John 2007		Kumar 2019 (i)		Latha 1992	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	Y	Participants self-reported their symptoms and were not blinded	Y	Participants self-reported their symptoms and were not blinded	Y	Participants self-reported their symptoms and were not blinded
	Y	The majority of outcomes were subjective and self reported, it is possible that the results could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PY	The majority of outcomes were subjective and self reported, it is possible that the results could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PY	The key outcomes such as headache pain and frequency were subjective and self-report in a diary, hence could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received
	PN	Participants were required to pay a fee to enrol in the yoga class, which is considered likely to incentivise biased reporting of the outcome	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	High		Some concerns		Some concerns	Limited information regarding the measurement instrument for the main outcomes
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan is available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan is available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan is available
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Study ID	John 2007		Kumar 2019 (i)		Latha 1992	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Naji-Esfahani 2014		Sethi 1981		Talakad 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer generated random numbers	PN	Quasi randomised, no mention of the randomisation method	PY	"concealled allocation protocol"
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	PY	assumed yes, as per above
	NI	No table of baseline characteristics is presented. Visual inspection of pre-intervention headache measures suggests some differences between the two groups	NI	No useful baseline information available to compare	N	No significant difference between baseline characteristics
	Some concerns		High		Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of assessors	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of assessors	Y	Authors report the study was not blinded
	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is not expected to be due to the trial context.	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is not expected to be due to the trial context.	PY	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered greater than what would occur in usual practice
	NA	NA	NA	NA	PY	A substantial proportion of participants (29%) did not complete the protocol
	NA	NA	NA	NA	N	More participants in the yoga arm did not complete the protocol
	PN	The analysis method used is unclear as the participant numbers in the CONSORT diagram do not align to the reported results.	Y	Intent-to-treat (modified) is interpreted	N	Per protocol is interpreted, as those who did not come to yoga were excluded

Study ID	Naji-Esfahani 2014		Sethi 1981		Talakad 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PY	Limited information regarding the number of participants analysed in the wrong group or their characteristics	NA	NA	Y	It is interpreted that data is excluded for 11/47 participants in the yoga group. Only 30/47 participants in the yoga group were analysed.
	High		Low		High	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Data was available for 85% (18/21) participants in the intervention group and 67% in the control group (14/21). In addition, only results of 15 participants in each group was recorded.	N	Data was available for 6/7 (85%) from intervention and 4/6 (66%) from control	PN	Data was available for 81% (control) and 63% (intervention), however reason for missing data differs slightly between treatment arms
	N	No analysis for missing outcome data is presented	N	No analysis for missing outcome data is presented	N	The analysis is unlikely to have removed the risk of bias arising from the missing data
	PY	Missingness of the data considered possibly related to true value outcome (lost to follow up due to participants health status)	PY	No reasons for drop out are provided making this difficult to assess. Drop out could plausibly be related to the true value of the outcome	PY	Missingness of the data considered possibly related to true value outcome (potential medical reasons - did not present for post assessment)
	PY	Missingness of the data could depend on its true value (differences between the proportion of missing data between groups and differing reasons for drop out)	PN	No reasons for drop out are provided making this difficult to assess. Drop out could plausibly be related to the true value of the outcome	PY	If participants did not attend yoga due to perceived ineffectiveness
	High		Some concerns		High	
	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PN	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.

Study ID	Naji-Esfahani 2014		Sethi 1981		Talakad 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	Y	Participants self-reported their symptoms and were not blinded	Y	Participants self-reported their symptoms and were not blinded	Y	Participants self-reported their symptoms and were not blinded
	PY	The key outcomes such as headache pain and frequency were subjective and self-report in a diary, hence could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received	PY	The key outcomes such as headache severity and frequency are subjective and could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received	PY	The key outcomes such as headache pain and frequency were subjective and self-report in a diary, hence could have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan is available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan is available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan is available
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Study ID	Naji-Esfahani 2014		Sethi 1981		Talakad 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochra

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Cramer-2018		Ghati 2020		McCaffrey 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Paitents stratified by sex and divided by block randomisation into 3 groups.	Y	Randomised by computer-generated table of random numbers	Y	Participants were matched to groups using Zeller's minimized randomisation
	Y	Opaque envelopes containing study group were used	PY	Enrolled then randomised based on passage	NI	Not indicated
	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Despite differences in angiotension receptor blocker use randomisation process seems good.	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups
	Low		Low		Some concerns	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Cramer-2018		Ghati 2020		McCaffrey 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Y	Intent to treat	Y	Modified intent to treat	Y	Modified intent to treat
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	
	PN	6/75 (8%) participants were lost over the intervention. All groups sizes remained above the required number to generate significant results.	N	3/35 participants were lost over the intervention.	Y	5/27 from experimental group and 2/27 from control group.

Study ID	Cramer-2018		Ghati 2020		McCaffrey 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Missing values were multiply imputed by means of Markov Chain Monte Carlo procedure. This results in a total of 50 complete data sets that each contained full data for the 75 randomised participants.	Y	Incomplete/ missing data was removed as per analysis approach	Y	Incomplete/ missing data was removed
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Low	
	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	N	The person who acquired the data was not involved in patient recruitment, group allocation or intervention and was blinded to group allocation.	N	Data recorded was visually inspected off-line	Y	Yoga participants were measured following yoga session

Study ID	Cramer-2018		Ghati 2020		McCaffrey 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	N	No, assessment was objective measure
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Misra 2019		Mourya 2009		Murugesan 2000	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Used Excel random generator	PY	Random selection of group related slips	PY	Subjects were divided into three equal groups randomly'
	Y	For allocation concealment...participants listed on Excel spreadsheet and assigned to arm of study by staff member". Participants were then sent an email informing them of their assigned groups.	NI	Not indicated	NI	Not indicated
	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	PN	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Misra 2019		Mourya 2009		Murugesan 2000	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance).	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	NI	Not indicated
	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable
	N	22/45 dropped out of in-class yoga group. 19/56 dropped out of DVD yoga group. 10/32 subjects dropped out of control.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Modified intent to treat	Y	Modified Intent to treat	Y	Modified intent to treat
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	High		Low		Some concerns	
	Y	22/45 dropped out of in-class yoga group. 19/56 dropped out of DVD yoga group. 10/32 subjects dropped out of control.	Y	2/20 dropped out of the slow breathing group. 3/20 dropped out of the fast breathing group	NI	Not indicated

Study ID	Misra 2019		Mourya 2009		Murugesan 2000	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Incomplete/ missing data was removed however remaining data was below number required to provided 80% power when testing one-sided alternatives for group differences.	Y	Incomplete/ missing data was removed	N	No sensitivity analysis provided
	PY	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.
	PN	Missingness in data was related to allocation, no further drop outs were recorded in follow up.	NA	Not applicable.	NI	Not indicated
	Some concerns		Low		High	
	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	NI	Not indicated	N	Outcome assessors were not aware of intervention group of participants	NI	Not indicated

Study ID	Misra 2019		Mourya 2009		Murugesan 2000	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	No, assessment was objective measure	NA	Not applicable.	N	No, assessment was objective measure
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =
Source: Chapter 8 Cochran
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Patil 2014		Punita 2016		Pushpanathan 2015	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	Was mentioned that it was randomised	Y	Block randomization was used to generate allocation sequence,	Y	Block randomization was used to generate allocation sequence,
	NI	Not indicated	Y	Serially numbered opaque sealed envelope technique (SNOSE) was applied to allot the subjects either to the control group or to the yoga group after obtaining their written informed consent	Y	Serially numbered opaque sealed envelope technique (SNOSE) was applied to allot the subjects either to the control group or to the yoga group after obtaining their written informed consent
	PN	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	NI	Not indicated
	Some concerns		Low		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Patil 2014		Punita 2016		Pushpanathan 2015	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	All participants completed intervention however some were absent for post-investigation.	Y	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance).	Y	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	NA	Not applicable	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	Y	10/40 dropped out of the control group. 14/40 dropped out of yoga group.	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Modified intent to treat	Y	Modified intent to treat	Y	Modified intent to treat
	N	Not applicable	N	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
	Y	28/30 for the experimental group and 29/30 for the control group.	N	10/40 dropped out of the control group. 14/40 dropped out of yoga group.	PN	6/36 dropped out of the control group. 4/34 dropped out of yoga group.

Study ID	Patil 2014		Punita 2016		Pushpanathan 2015	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	NA	Not applicable	NA	Incomplete/ missing data was removed	N	Incomplete/ missing data was removed
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	
	py	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	py	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	N	No. 'Person's handling data analysis were kept blinded.'	NI	Not indicated	NI	Not indicated

Study ID	Patil 2014		Punita 2016		Pushpanathan 2015	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	NA	Not applicable.	N	No, assessment was objective measure	N	No, assessment was objective measure
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =
Source: Chapter 8 Cochran
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Saptharishi 2009		Shetty 2017		Sieverdes 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Standardised randomisation process, with a random number generator	Y	Randomization was accomplished by assigning each participant to a nonidentifying study identification (ID), randomly ordering the IDs, and then using a serial number generator to assign odd or even to each study ID.	PY	Students were enrolled after informed parental consent and child assent were obtained. The students were then randomly assigned by school administrators'
	NI	Not indicated	NI	Not indicated	NI	Not indicated
	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Saptharishi 2009		Shetty 2017		Sieverdes 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	Y	All participants completed at least 80% of all study visits	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Intent to treat	N	Per protocol	Y	Modified intent to treat
	NA	Not applicable	N	No, all participants were retained for the duration of the experiment.	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
	N	1/30, 1/28, 3/28 and 6/27 were lost to control, physical exercise, salt reduction and yoga.	Y	No participants lost to follow up	Y	Yes, only 2/16 lost to yoga and 1/15 lost to control group.

Study ID	Saptharishi 2009		Shetty 2017		Sieverdes 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	NI	Not indicated	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	PY	Missingness of the data considered to affect true value of the outcome. Droppouts not balanced between groups.	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	High		Low		Low	
	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	NI	Not indicated	Y	No, outcome assessors were blinded	NI	Not indicated

Study ID	Saptharishi 2009		Shetty 2017		Sieverdes 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	No, assessment was objective measure	N	Not applicable	N	No, assessment was objective measure
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Sriloy 2015		Sujatha 2014		Thanalakshmi 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	It is mentioned that participants are 'randomly divided' into two groups.	PY	238 [participants] were randomly allocated into two groups'	Y	Randomised using computerised random allocation software version 1.
	Y	Allocation concealment method using an opaque envelope.	NI	Not indicated	Y	Allocation concealment carried out using sequentially numbered, opaque sealed envelope method.
	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Srilooy 2015		Sujatha 2014		Thanalakshmi 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	N	100% commitment to yoga program	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Modified intent to treat	Y	Intent to treat	Y	Modified intent to treat
	N	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	
	PN	4/23 dropped out in slow breathing group and 5/23 dropped out of acupuncture group.	Y	100% commitment to yoga program	N	10/50 lost from yoga group and 8/50 lost from control group.

Study ID	Srilooy 2015		Sujatha 2014		Thanalakshmi 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Incomplete/ missing data was removed and missingness of data was balanced.	NA	Not applicable	Y	Incomplete data was imputed using last observation carried forward method.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	
	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	NI	Not indicated	NI	Not indicated	N	Investigator blinded to both the group participants, as an independent researcher delivered the pranayama intervention and assessed the HRV'

Study ID	Sriloy 2015		Sujatha 2014		Thanalakshmi 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	No, assessment was objective measure	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochran

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Thiyagarajan 2015		Tolbanos Roche 2014		Tolbanos Roche 2017	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Block randomisation method	PY	Systematic random sampling	PY	Systematic random sampling
	PY	Individuals allotted to their group using the serially numbered opaque sealed envelope technique.	PN	Patients assigned, then asked to consent.	PN	Patients assigned, then asked to consent.
	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	NI	Not indicated	NI	Not indicated
	Low		High		High	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Thiyagarajan 2015		Tolbanos Roche 2014		Tolbanos Roche 2017	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance).	Y	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance).	Y	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance).
	Y	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	Y	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	Y	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results
	Y	43/92 lost to LSM group and 41/92 lost to LSM+yoga group.	Y	15/25 lost to both groups	N	45/ 100 lost across study. 9/21 from HT group, 4/23 from Pranayama group, 8/22 from yoga group and 9/19 from control group.
	N	Per protocol	Y	Modified intent to treat	Y	Modified intent to treat
	Y	Almost 50% of participants were excluded from both groups	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	High		Some concerns		High	
	N	43/92 lost to LSM group and 41/92 lost to LSM+yoga group.	N	15/25 lost to both groups	N	45/ 100 lost across study. 9/21 from HT group, 4/23 from Pranayama group, 8/22 from yoga group and 9/19 from control group.

Study ID	Thiyagarajan 2015		Tolbanos Roche 2014		Tolbanos Roche 2017	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	No evidence provided	N	No evidence provided	N	No evidence provided
	PN	Yes, reasons for drop out include; lack of self-motivation and no immediate health benefits. None related to health concerns.	PY	Yes, reasons for drop out not provided.	PY	Yes, reasons for drop out not provided.
	NA	Not applicable	PN	A significant proportion of participants were lost to follow up which is likely to have influenced the final results . As drops out were even between both groups, it is unclear how this would impact the final results	N	A significant proportion of participants were lost to follow up which is likely to have influenced the final results
	Low		Some concerns		High	
	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	NI	Not indicated	N	Mix of Participant-reported outcomes and physiological measures	N	Mix of Participant-reported outcomes and physiological measures

Study ID	Thiyagarajan 2015		Tolbanos Roche 2014		Tolbanos Roche 2017	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	No, assessment was objective measure	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	NA	Not applicable	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochran

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Wolff 2016		Yadav 2012		Ankolekar 2019		Cohen 2011a
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer-generated random number schedule with block size of four	Y	Using a computer generated random table.	Y	Random sampling method	PY
	PY	To ensure allocation concealment, randomization to groups was undertaken by a research assistant not involved in recruitment... Randomization to study groups occurred after completion of baseline assessments and questionnaires.'	NI	Not indicated	NI	Not indicated	NI
	PN	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	NI	Not indicated	PN	Minimal baseline characteristics presented, however outcomes appear comparable at baseline	N
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y

Study ID	Wolff 2016		Yadav 2012		Ankolekar 2019		Cohen 2011a
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	N	No deviations from intended intervention reported	N	No deviations from intended intervention reported	Y
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	Y
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	N
	Y	Intent to treat	Y	Intent to treat	Y	Intent to treat	N
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	Y
	Low		Low		Low		High
	N	11/96 lost to follow up in yoga group whereas 9/95 lost to follow up in control group.	Y	No reported missing data	NI	No information on the rate of drop out in the trial.	N

Study ID	Wolff 2016		Yadav 2012		Ankolekar 2019		Cohen 2011a
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Incomplete/ missing data was removed, no differences between per protocol and intent to treat results	NA	Not applicable	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of any potentially missing outcome data.	N
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.	Y
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.	Y
	Low		Low		Some concerns		High
	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N
	N	Mix of Participant-reported outcomes and physiological measures	N	No, assessors were blinded to group allocation	N	Mix of Participant-reported outcomes and physiological measures	Y

Study ID	Wolff 2016		Yadav 2012		Ankolekar 2019		Cohen 2011a
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement
Bias in measurement of the outcome	Y	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	NA	Not applicable	Y	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	Y
	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	NA	Not applicable	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	N
	Some concerns		Low		Some concerns		Some concerns
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N
	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID		Cohen 2013		Hagins 2014	
	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Only mentions that cohorts were randomised not how they were randomised.	Y	Simple, blocked randomisation	Y	Coin tosses performed by primary investigator were used for sequence generation for treatment group assignment.
	Not indicated	Y	Yes, participants were provided with folder with necessary items for group following baseline testing.	Y	Sequential results were placed inside 90 opaque sealed envelopes numbered in advance and participants received these at random once completing pretest measures.
	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups
		Low		Low	
	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID		Cohen 2013		Hagins 2014	
	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance).	Y	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance).	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	Y	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results.	NA	Not applicable
	No, 20/43 lost to yoga group and 1/32 lost to control group	N	Yes, 27/43, 34/48 and 29/46 completed protocol for Yoga, BPEP and combo groups respectively.	NA	Not applicable
	Per protocol, participants who did not complete a requisite number of classes were excluded	Y	Both per protocol and ITT presented	Y	Modified intent to treat
	9/43 participants in the yoga group were excluded	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
		High		Low	
	No, 20/43 lost to yoga group and 1/32 lost to control group	N	No, 16/43, 14/48 and 17/46 dropped out of Yoga, BPEP and combo groups respectively.	N	9/45 lost to follow up in yoga group, 7/39 lost to follow up in exercise group.

Study ID		Cohen 2013		Hagins 2014	
	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	No sensitivity analysis performed	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.
	Reasons for drop out include adverse events and hence could depend on true value.	Y	Yes as reasons for drop out included removal due to not adhering to protocol criteria and for person reasons.	PY	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.
	Missingness of the data was considered to affect true value of the outcome as drop outs were not balanced	PY	Missingness of the data considered to affect true value of the outcome as drop outs were not balanced	N	Missingness of the data not considered to affect true value of the outcome as drop outs were balanced
		High		Some concerns	
	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Mix of Participant-reported outcomes and physiological measures	Y	Mix of Participant-reported outcomes and physiological measures	NI	Not indicated

Study ID		Cohen 2013		Hagins 2014	
	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	Y	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	N	No, outcomes being observed were physiological parameters and unable to be altered.
	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	NA	Not applicable
		Some concerns		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	Outcomes (psychological questionnaires) missing from those outlined in pre-specified analysis plan.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	NI	Variances between pre-specified analysis plan and final study report are not explained.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	ITT and per protocol analysis are both provided for transparency	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Bidwell 2012		Jiandani Mariya 2013		Malarvizhi 2019	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	No information provided. Authors state participants were 'randomly assigned' into intervention or control	Y	BINGO randomisation method was used to allocate participants into yoga or physiotherapy	Y	Computerised random allocation software used to assign either yoga or control. Performed by assessor not involved in the study.
	NI	No information provided about allocation concealment.	NI	No information provided about allocation concealment.	py	Randomisation performed by an author not part of the assessment.
	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated intervention	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff
	PN	No deviations from the trial protocol were reported.	N	No deviations from the trial protocol were reported.	PN	2 participants from yoga and 5 from control dropped out and were not included in analysis. Reasons for discontinuing not reported but are considered in line with what would occur in usual practice given the size and duration of the study.

Study ID	Bidwell 2012		Jiandani Mariya 2013		Malarvizhi 2019	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	Y	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.	PY	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.	PY	Analysis method not specified but modified ITT is interpreted. , excluding the participants who dropped out.
	NA		NA		NA	
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	It is likely that outcome data was available for nearly all participants. Possible that outcomes for one participant are missing, but this is unclear in the study report.	Y	Outcome data was available for all participants in yoga and physiotherapy groups.	PY	Outcome data available for participants who completed the study (yoga= 98%; control=96%)
	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	

Study ID	Bidwell 2012		Jiandani Mariya 2013		Malarvizhi 2019	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA		NA		NI	
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measures used	N	Validated outcome measures used	N	Validated outcome measures used
	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.
	Y	Some outcome measures were self reported and patients were aware of their allocated intervention. Blinding of outcome assessors for pulmonary outcomes is not reported.	Y	The study reports that the outcome assessor was not blind to intervention allocation. Participants who self-reported outcomes would also be aware of their intervention group.	Y	Investigator assessing outcome data was blinded to intervention groups, however the participants were not blinded and self-reported subjective outcomes.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	For objective outcomes (pulmonary function, breath holding time) it is not considered likely that the outcome assessor could bias the measurement.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.

Study ID	Bidwell 2012		Jiandani Mariya 2013		Malarvizhi 2019	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PY	There is no reason to believe that that patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention received.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No prespecified plan analysis was available	NI	No prespecified plan analysis was available	NI	No prespecified plan analysis was available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that multiple analysis of the data was conducted
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Manocha 2002		Mekonnen 2010		Prem 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Allocation to interventions were randomised by randomised permuted blocks with a block size of 4.	PY	No mention of randomisation method. Participants were randomly assigned into either treatment arm.	Y	Patients were assigned to 3 groups thorough block randomisation
	Y	Allocation for each successive subject was contained within a sealed envelope.	NI	No information provided. Authors state participants were 'randomly assigned' into yoga or control.	Y	Allocation sequence was concealed using sequentially numbered, opaque envelopes
	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	Participants were told about the nature of the intervention.	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated intervention	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated intervention
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff
	N	9 participants withdrew from yoga arm and 3 withdrew from control arm. Reasons for withdrawal listed in table and do not appear related to the trial context in most cases (1 withdrawal due to not liking the intervention).	N	No reported deviations. All participants completed intervention and were included in the analysis.	PN	No reported deviations. All participants completed intervention.

Study ID	Manocha 2002		Mekonnen 2010		Prem 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	Y	Authors specify intention to treat, but mITT is interpreted	Y	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.	N	Per protocol. Participants who did not comply with the exercise for >15% of sessions were excluded.
	NA		NA		PY	4/40 participants in the yoga breathing group were excluded. This was not balanced between groups.
	Low		Low		High	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Outcome data available for those who completed the study (yoga=70%, control=80%)	Y	Outcome data was available for all participants	PY	Outcome data was presented for almost all the participants (yoga=90%, Butekyo=97%, control=100%). All participants provided outcome data, but only data for 'completers' was presented.
	N	No analysis for missing data was presented	NA		N	No analysis to assess the impact of missing data was presented.
	PY	Missingness of the data considered possibly related to true value outcome	NA		PY	Reasons for non-attendance at sessions were not presented. It is not clear why the authors did not present outcome data for all participants.

Study ID	Manocha 2002		Mekonnen 2010		Prem 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	Missingness of the data could depend on its true value (differences between the proportion of missing data between groups and differing reasons for drop out)	NA		PN	It is not considered likely that missing outcome is related to the outcome.
	Some concerns	Concerns due to the rate of drop out in yoga arm	Low		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measures used. Diary cards used to track PEF rates, symptoms and bronchodilators)	PN	Validated outcome measures used. Diary entries used to express patient asthmatic experience.	N	Validated outcome measured were used.
	N	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between intervention groups.
	Y	Investigator assessing outcome data was blinded to intervention groups, however the participants were not blinded and self-reported subjective outcomes.	Y	Investigator assessing outcome data was blinded to intervention groups, however the participants were not blinded and self-reported subjective outcomes.	Y	Investigator assessing outcome data was blinded to intervention groups, however the participants were not blinded and self-reported subjective outcomes.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	Y	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	Y	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.

Study ID	Manocha 2002		Mekonnen 2010		Prem 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga and Butkyo groups would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No prespecified plan analysis was available	NI	No prespecified plan analysis was available	NI	No prespecified plan analysis was available
	N	All reported outcome measures were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Pushpa 2018		Agnihotri 2017		Raghavendra 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	The method of generating the randomisation sequence is not presented	Y	Computer generated random sequence	Y	Computer-based random number generator
	NI	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment
	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	PN	Minimal baseline characteristics presented but appear comparable between groups.	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated intervention	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated intervention
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff
	N	No reported deviations. All participants completed intervention and were included in the analysis.	PN	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants. Reasons for discontinuing not reported but are considered in line with what would occur in usual practice given the size and duration of the study.	N	No reported deviations. All participants completed intervention and were included in the analysis.

Study ID	Pushpa 2018		Agnihotri 2017		Raghavendra 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	Y	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.	Y	Analysis method not specified but modified ITT is interpreted.	Y	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.
	NA		NA		NA	
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Outcome data was available for all the participants	N	Outcome data was available for 84% of participants in the yoga group and 87% in the control group.	Y	Outcome data was available for all the participants
	NA		N	No mention of analysis methods to adjust for missing outcome data.	NA	
	NA		Y	Missingness in the outcome could plausibly be due to its true value if participants dropped out of the yoga group because they felt the intervention was not working.	NA	

Study ID	Pushpa 2018		Agnihotri 2017		Raghavendra 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA		PN	It is not considered likely that most patients would have dropped out due to the true value of the outcome.	NA	
	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns due to the rate of drop out and the lack of information regarding reasons for drop out or how missing data was handled.	Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measured were used.	N	Validated outcome measures were used	N	Validated outcome measured were used.
	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	NI	The authors do not report whether the outcome assessor was blinded to the intervention group	Y	Outcome measure was self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention.	NI	Blinding of outcome assessors is not reported
	PN	Outcomes were objective and unlikely to be biased by knowledge of the intervention.	Y	Participants in the yoga group could plausibly differentially report their outcomes if they signed up to the trial because of a belief in the effectiveness of yoga.	PN	Outcome is objective and unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention status

Study ID	Pushpa 2018		Agnihotri 2017		Raghavendra 2016	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA		PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	NA	
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No prespecified plan analysis was available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Sabina 2005		Saravanan 2019		Saxena 2009	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Author's state participants were randomised into control or treatment arm.	Y	Participants were randomised using a randomisation sequence generated on Excel	PY	Quasi-Random, alternate allocation
	Y	Allocations were in seal envelopes unavailable to outcome assessors	PY	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment	PY	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment
	PY	Some baseline characteristics were significantly different (FEV1/FVC and FEV25-75). Differences are not considered likely due to an issue with randomisation.	NI	Minimal baseline characteristics are presented. Baseline values for some of the outcomes appear better in the control group.	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants, however the study design was double masked with sham active control arm consisting of physiotherapy.	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated interintervention	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated interintervention
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding, however the study design was double masked with assessors unaware of treatment allocation to participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff
	PY	The only reported deviations are non-completion by some participants (27%). This is considered higher than what would occur in usual practice given the length of the trial.	N	No reported deviations	N	No reported deviations

Study ID	Sabina 2005		Saravanan 2019		Saxena 2009	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	PY	Due to the number of deviations and the lack of information regarding missingness, it is possible that the outcome may be biased.	NA		NA	
	PN	Substantially more discontinuations in the control group.	NA		NA	
	Y	Authors specify ITT	Y	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.	Y	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.
	NA		NA		N	
	High		Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	6/29 (20.7%) in yoga and 11/33 (33.3%) in control lost to followup	Y	Outcome data was available for all participants.	Y	Outcome data was available for all participants.
	N	No mention of analysis methods to adjust for missing outcome data.	NA		NA	
	Y	Missingness in the outcome could plausibly be due to its true value if participants dropped out of the yoga group because they felt the intervention was not working.	NA		NA	

Study ID	Sabina 2005		Saravanan 2019		Saxena 2009	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PN	It is not considered likely that most patients would have dropped out due to the true value of the outcome.	NA		NA	
	Some concerns	Concerns due to the rate of drop out	Low		Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measured were used.	N	Validated outcome measured were used.	N	Validated outcome measured were used.
	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	PN	Investigator assessing outcome data was blinded to intervention groups (double-masked) and participants were blinded to whether they were receiving the active intervention or the 'sham' placebo.	NI	Blinding of outcome assessors is not reported	NI	Blinding of outcome assessors is not reported
	NA		PN	Outcome is objective and unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention status	PN	Outcome is objective and unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention status

Study ID	Sabina 2005		Saravanan 2019		Saxena 2009	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA		NA		NA	
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	Pre-specified analysis mentioned	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Sodhi 2009		Turan 2020		Yuce 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	No mention of the randomisation sequence generation	Y	Simple random numbers table	Y	Simple random sampling was used. Double blocks were formed according to the features of the categorized patients
	PY	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment	PY	Allocation for each subject was contained within a sealed envelope written by researcher not involved in the study
	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	PN	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated interintervention	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated interintervention	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated interintervention. The control intervention received relaxation therapy in an attempt to mask participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff
	N	No reported deviations	PN	The only reported deviations were reported as non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice given the nature of the intervention.	PN	The only reported deviations were reported as non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice given the nature of the intervention.

Study ID	Sodhi 2009		Turan 2020		Yuce 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	Y	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.	Y	Analysis method not specified but modified ITT is interpreted.	Y	Analysis method not specified but modified ITT is interpreted.
	N		N		N	
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Outcome data was available for all participants.	Y	Outcome data available for participants who had completed the study (yoga=93% and control=93%).	PN	Outcome data available for participants who had completed the study (yoga=93% and control=89%).
	NA		NA		N	No analysis examining the impact of missing outcome data was presented.
	NA		NA		PY	Missingness could plausibly be due to the outcome if participants discontinued due to perceptions of no effect

Study ID	Sodhi 2009		Turan 2020		Yuce 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA		NA		N	There is no evidence to suggest that missingness was related to the true value of the outcome
	Low		Low		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measured were used.	N	Validated outcome measured were used.	N	Validated outcome measured were used.
	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	NI	Blinding of outcome assessors is not reported	PY	The authors do not report on whether the outcome assessor for objective outcomes was blinded. Participants who self-reported subjective outcome measures were aware of their intervention group.	PY	The authors do not report on whether the outcome assessor for objective outcomes was blinded. Participants who self-reported subjective outcome measures were aware of their intervention group.
	PN	Outcome is objective and unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention status	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.

Study ID	Sodhi 2009		Turan 2020		Yuce 2020	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	NA		PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Agnihotri 2013		Satpathy 2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	Computer-generated random number table	Y	Authors do not state randomisation methods.
	NI	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not comment on allocation concealment
	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups
	Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated interintervention	Y	Nature of intervention meant participants were aware of their allocated interintervention
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff
	PN	The only reported deviations were reported as non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in usual practice given the nature of the intervention.	N	No reported deviations

Study ID	Agnihotri 2013		Satpathy 2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
intervention [ITT]	NA		NA	
	NA		NA	
	Y	Analysis method not specified but modified ITT is interpreted.	Y	Analysis method not specified but ITT is interpreted.
	N		N	
	Low		Low	
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Outcome data available for participants who had completed the study. 12.7% dropped from the study and were not included in the analysis.	Y	Outcome data was available for all participants.
	N	No analysis examining the impact of missing outcome data was presented.	NA	
	PY	Missingness could plausibly be due to the outcome if participants discontinued due to perceptions of no effect	NA	

Study ID	Agnihotri 2013		Satpathy 2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	N	There is no evidence to suggest that missingness was related to the true value of the outcome	NA	
	Low		Low	
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Validated outcome measured were used.	N	Validated outcome measured were used.
	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	PY	The authors do not report on whether the outcome assessor for objective outcomes was blinded. Participants who self-reported subjective outcome measures were aware of their intervention group.	NI	The authors do not report on whether the outcome assessor was blinded to intervention.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PN	The outcome measure is objective and unlikely to be biased by knowledge of the intervention group.

Study ID	Agnihotri 2013		Satpathy 2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	NA	
	Some concerns		Low	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

	Chronic pain		Chronic pain		Chronic pain	
Study ID	Carson 2010		Flehr 2019		Khan 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random number table, generated by someone not involved in the study.	Y	Random number table in Excel	NI	The method of randomisation was not specified.
	Y	Assignments were concealed in envelopes and not opened until after the baseline assessment.	Y	Allocation took place at recruitment, random number table maintained by someone who was blind to which activity each number represented.	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment.
	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appeared comparable between groups	NI	Baseline characteristics are not presented.
	Low		Low		High	lack of information on the randomisation process and insufficient baseline characteristics
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants, however both arms of the study were presented as the experimental arm so participants were not aware of the aim of the study.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of carers and staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding, however both arms of the study were presented as the experimental arm so instructors were not aware of the aim of the study.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.

Study ID	Carson 2010		Flehr 2019		Khan 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is not expected to be due to the trial context.	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is not expected to be due to the trial context.	NI	No deviations from the trial protocol were reported.
	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	Y	Intention to treat analysis is specified.	PY	Intention to treat analysis is specified, however mITT was used as two participants were excluded (one from each treatment arm) who dropped out after randomisation before collection of baseline characteristics.	NI	No information on the method of analysis was provided.
	NA		NA		NI	No information provided on the number of participants who may have been affected by failing to analyse patients appropriately.
	Low		Low		High	lack of information provided on potential protocol deviations and the method of analysis.

Study ID	Carson 2010		Flehr 2019		Khan 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	PN	Outcome data was available for 48/53 participants (90.6%)	PY	Outcome data is analysed for 32/34 participants.	NI	No information on the rate of drop out in the trial.
	N	LOCF should not be assumed to correct for missing outcome data. No sensitivity analyses presented.	NA		N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of any potentially missing outcome data.
	PY	It is possible that missingness could relate to the true value of the outcome.	NA		NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.
	N	It is not considered likely that missingness is related to the outcome, as reasons for drop out are provided in the study.	NA		NI	No information regarding the extent of missing outcome data or reasons for missingness.
	Some concerns	Some concerns relating to the proportion of missing outcome data, not considered likely to be related to the outcome.	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided on potential drop out.
	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measures were used.	NI	No information on the tools used to measure outcome.

Study ID	Carson 2010		Flehr 2019		Khan 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	NI	No information on the tools used to measure outcome, or whether this was the same between groups.
	Y	Most outcome measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention.	Y	Most outcome measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention.	Y	Outcomes were self-reported and patients were aware of their intervention allocation.
	Y	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PN	As participants were not aware of which arm was the 'intervention' participants are not considered to differentially report their outcomes.	Y	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.
	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	NA		Y	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Low		Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.

Study ID	Carson 2010		Flehr 2019		Khan 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

	Chronic pain		Osteoarthritis		Osteoarthritis	
Study ID	Schmid 2018		Bedekar 2012		Cheung 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random number generator.	N	Alternate allocation	Y	Computer-generated random numbers
	PY	Assessor blinded to allocation assisted with baseline assessments.	PN	Given the alternate allocation method, it is likely that the allocation sequence was not concealed	PY	Research assistant who enrolled participants was blinded to the group assignment. The primary investigator randomised participants
	PN	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups, but the sample does not include all patients randomised to yoga, only those who completed the intervention.	PY	Only one baseline characteristic is available, which numerically favoured the intervention group.	N	Baseline characteristics are comparable between intervention groups
	Low	Minor concerns due to the missing patients in the baseline characteristics	High	lack of allocation concealment, quasirandomisation and insufficient baseline characteristics	Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.

Study ID	Schmid 2018		Bedekar 2012		Cheung 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	N	Per protocol analysis was used.	PY	Modified intention to treat is interpreted. Participants lost to follow up were excluded. It is unclear whether the participants who dropped out were included in the baseline characteristics.	Y	Intention to treat is specified and conducted.
	Y	A large portion of patients were excluded from the analysis in the yoga group (36%)	NA		NA	
	High	High risk due to inappropriate method of analysis	Low		Low	

Study ID	Schmid 2018		Bedekar 2012		Cheung 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	A large portion of patients were excluded from the analysis in the yoga group (36%).	Y	Outcome data was missing for 4/51 participants (7.8%).	Y	One participant in the control group withdrew due to family obligations
	N	No analysis was conducted to assess the impact of not including these participants.	NA		NA	
	Y	No reason for drop out was provided for half of the participants (8/16) with a further 3/16 not liking yoga.	NA		NA	
	Y	It is considered likely that those who do not attend sufficient classes do not believe the intervention is working. This is likely to be linked with the true value of the outcome. There were no drop outs in the control group.	NA		NA	
	High	large proportion of participants with missing outcome data.	Low		Low	
	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.

Study ID	Schmid 2018		Bedekar 2012		Cheung 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	Y	Most outcome measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention.	Y	Outcome measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention.	Y	Primary outcome measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.
	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.

Study ID	Schmid 2018		Bedekar 2012		Cheung 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	PY	It is unclear why the pain and stiffness subscales were combined into a single measure. It is plausible that this occurred due to multiple analyses of the data.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

	Osteoarthritis		Osteoarthritis		Osteoarthritis	
Study ID	Cheung 2016		Deepeshwar 2018		Ebnezar 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer-generated random numbers	PN	"Systematic sampling method"	Y	Computer generated random numbers
	Y	Group assignment was placed in a sealed envelope and distributed to participants after baseline data was collected	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	Y	Sealed, numbered envelopes used to conceal sequence
	N	Baseline characteristics are comparable between intervention groups	N	Baseline characteristics are comparable between intervention groups	PN	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between intervention groups. A number of outcome variables are missing baseline data.
	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns due to the systematic method of randomisation	Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.

Study ID	Cheung 2016		Deepeshwar 2018		Ebnezar 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	N	The were no reported deviations from the protocol.	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	Y	Intention to treat is specified and conducted.	Y	Intention to treat is interpreted.	Y	Modified intention to treat is interpreted, with participants who withdrew from the study excluded from the final analysis.
	NA		NA		NA	
	Low		Low		Low	

Study ID	Cheung 2016		Deepeshwar 2018		Ebnezar 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	10 participants (12%) withdrew prior to completion of the study.	Y	No missing data.	Y	Outcome data is available for 235/250 participants (94%).
	N	LOCF should not be assumed to correct for missing outcome data. No sensitivity analyses presented.	NA		NA	
	PY	Reasons for drop out are provided, with a number of participants dropping out due to falls or leg pain which could plausibly be related to the outcome.	NA		NA	
	PN	Drop outs balanced between groups	NA		NA	
	Some concerns		Low		Low	
	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.

Study ID	Cheung 2016		Deepeshwar 2018		Ebnezar 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	Y	Primary outcome measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention.	N	Blinded assessor is specified.	Y	Quality of life measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention. Clinician graded outcomes were conducted by a blinded researcher.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	NA		PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.
	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	NA		PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Low		Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.

Study ID	Cheung 2016		Deepeshwar 2018		Ebnezar 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

	Osteoarthritis		Osteoarthritis		Osteoarthritis	
Study ID	Kuntz 2016		McCaffrey 2019		Park 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer generated random numbers	Y	Computer generated random numbers	PN	No mention of the randomisation sequence. The study included an education control group who were not randomised.
	Y	Opaque envelopes to conceal sequence	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment
	N	Baseline characteristics are comparable between intervention groups	N	Baseline characteristics are comparable between intervention groups	PY	Baseline characteristics between intervention groups are difficult to interpret and inconsistently reported.
	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided regarding the allocation concealment process	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information provided regarding the randomisation process, and minimal baseline characteristics presented
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.

Study ID	Kuntz 2016		McCaffrey 2019		Park 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	N	No reported deviations.	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	NA		NA		NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	Y	Per-protocol analysis was performed, with one participant in the yoga group being excluded from the analysis due to a flare up of a pre-existing condition. No sensitivity analysis to assess the impact of this exclusion was presented.	Y	Intention to treat is interpreted.	Y	Modified ITT is interpreted, with participants who dropped out of the study being excluded from the analysis.
	PN	It is not considered likely that this exclusion would significantly alter the results.	NA		NA	
	Some concerns	Some concerns arising from the inappropriate exclusion of one participant.	Low		Low	

Study ID	Kuntz 2016		McCaffrey 2019		Park 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Outcome data is available for 30/31 participants.	Y	None of the participants dropped out of the program.	N	8 participants dropped out (28%), and are not included in the analysis.
	NA		NA		N	No analysis to assess the impact of missing outcome data is presented.
	NA		NA		Y	Reasons for drop out are not reported for most participants. Drop outs could plausibly be related to the intervention or the outcome.
	NA		NA		PY	One participant in the yoga group dropped out because the yoga increased back pain. Reasons for drop out are not presented for other participants.
	Low		Low		High	High risk due to the large proportion of missing outcome data, and the lack of analysis presented to measure the impact of this.
	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.

Study ID	Kuntz 2016		McCaffrey 2019		Park 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	Y	Quality of life, pain and self-reported physical function measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention. Clinician graded outcomes were conducted by a blinded researcher.	Y	Pain and physical function measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention. Clinician graded outcomes were conducted by a blinded researcher.	Y	Outcome measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.
	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.

Study ID	Kuntz 2016		McCaffrey 2019		Park 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

	Osteoarthritis		Rheumatoid arthritis		Rheumatoid arthritis	
Study ID	Park 2016		Bhandari 2009		Evans 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer generated random number sequence	PN	No mention of the randomisation sequence	Y	Computer generated block randomisation
	PY	Independent statistician and allocation concealment mentioned	PY	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment
	N	No significant differences in baseline characteristics are reported	N	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups	PN	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups. Some differences were noted (e.g. duration of RA) however this is not considered to reflect an issue with randomisation
	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns relating to the lack of information provided regarding the randomisation and allocation concealment processes	Some concerns	Some concerns relating to the lack of information on allocation concealment
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.

Study ID	Park 2016		Bhandari 2009		Evans 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	6 participants in the control group dropped out due to not wanting to be in the control group.	N	No deviations from the trial protocol were reported.	N	The only deviations from the intervention were not completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in routine practice.
	Y	Those remaining in each group are more likely to be motivated to participate in the intervention.	NA		NA	
	N	More drop outs prior to the intervention period in the control group (n=11) compared to the yoga group (n=2).	NA		NA	
	Y	Modified ITT is interpreted, with participants who dropped out of the study being excluded from the analysis. One analysis was conducted per protocol, with Hispanic participants who completed the English intervention being excluded from the analysis.	Y	ITT analysis is interpreted	Y	mITT analysis is interpreted
	PN		NA		NA	
	High	High risk due to the large and uneven proportion of drop outs between the intervention groups that may be related to the trial context	Low		Low	

Study ID	Park 2016		Bhandari 2009		Evans 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	19 participants did not complete the intervention as allocated (14.5%).	Y	None of the participants dropped out of the program.	N	Outcome data is missing for 4/30 (13.3%) of participants.
	N	No analysis to assess the impact of missing outcome data is presented. Missing Value Analysis is specified but not presented.	NA		PN	The study reports no significant difference between drop outs and those who completed the study. No analysis was presented to assess the impact of any missing outcome data.
	Y	6 participants in the control group dropped out due to not wanting to be in the control group prior to commencing the intervention, and 1 participant in the yoga group dropped out due to disinterest after the intervention had commenced. Those remaining could plausibly be more invested in the intervention working.	NA		PY	It is considered possible that drop outs could have occurred due to the true value of the outcome.
	Y	It is considered likely that the differential drop out could influence the true value of the outcome.	NA		N	Reasons for drop out are provided, and do not appear to be related to the outcome.
	High	High risk due to the large and differential proportion of missing outcome data, and the lack of analysis presented to measure the impact of this.	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns relating to the proportion of missing outcome data and the lack of analysis presented to assess the impact of missingness
	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.

Study ID	Park 2016		Bhandari 2009		Evans 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	Y	Most outcome measures were self-reported, and participants were aware of their allocation to the yoga intervention. Clinician graded outcomes were conducted by a blinded researcher.	Y	For self-reported outcome measures, the participants were aware of their allocation intervention. The authors did not report on blinding of outcome measurement for clinical outcomes.	Y	For self-reported outcome measures, the participants were aware of their allocation intervention. Clinical outcomes were graded by a blinded physician.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.
	Y	It is considered likely that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered likely that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes. Participants were told during yoga classes that certain postures were designed to improve their symptoms.
	High	The differential rate of drop out due in the control group signifies a clear belief in the effectiveness of the intervention, that is considered likely to bias reporting of results.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	High	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.

Study ID	Park 2016		Bhandari 2009		Evans 2011	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	N	Published results do not align with statistical methods pre-specified in the study protocol.
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	Y	Presented results appear to be selected from multiple subscales of outcome measures.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		High	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

	Rheumatoid arthritis		Rheumatoid arthritis		Rheumatoid arthritis	
Study ID	Ganesan 2020		Gautam 2019		Ward 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer generated simple randomisation method	Y	Computer generated permuted block randomisation	Y	Computer generated block randomisation
	Y	Allocation concealment using sealed opaque envelopes	Y	Allocation concealment using sealed opaque envelopes	Y	Allocation concealment using sealed opaque envelopes
	N	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups	N	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups
	Low		Low		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.

Study ID	Ganesan 2020		Gautam 2019		Ward 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	The only deviations from the intervention were not completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in routine practice.	PY	One participant was withdrawn from the study by the PI for disruptive behaviour. The only other deviations from the intervention were not completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in routine practice.	PN	The only deviations from the intervention were not completion by one participant. This is considered in line with what would occur in routine practice.
	NA		N	It is not considered likely that the withdrawal of a single participant would influence the outcome.	NA	
	NA		NA		NA	
	Y	mITT analysis is interpreted	Y	ITT analysis is specified	Y	mITT analysis is interpreted
	NA		NA		NA	
	Low		Low		Low	

Study ID	Ganesan 2020		Gautam 2019		Ward 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	23 participants were lost to follow up (13.9%)	N	10/72 (13.9%) of participants were lost to follow up.	Y	Outcome data was missing from 1 participant in the control group due to hospitalisation.
	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of missing data. No reasons for drop out were provided	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of missing data. Reasons for drop out were provided	NA	
	PY	It is considered possible that drop outs could have occurred due to the true value of the outcome. More drop outs occurred in the yoga group (n=15) compared to the control group (n=8).	PY	It is considered possible that drop outs could have occurred due to the true value of the outcome.	NA	
	PY	No reasons for drop outs are provided, with the proportion of missing data different between the intervention groups.	PN	Reasons for withdrawal are provided. It is not considered likely that these would be related to the outcome.	NA	
	High	High risk due to the high and differential rate of missing data between the intervention groups	Some concerns	Some concerns due to the proportion of missing data	Low	
	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.	N	Validated outcome measurement used.

Study ID	Ganesan 2020		Gautam 2019		Ward 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	Y	For self-reported outcome measures, the participants were aware of their allocation intervention. No information provided regarding blinding for clinician graded assessments.	Y	Primary outcome measures are objective and unable to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention. Patient-reported outcomes would be aware of their intervention group.	Y	For self-reported outcome measures, the participants were aware of their allocation intervention. Clinician graded outcomes were performed by blinded assessors.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups. If investigators were aware of intervention group, it is plausible that they would differentially measure outcomes.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.
	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Low	Some concerns for the patient reported outcomes.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.

Study ID	Ganesan 2020		Gautam 2019		Ward 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	Y	Study protocol available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

	Rheumatoid arthritis or osteoarthritis	
Study ID	Moonaz 2015	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Web based randomiser
	Y	Allocation concealment using sealed opaque envelopes
	PN	Baseline characteristics between groups are comparable, with the exception of age where yoga patients are significantly younger. This is not considered reflective of an issue with the randomisation process.
	Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of staff and carers.

Study ID	Moonaz 2015	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PN	The only deviations from the intervention were not completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in routine practice.
	NA	
	NA	
	Y	mITT analysis is interpreted
	NA	
	Low	

Study ID	Moonaz 2015	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Outcome data was missing for 22/75 (29.3%) of participants.
	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of missing data. Reasons for drop out were provided
	PY	It is considered possible that drop outs could have occurred due to the true value of the outcome.
	PY	Reasons for drop out do not appear to be related to the intervention. Drop out rates are not balanced between groups, with substantially more drop outs in the yoga group.
	High	Some concerns relating to the proportion of missing data.
	N	Validated outcome measurement used.

Study ID	Moonaz 2015	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	N	Outcomes were measured with the same instruments and time points between both intervention groups.
	Y	For self-reported outcome measures, the participants were aware of their allocation intervention. Clinician graded outcomes were performed by blinded assessors.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.
	PY	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.

Study ID	Moonaz 2015	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Aboagye 2015		Highland 2018		Cox 2010a	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	A block randomisation was utilised using the pre-randomisation technique and participants were picked consecutively by a research assistant	Y	A computerised random number generator produced the randomisation table	Y	Patient randomised using computer generated random number by independent data manager
	Y	During the assignment of study participants to intervention groups, assessors (those collecting outcome data) were blinded to group allocation and the patients were blinded with respect to other intervention options	Y	Participants opened presealed envelopes labeled with the sequential enrollment number containing group assignment.	Y	Patients knew their allocation when completing the baseline questionnaire. Carried out by independent data manager
	PY	Participants in the exercise therapy and self-care advice groups had higher mean EQ-5D scores at baseline than did individuals in the medical yoga group	N	No significant differences at baseline in sex, military status, age, past 24hr pain, radiating back pain/ constant back pain, leg/foot weakness or symptom burden between treatment groups. Intervention vs comaprator has same size	PN	Despite differences between groups there was no suggestion that this was a result of randomisation process
	Some concerns		Low		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Aboagye 2015		Highland 2018		Cox 2010a	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PN	None reported.	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	PY	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance)
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable	N	More participants did not complete the intervention due to reasons which may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance) when compared to the control groups.
	Y	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis	Y	Intent-to-treat	Y	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable	N	Not applicable
	Some concerns		Low		High	

Study ID	Aboagye 2015		Highland 2018		Cox 2010a	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	The response rate for the 3 follow-up periods after the baseline assessment was 89% for medical yoga, 69% for exercise therapy and 63% for self-care advice.	PN	Some missing data, given small cohort it may infer bias	PN	50% drop out rate for intervention compared to 20% for usual care group
	PN	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.	Y	GLMM handles missing data without imputation or case removal	PN	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.
	PY	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.	NA	Not applicable	PY	Differential response rates for intervention were 60% whereas comparator was 90%
	PY	Missingness of the data considered to affect true value of the outcome. Dropouts not balanced between groups.	NA	Not applicable	PY	Missingness of the data considered to affect true value of the outcome. Dropouts not balanced between groups.
	High		Low		High	
Bias in measurement of	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	Participant-reported outcomes	Y	Participant-reported outcomes

Study ID	Aboagye 2015		Highland 2018		Cox 2010a	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	Outcome not mentioned in methods was reported in results (current low back pain) and outcome mentioned in methods was not reported in results (days spent in bed). No protocol available.
	PN	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	PN	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	PY	Addition of results not mentioned in methods
	PN	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	PN	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N :

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Cox 2010b		Demirel 2019		Galantino, 2004	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	The randomisation sequence was computer generated by an independent data manager and was stratified by participants' prespecified availability to attend yoga classes from a list of classes available	NI	Randomisation sequence not specified.	PY	Assignment determined using sequential random numbers
	PY	Eligible participants' details were entered into a randomization database by the trial coordinators and secretary, who were blinded to the allocation sequence. No details around concealment.	Y	Allocation concealed within sealed envelopes	NI	No details around concealment
	PN	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	PN	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	PY	Beck depression inventory was substantially higher in control group.
	Low		Some concerns		High	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Cox 2010b		Demirel 2019		Galantino, 2004	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	N	Treatment retention was high and drop outs that occurred had valid reasons	Y	6/11 control participants lost to follow up
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	PY	Trial context led to failure to implement the protocol interventions as drop out followed baseline measurements
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	N	More participants did not complete the control due to reasons which may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance) when compared to the treatment groups
	Y	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis	Y	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis	Y	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		High	

Study ID	Cox 2010b		Demirel 2019		Galantino, 2004	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	There were missing data for the primary outcome (yoga group, n=21; usual care group, n=18) and differential missing data (more in the yoga group) for secondary outcomes.	Y	Participants that dropped out had data excluded. Enrolled patients above required number to acquire 90% power at an alpha level of 0.05	N	6/11 lost to control group at post treatment measurements
	Y	Sensitivity analyses for best/worst-case scenario were carried out.	NA	Not applicable	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	PY	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	PY	Missingness of the data considered to affect true value of the outcome. Dropouts not balanced between groups.
	Low		Low		High	
Bias in measurement of	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	Participant-reported outcomes	Y	Participant-reported outcomes	Y	Participant-reported outcomes

Study ID	Cox 2010b		Demirel 2019		Galantino, 2004	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	PN	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	PN	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N :

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Groessl, 2016		Jacobs, 2004		Kim, 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	The binary non-stratified randomization sequence was computer generated, at a 1:1 allocation ratio in blocks of 10 participants to facilitate balanced group assignment	PY	Random number generator used	PY	"Participants were randomly separated into two groups"
	Y	Participants assigned to group post baseline assessment	PY	Allocation by co-ordinator according to a pre-established randomization list.	NI	No details around concealment
	PN	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups	N	No significant differences between groups
	Low		Low		Some concerns	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Groessl, 2016		Jacobs, 2004		Kim, 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PN	28/76 (34%) participants did not complete the yoga intervention.	PN	Data collection for 3 month time interval was completed by 84% of all participants without differences between groups.	NI	Not indicated
	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	N	Drop out in yoga group was higher than control group.	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Intent to treat	NI	No analysis of treatment vs comparator provided	Y	Intent to treat
	NA	Not applicable	NI	Not reported as there were no results to discuss	NA	Not applicable
	High		High		Some concerns	

Study ID	Groessl, 2016		Jacobs, 2004		Kim, 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	21/75 lost to follow up at 6 months for treatment group	N	No, data collection was completed for 84% of all participants	PY	No missing data mentioned
	Y	"Attrition was also higher than expected in the current study, but did not exceed suggested guidelines, at which bias is more likely"	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in measurement of	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	Participant-reported outcomes	Y	Participant-reported outcomes	Y	Participant-reported outcomes

Study ID	Groessl, 2016		Jacobs, 2004		Kim, 2014	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan	PN	No protocol available. Some primary and secondary outcomes were mentioned in the study report and not included in the outcome file (e.g. drug usage for back pain, biological markers of stress, and healthcare utilization).	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	NA	Not applicable	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	NA	Not applicable	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N :

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Monro, 2015		Nambi, 2014		Neyaz, 2019	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Computer-generated random number table	Y	Random number generating table	Y	Pregenerated randomised sequence
	Y	Participants were given number at random, number written on piece of paper and mixed manually and placed in two boxes. Individuals in box A were given yoga intervention and Individuals in box B were assigned to standard care.	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	Y	Opaque sealed envelopes were used to conceal the allocation.
	PN	Baseline characteristics were similar between groups in Monro and Telles(a). In Telles, 2016(b) variances in respiratory rate was significant between groups which may have inferred bias	N	No significant differences between groups at baseline	N	No significant differences between groups at baseline
	Low		Some concerns		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	PY	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	PY	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Monro, 2015		Nambi, 2014		Neyaz, 2019	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	Y	Drop out rate was consistent across classesThe only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance)	N	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	PY	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance)
	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's result	NA	Not applicable	Y	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's result
	Y	Drop out rate was consistent across groups	NA	Not applicable	Y	In yoga group 15 lost to 6 week follow up and 3 lost to 12 week follow up. In exercise group 12 lost to 6 week follow up and 5 lost to 12 week follow up.
	Y	Intent to treat	Y	Modified intent-to-treat, participants who discontinued intervention were excluded from the analysis	Y	Intent to treat
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	

Study ID	Monro, 2015		Nambi, 2014		Neyaz, 2019	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	12/30 of those in yoga group didn't follow up and 9/31 of those in control didn't follow up. In Telles, 2016 (a) 22 patients were unable to make post assessments but they were lost pre randomisation	N	4/30 lost to yoga group and 2/30 lost to exercise group.	N	In yoga group 15 lost to 6 week follow up and 3 lost to 12 week follow up. In exercise group 12 lost to 6 week follow up and 5 lost to 12 week follow up.
	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.	N	None reported	N	None reported
	NA	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.	PN	Valid reasons were provided for participants that dropped out.	PY	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.
	NA	Rate of drop out is similar between groups. Considered unlikely to seriously impact the result.	NA	Not applicable	PN	As drops out were even between both groups, it is unlikely this would impact the final results
	Some concerns		Low		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	PY	Participant-reported outcomes	PY	Participant-reported outcomes	PY	Participant-reported outcomes

Study ID	Monro, 2015		Nambi, 2014		Neyaz, 2019	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	N	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	PY	Two methods of analysis, intent to treat and per protocol were used and it is unclear which results judgements are made on.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		High	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N :

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Patil, 2018		PushpikaAttanayake, 2010		Saper. 2009	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random number generator used	PY	Only information about randomisation methods is a statement that the study is randomized.	Y	Used computer-generated permuted block randomisation
	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	NI	Details about concealing allocation sequence not reported. It is possible the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation.	Y	Treatment assignments were placed in opaque, sequentially numbered envelopes
	N	No significant differences between groups at baseline	NI	Only demographic data provided	N	No statistically significant differences between groups at baseline were observed.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Patil, 2018		PushpikaAttanayake, 2010		Saper. 2009	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	100% retention rate across both groups	N	100% retention rate across both groups	PN	97% retention rate at 12 weeks. 1 person discontinued yoga intervention due to worsening back pain
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	Intent to treat	Y	Intent to treat	Y	modified intent to treat
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	

Study ID	Patil, 2018		PushpikaAttanayake, 2010		Saper. 2009	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	Yes 100% retention rate, no drop outs	Y	Yes 100% retention rate	Y	Yes 97% retention at 12 weeks.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in measurement of	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	PY	Participant-reported outcomes	PY	Participant-reported outcomes	PY	Participant-reported outcomes

Study ID	Patil, 2018		PushpikaAttanayake, 2010		Saper. 2009	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	PY	Full reporting of results is not shown, only whether results are statistically significant or not.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		High		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N :

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Saper, 2014		Sherman 2005		Sherman 2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Staff entered participants into StudyTRAX (ScienceTrax), a data management platform. StudyTRAX generated a randomization sequence using permuted block randomization with varying block sizes and a 2:2:1 ratio of yoga, PT, and education.	Y	Randomly generated treatment assignments for each class series by using a computer program with block sizes of 6 or 9	Y	Treatment assignments were generated by a statistician (A.J.C.) using R software, version 2.10.11 with random block sizes of 5 or 10,
	PY	Participants were informed of group following baseline surveys by staff.	Y	placed the assignments in opaque, sequentially numbered envelopes, which were stored in a locked filing cabinet until needed for randomization.	PY	embedded in the computer-assisted telephone interviewing program by a programmer (K.D.) to be inaccessible by study staff prior to randomization.
	PY	Baseline mean between-group differences were present for RMDQ, sex, and body mass index	N	No statistically significant differences between groups at baseline were observed.	PN	Baseline characteristics were well balanced across groups, except the yoga group had greater back dysfunction
	Some concerns		Low		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Saper, 2014		Sherman 2005		Sherman 2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	PN	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Y	modified intent to treat	Y	intent to treat	Y	intent to treat
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	

Study ID	Saper, 2014		Sherman 2005		Sherman 2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	Follow-up was lower in PT than in yoga or education at 12 weeks (88% vs. 98% and 95%, respectively) and 52 weeks (84% vs. 93% and 93%, respectively).	Y	All data required at 12 weeks was available	N	5/92 and 5/91 declined follow up in yoga and exercise group respectively.
	PY	For primary outcomes analysis imputation was used whereas in secondary outcomes last observation was carried forward	NA	Not applicable	Y	sensitivity analysis applying a nonignorable imputation approach to handle missing data confirmed conclusions
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	Low		Low		Low	
Bias in measurement of	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	N	Participant-reported outcomes	N	Participant-reported outcomes	N	Participant-reported outcomes

Study ID	Saper, 2014		Sherman 2005		Sherman 2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	Degree of restricted activity data not reported. 12 week data for symptom bothersomeness score not determined.	Y	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N :

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Tekur, 2008		Teut, 2016		Williams, 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Participants allotted to 2 groups, experimental and control, by a computer-generated random number table	Y	Randomisation was carried out using the ranuni function of SAS software.	Y	Subjects were randomized to control or yoga groups using a random number generating program from JMP 4.0 statistical software
	PY	Numbered containers used to implement the random allocation to conceal sequence until interventions were assigned.	Y	The group allocation was then revealed to the participants. The group allocation could not be changed or deleted, which ensured allocation concealment.	NI	No details around concealment
	N	No statistically significant differences between groups at baseline were observed.	N	No statistically significant differences between groups at baseline were observed.	Y	"Higher functional ability on the Back Pain Self-Efficacy Scale (P=0.005), lower catastrophizing as a coping strategy (P=0.007), and less perceived disability (P=0.002) and harm (P=0.02) on the Survey of Pain Attitudes by the yoga group compared to the control group."
	Low		Low		High	
	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Tekur, 2008		Teut, 2016		Williams, 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	N	"There were no dropouts as this was a residential short-term program"	PY	The only reported deviations were non completion by some participants. This is considered in line with what would occur in standard practice.	PY	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance)
	PY	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's result
	N	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	Y	Drop out rate was consistent across classes
	N	Per protocol	Y	Intent to treat	PY	Modified intent to treat
	Y	30% of participants excluded due to analysis method	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable
	High		Low		Some concerns	

Study ID	Tekur, 2008		Teut, 2016		Williams, 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	No drop outs reported	N	93% of all participants followed up at 3 months.	N	70% of participants completed the study
	NA	Not applicable	PY	To compensate for withdrawals or losses of participants among each group, a total cohort size of 60 participants was planned. Despite drop outs all group size's remained above 50 (minimum required for each group).	N	No sensitivity analyses conducted
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	NA	Majority of missing data does not have valid reasons for drop out.
	NA	Not applicable	NA	Not applicable	PN	Rate of drop out is similar between groups. Considered unlikely to seriously impact the result.
	Low		Low		Some concerns	
Bias in measurement of	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	N	Participant-reported outcomes	Y	Participant-reported outcomes	Y	Participant-reported outcomes

Study ID	Tekur, 2008		Teut, 2016		Williams, 2005	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	N	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available.	Y	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N :

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane

a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Williams, 2009	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	"randomly generated group assignment"
	PY	Eligible participants were given envelopes with randomly generated group assignment
	PN	"More African-Americans were enrolled in the yoga versus control groups, while the number of months since experiencing the first episode of LBP was greater in the control versus yoga groups. No other statistically significant differences were found."
	Low	
	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	N	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Williams, 2009	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PY	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance)
	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's result
	N	More participants did not complete the intervention due to reasons which may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance) when compared to the control groups
	Y	Intent to treat
	NA	Not applicable
	High	

Study ID	Williams, 2009	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	N	28% of yoga participants dropped out.
	PN	None reported
	PY	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.
	PY	Missingness of the data considered to affect true value of the outcome. Dropouts not balanced between groups.
	High	
Bias in measurement of	N	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	N	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	Participant-reported outcomes

Study ID	Williams, 2009	
	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	Y	No pre-specified analysis plan available.
	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results
	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements
	Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.
Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N : Source: Chapter 8 Cochrar a. For the precise wording		

Study ID	Cramer-2013		Jain 2020		Michalsen-2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Non-stratified block randomisation	Y	Non-stratified block randomisation	Y	Non-stratified block randomisation
	Y	within sealed envelopes	Y	concealment through sealed and opaque envelopes	Y	within sealed envelopes
	N	Sociodemographic and neck pain characteristics did not differ between groups at baseline. However, treatment expectancy was significantly higher in the yoga group	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both groups	N	Baseline characteristics were balanced between both groups
	Low		Low		Low	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Cramer-2013		Jain 2020		Michalsen-2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PN	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants, however, this was considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	N	All randomised participants completed the trial	PN	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants. Reasons given for non-completion may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance)
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	PY	Dropping out may have been influenced by participants perception about the group to which they were assigned. Differences between people who leave the study and those who continue can introduce bias into a study's results
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	Y	More participants did not complete the intervention due to reasons which may have been influenced by the trial context (non-compliance) when compared to the control groups
	Y	ITT	Y	ITT	Y	mITT analysis performed for all randomised participants
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Some concerns	
	Y	3/51 participants lost to follow up. Data was available for nearly all participants	Y	0/72 participants lost to follow up	Y	23/77 (~30%) participants lost to follow up

Study ID	Cramer-2013		Jain 2020		Michalsen-2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	Y	There were no relevant changes in the results when the sensitivity analyses were performed, suggesting minimal influence of the study dropout
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Low	
	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving

Study ID	Cramer-2013		Jain 2020		Michalsen-2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	The high rate of drop out in the control group due to subjects wanting to immediately start the yoga intervention suggests that participants strongly believed in the intervention, which is likely to influence reporting of results.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		High	
Bias in selection of the reported result	PY	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan	PY	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	PY	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan
	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results.	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Low		Some concerns		Low	

Study ID	Cramer-2013		Jain 2020		Michalsen-2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.
a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Rajalaxmi-2018		Ulug-2018		Yogitha-2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	simple random sampling method	PY	Participants were randomized using the sealed envelope method and divided into 3 groups of 20. 60 envelopes were used and equally numbered with group names 1 (Pilates), 2 (yoga), and 3 (isometric). The patients were asked to choose 1 of these sealed envelopes.	Y	Computer-generated random number table on the "randomizer.com" software
	NI	Not reported	Y	Sealed envelopes were used, which were opened immediately prior to intervention after the participant consented to be a part of the study.	NI	Not reported
	N	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between the treatment groups.	N	There was no significant difference between the three groups in terms of sex and BMI. There was a significant difference in age, but this was likely due to chance	N	baseline characteristics which were similar between groups
	Some concerns		Low		Some concerns	
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding participants to their group assignment.
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding carers and deliverers of the intervention to their group assignment

Study ID	Rajalaxmi-2018		Ulug-2018		Yogitha-2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to deviations from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NI	None reported	PN	The only reported deviations were non-completion by some participants, however, this was considered in line with what would occur in usual practice	NI	None reported
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	PY	Limited information provided. Likely ITT or mITT. Unclear if any participants were lost to follow up	PY	Modified. Final analyses excluded participants with missing outcome data.	PY	mITT analysis performed for all randomised participants
	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.	NA	Not applicable.
	Low		Low		Low	
	Y	Not drop outs reported	N	4 originally enrolled participants dropped out of the study (6.7% of study population), 2 in the Yoga group and 2 in the Isometric group.	N	6/60 participants lost to follow up

Study ID	Rajalaxmi-2018		Ulug-2018		Yogitha-2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	NA	Not applicable.	PN	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.	PN	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.
	NA	Not applicable.	PY	Without reasons for drop out, it is difficult to assess this domain. Could plausibly be due to illness or disease severity.	PY	Drops out were higher in the control group, some due to aggravation of pain
	NA	Not applicable.	PN	Dropouts were balanced between yoga and control group, not considered likely to be due to the outcome	PY	In two patients from the control group, reasons for dropping out were related to pain. As more patients dropped out of the control group, this could have influenced the final value reported
	Low		Some concerns		High	
	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.	N	The trial included appropriate outcome measurement instruments.	PN	Study used validated methods for outcome measures.
	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points	PN	The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups.	PN	Measurements were recorded by the same methods, at the same time points
	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving	Y	All of the assessment procedures were performed by the same physiotherapist who was blinded to the US measurements. However, the participant was aware of the intervention.	Y	All primary outcomes were participant-reported, therefore the outcome assessor is the study participant who were aware of the intervention they were receiving

Study ID	Rajalaxmi-2018		Ulug-2018		Yogitha-2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias in measurement of the outcome	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement	PY	The primary outcome measures were self-reported and could be influenced by knowledge fo the intervention recieved. Assessor measuring the outcome variables was blinded to treatment allocation.	PY	Participants were aware of the intervention they were receiving, therefore this could have influenced self-reported outcomes, which by nature involve some judgement
	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.	PN	There is no reason to believe that the patient-reported outcomes were substantially influenced by knowledge of the intervention.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	Data was analysed in accordance with the statistical analysis plan but there is no mention of whether it changed after study start	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.	NI	The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available, but are sufficiently described and data analysis performed accordingly.
	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results.	PN	There are no reasons to suggest outcome measures reported have been selected on the basis of results.
	PN	There is clear evidence through examination of the results that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.	N	All eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.
	Low		Some concerns		Some concerns	

Study ID	Rajalaxmi-2018		Ulug-2018		Yogitha-2010	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N =
Source: Chapter 8 Cochran
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Granath 2006		Grensman 2018		Hartfiel 2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	NI	No mention of how the randomisation sequence was generated.	Y	Block randomisation	Y	Computer generated randomisation
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment.	Y	Sealed non transparent envelopes before the start of treatment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment.
	N	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups. No statistical analysis is presented.	NI	Baseline characteristics not presented	N	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups. No statistical analysis is presented.
	Some concerns	lack of information regarding the randomisation process and allocation concealment.	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of baseline characteristics to compare	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information regarding allocation concealment.
Bias due to deviations	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff
	PN	The only reported deviations are non completion by some participants. This is consistent with what would occur in normal practice.	PY	4 participants disliked their treatment allocation and discontinued or did not receive treatment. One felt the time commitment required was too great.	N	Drop out is substantially greater in the control group compared to the yoga group (30% vs 11%) which raises some concerns.
	NA		PN	Relatively small rate of deviation	NA	

Study ID	Granath 2006		Grensman 2018		Hartfiel 2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NA		NA		NA	
	PY	Not specified but mITT is interpreted. Participants who were lost to follow up are excluded from all timepoints.	PN	mITT interpreted. Participants who discontinued the intervention were excluded from the analysis.	PY	Not specified but mITT is interpreted. Participants who were lost to follow up are excluded from all timepoints.
	NA		NA		NA	
	Low		Some concerns	Some concerns due to deviations from the intended intervention	Low	
	N	4 participants (11%) dropped out of the study and an additional 2 participants were missing physiological outcomes data. This was balanced between the groups.	PN	14 participants (14.9%) either discontinued the intervention (n=11, 11.7%) or were lost to follow up (n=3, 3.2%).	N	15 participants (20%) were lost to follow up. 4 participants (11%) in the yoga group and 11 participants (30%) in the control group were lost to follow up.
	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of this missing data.	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of missing data.

Study ID	Granath 2006		Grensman 2018		Hartfiel 2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	Y	No reasons for drop out were reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome, if participants discontinued due to an impression that the intervention was not working.	PY	It is considered possible that drop outs could have occurred due to the true value of the outcome.	PY	No reasons for drop out were reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.
	PN	It is not considered likely that drop outs were related to the outcome, and drop outs are balanced between the groups.	PN	Reasons for drop out are provided and in most cases do not appear related to the outcome.	PY	Given the substantial difference in drop out between the two groups, it is considered likely that the drop out rate was related to the true value of the outcome.
	Some concerns	missing outcome measurements and lack of information regarding reasons for drop out or methods of adjustment.	Some concerns	missing outcome data and the lack of analysis presented to assess the impact of missingness	High	High risk due to the high and uneven rate of drop out.
Bias in measurement of	N	Validated outcome measures used.	N	Validated outcome measures used.	N	Validated outcome measures used.
	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.
	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.

Study ID	Granath 2006		Grensman 2018		Hartfiel 2012	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
the outcome	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N

Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions.

a. For the precise wording of signalling questions and guidance for answering each one, see the full risk-of-bias tool at www.riskofbias.info.

Study ID	Harkess 2016		Maddux 2018		Daukantaite 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Randomisation using Research Randomizer	Y	Randomisation using Research Randomizer	Y	Web based randomisation
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	py	Research staff who were blinded to study intervention and hypotheses
	PN	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups	PN	Baseline characteristics appear comparable between groups	PN	Some significant differences between groups at baseline, not considered to suggest problem with randomisation
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information relating to allocation concealment	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information relating to allocation concealment	Low	
Bias due to deviations	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff
	PN	The only reported deviations are non completion by some participants. This is consistent with what would occur in normal practice.	py	The proportion of participants with missing data (31% yoga vs 44% control) is considered higher than what would occur in usual practice.	PN	The only reported deviations are non completion by some participants. This is consistent with what would occur in normal practice.
	NA		py	If discontinuations were related to perceived treatment effect, they could influence the outcome.	NA	

Study ID	Harkess 2016		Maddux 2018		Daukantaite 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NA		PN	The proportion of participants who dropped out is greater in the control group than in the intervention group, which may be expected due to the nature of the intervention and control.	NA	
	Y	Both mITT and per protocol analyses presented.	Y	Not specified but mITT is interpreted.	N	Per protocol is interpreted as participants who did not receive the allocated intervention have been excluded
	NA		NA		Y	7/37 (18%) of participants in the control group were excluded from the analysis. This was uneven between groups.
	Low		High	high proportion of deviations from the intended intervention which were unbalanced between groups.	High	high proportion of exclusions from analysis which were unbalanced between groups.
	N	16 participants (14%) were lost to follow up or discontinued and were not included in the analysis.	N	Outcome data was missing for 34 participants (37.8%) including 14 in the yoga group (31.1%) and 20 in the control group (44.4%).	N	Outcome data was missing for 19 participants (18%) including 5 in the yoga group and 9 in the control group.
	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of missing data.	PN	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of missing data. It is reported that after attrition, there were no significant differences between groups and that those who completed the study did not differ from those who dropped out (with the exception of the Harmony in Life Scale in the control group).	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of missing data. It is reported that the full-information maximum likelihood method was used for analysis.

Study ID	Harkess 2016		Maddux 2018		Daukantaite 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	PY	No reasons for drop out were reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.	PY	No reasons for drop out were reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.	PY	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.
	PN	It is not considered likely that drop outs were related to the outcome, and drop outs are balanced between the groups.	NI	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.	NI	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.
	Some concerns	Some concerns relating to the proportion of missing outcome data and the lack of analysis presented to assess the impact of missingness	High	High risk of bias relating to the proportion of missing outcome data and the lack of analysis presented to assess the impact of missingness	High	High risk of bias relating to the proportion of missing outcome data and the lack of analysis presented to assess the impact of missingness
Bias in measurement of	N	Validated outcome measures used.	N	Validated outcome measures used.	N	Validated outcome measures used.
	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.
	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.

Study ID	Harkess 2016		Maddux 2018		Daukantaite 2018	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
the outcome	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	Y	Analysis methods aligns to what is reported in the protocol. Some outcomes specified in the protocol were not reported in the manuscript.
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Low	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane.
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Godse 2015		Hewett 2017		Kohn 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	Y	Random number table	Y	Computer generated random numbers, prepared by investigator not involved in the testing or delivery of the intervention	Y	Computer generated random numbers
	NI	The authors do not report on allocation concealment	Y	Group assignments delivered in sealed envelopes after completion of baseline testing.	Y	Group assignments delivered in sealed envelopes.
	N	Groups appear reasonably balanced although no formal analysis is presented	N	No significant differences between groups at baseline	N	No significant differences between groups at baseline
	Some concerns	Some concerns due to a lack of information relating to allocation concealment	Low		Low	
Bias due to deviations	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff
	PY	The proportion of participants with missing data (35% in both arms) is considered greater than what would likely occur in usual practice, especially given the time horizon of the study.	PN	The only reported deviations are non completion by some participants. This is considered in-line with what would occur in usual practice.	PN	The only reported deviations are non completion by some participants. This is considered in-line with what would occur in usual practice.
	NI	Reasons for discontinuation are not provided, making is difficult to assess whether they could have affected the outcome.	NA		NA	

Study ID	Godse 2015		Hewett 2017		Kohn 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	PY	Although the proportion of discontinuations in each group is balanced, the reasons for discontinuations are not provided making it difficult to assess whether there was any imbalance in the reasons.	NA		NA	
	N	Per protocol is interpreted, as participants who had incomplete outcome responses were excluded from the analysis.	PY	mITT is interpreted	PY	mITT is interpreted
	Y	7/62 participants (13%) in the control arm only were excluded for this reason.	NA		NA	
	High	high rate of deviations from the intended information and the uneven exclusion of participants from the analysis.	Low		Low	
	N	Outcome data for 44/124 (35%) of participants was not included in the analysis.	N	Outcome data is missing for 7/68 participants (10%). A further 5/68 participants were excluded post-randomisation due to not meeting the eligibility criteria.	Y	Outcome data is missing for 2/39 (5%) of participants, both in the yoga group. Reasons for drop out are provided and do not appear related to the intervention or outcome.
	N	No analysis was presented to assess the impact of missing data. No reasons for drop out are reported.	N	No analysis is presented to assess the impact of missing data. Last observation carried forward should not be considered sufficient.	NA	

Study ID	Godse 2015		Hewett 2017		Kohn 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	PY	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.	PY	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.	NA	
	NI	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.	NI	No reasons for drop out are reported. It is possible that drop out was related to the true value of the outcome.	NA	
	High	High risk of bias relating to the proportion of missing outcome data and the lack of analysis presented to assess the impact of missingness	Some concerns	Some concerns due to the missing outcome data and lack of appropriate analysis methods to account for missingness.	Low	
Bias in measurement of	N	Validated outcome measures used.	N	Validated outcome measures used.	N	Validated outcome measures used.
	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.
	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.

Study ID	Godse 2015		Hewett 2017		Kohn 2013	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
the outcome	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.
Bias in selection of the reported result	N	No pre-specified analysis plan available Analysis methods aligns to what is reported in the protocol. Some outcomes specified in the protocol were not reported in the manuscript.	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available. Study was retrospectively registered	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		Some concerns		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochrane.
a. For the precise wording

Study ID	Kumar 2016		Michalsen 2012		Smith 2007	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias arising from the randomisation process	PY	Envelope method, unclear how the randomisation sequence was produced	Y	Pseudo-random number generator	Y	Computer generated random numbers
	PY	Interpretted that allocation was concealed using envelopes	Y	Sealed opaque envelopes	PY	Sealed opaque envelopes
	N	There appear to be significantly more males in the aerobic exercise group than the yoga or mental imagery group. No formal analysis is presented.	N	Difference in baseline exercise practice, with fewer participants in yoga group 2 reporting exercise. Not considered a problem with randomisation.	N	Significant difference reported for SF-36 General Health Perceptions, not considered an issue with randomisation
	Some concerns		Low		Low	
Bias due to deviations	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of participants
	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff	Y	The nature of the intervention precludes blinding of trial staff
	PN	The only reported deviations are non completion by some participants. This is considered in-line with what would occur in usual practice.	PN	The only reported deviations are non completion by some participants. This is considered in-line with what would occur in usual practice. The rate of noncompletion is roughly balanced between arms.	PN	The only reported deviations are non completion by some participants. This is considered in-line with what would occur in usual practice.
	NA		NA		NA	

Study ID	Kumar 2016		Michalsen 2012		Smith 2007	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
from intended interventions (effect of assignment to intervention [ITT])	NA		NA		NA	
	PY	mITT is interpreted	Y	ITT is reported	PY	mITT is interpreted
	NA		NA		NA	
	Low		Low		Low	
	Y	5 participants (5%) were lost to follow up or withdrew from the study. It is not reported which group these participants were allocated, or reasons for withdrawal.	N	10/72 participants (14%) were lost to follow up	N	10-week data was missing for 9/131 participants (7%). Drop outs in-text (10%) do not align to drop outs reported in the CONSORT diagram (7%).
	NA		Y	Multiple imputation was used to replace missing values with randomly generated values.	N	No analysis is presented to assess the impact of missing data.

Study ID	Kumar 2016		Michalsen 2012		Smith 2007	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
Bias due to missing outcome data	NA		NA		PY	Reasons for drop out are provided and include ill health, too busy, and not specified. Ill health and not specified could be related to the true value of the outcome.
	NA		NA		PN	
	Low		Low		Some concerns	Some concerns due to the proportion of missing data and inconsistency of reporting.
Bias in measurement of	N	Validated outcome measures used.	N	Validated outcome measures used.	N	Validated outcome measures used.
	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.	N	Outcomes were measured using the same instruments and timepoints between the two groups.
	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.	Y	Outcomes are self-reported by participants who are aware of their intervention group.
	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.	PY	If participants believe in the effectiveness of the intervention, then it is possible that they would report their outcomes differently between groups.

Study ID	Kumar 2016		Michalsen 2012		Smith 2007	
	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments	Judgement	Comments
the outcome	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PN	It is considered possible that participants in the yoga group would differentially report their outcomes.	PY	The study reports that participants had expectations of the yoga and relaxation classes including relaxation, flexibility, and lifestyle changes. The expectations of participants are likely to bias their reporting of results.
	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	Some concerns	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.	High	Lack of blinding of participants/ Knowledge of the intervention or control status may influence reporting for subjective outcome measures.
Bias in selection of the reported result	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available. Study was retrospectively registered	NI	No pre-specified analysis plan available
	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.	PY	Only significant outcomes are presented in tables. Non-significant results are mentioned in-text but unable to be extracted for analysis.	N	All reported outcome measures and time points were considered in the analysis.
	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.	N	No indication that inappropriate multiple analysis of the data was conducted.
	Some concerns		High		Some concerns	
Overall risk of bias	Some concerns	The study has plausible bias that raises some doubt about the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.	High risk	The study has plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results.

Y = yes; PY= partial yes; N
Source: Chapter 8 Cochra
a. For the precise wording