AARHUS UNIVERSITY

Coversheet

This is the accepted manuscript (post-print version) of the article.

Contentwise, the accepted manuscript version is identical to the final published version, but there may be differences in typography and layout.

How to cite this publication

Please cite the final published version:

Mikkelsen MB, Rosholm M

Systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for sick-listed workers with common mental disorders, stress-related disorders, somatoform disorders and personality disorders

Occupational and Environmental Medicine 2018;**75**:675-686.

Publication metadata

Title:	Systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for sick-listed workers with common mental disorders, stress-related disorders, somatoform disorders and personality disorders
Author(s):	Mai Bjørnskov Mikkelsen; Michael Rosholm
Journal:	Occupational and Environmental Medicine
DOI/Link:	10.1136/oemed-2018-105073
Document version:	Accepted manuscript (post-print)

General Rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

If the document is published under a Creative Commons license, this applies instead of the general rights.

Manuscript for OEM

Title: Systematic review and meta-analysis of interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for sick-listed workers with common mental disorders, stress-related disorders, somatoform disorders and personality disorders

Mai Bjørnskov Mikkelsen, MSc¹ and Michael Rosholm, PhD^{2,3}

¹Dept. of Psychology and Behavioural Sciences, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

²Department of Economics and Business, Aarhus University, Aarhus, Denmark

³IZA, Bonn, Germany

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Michael Rosholm,

Dept. of Economics and Business, Aarhus University, Fuglesangs Allé 4, DK8210 Aarhus V,

Denmark. E-mail: rom@econ.au.dk, Telephone: +45 87 16 48 32

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have not received funding and declare that they have no competing interests.

Word count (excl. tables, reference list, key messages and abstract): 4295

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have not received funding. The authors have read and understood BMJ policy on declaration of interests and declare that they have no competing interests. The authors have not made use of copyright protected materials. No ethics approval were required. All authors had full access to all of the data in the review and meta-analysis and can take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. The lead author affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate and transparent account of the review and meta-analysis and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, a worldwide license to the Publishers and its licensees in perpetuity, in all forms, formats and media (whether known now or created in the future), to i) publish, reproduce, distribute, display and store the Contribution, ii) translate the Contribution into other languages, create adaptations, reprints, include within collections and create summaries, extracts and/or, abstracts of the Contribution, iii) create any other derivative work(s) based on the Contribution, iv) to exploit all subsidiary rights in the Contribution, v) the inclusion of electronic links from the Contribution to third party material where-ever it may be located; and, vi) licence any third party to do any or all of the above.

Review registration: A review protocol was prospectively registered with Prospero (registration number: CRD 42017070410).

Data sharing: data available in reviewed articles.

Author contributions

Review conception and design: Mikkelsen and Rosholm

Acquisition of data: Mikkelsen and Rosholm

Systematic review and data-interpretation: Mikkelsen and Rosholm

Meta-analysis: Rosholm

Drafting of manuscript: Mikkelsen

Critical revision: Mikkelsen and Rosholm

Manuscript guarantors: Mikkelsen and Rosholm

Abstract

Objectives Mental disorders are associated with significant functional impairment, sickness absence and disability. The consequences of sickness absence warrant investigation into interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for workers with mental disorders. The present systematic review and meta-analysis aim to synthesize evidence on the effectiveness of interventions aimed at enhancing return to work in sick-listed workers with mental disorders.

Methods EconLit, Embase, PsychInfo, PubMed, Svemed+ and Web of Science were searched for peer-reviewed, randomized or controlled studies assessing employment related outcomes of interventions. A meta-analysis was conducted and meta-regressions were performed to explore prespecified potential sources of heterogeneity between studies.

Results The literature search yielded 3777 publications of which 42 (n=38,938) were included in the systematic review and 32 (n=9,459) had appropriate data for the meta-analysis. The pooled effect size (95 % CI) was 0.14 (0.07, 0.22). Meta-regressions revealed that the heterogeneity could not be attributed to study quality, timing of the intervention or length of the intervention. However, it could be partly explained by number of components included in the intervention, if the intervention included contact to the work place, and by the disorder targeted by the intervention.

Conclusions The results reveal strong evidence for interventions including contact to the work place and multi-component interventions, and moderate evidence for interventions including graded return to work. In addition, the results provide strong evidence for interventions targeting stress compared to interventions targeting other mental disorders. The findings point to important implications for policy and design of future interventions.

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

Key messages:

What is already known about this subject?

- A variety of interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for sick-listed workers with mental disorders have been developed and tested, but no clear consensus about design and content has been reached.

What are the new findings?

- Interventions aimed at sick-listed with mental disorders have positive effects on average in terms of speeding up the return to work process.
- Interventions are more effective when they contain more than one component, e.g. contact to the workplace and therapy.
- Interventions were only effective when containing some form of work place contact. This could be in the form of a meeting between case worker, client, and employer, or in the form of graded return-to-work programmes.

How might this impact on policy or clinical practice in the foreseeable future?

- The results may inform design of future interventions and inform development of policy guidelines for interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for sick-listed workers with mental disorders.

INTRODUCTION

Mental disorders are prevalent in the labour force in developed countries and associated with significant personal and public expenses (1). Inherent to the definition of mental disorders is that they imply significant distress and functional impairment for the person affected (2-3). This is mirrored in the strong association between mental disorders and low work function as well as increased sickness absence (5). Common mental disorders are the leading cause of sickness absence in the majority of high-income countries and the main impetus behind 1/3 of all disability benefits (6).

The consequences of reduced work functioning and increased sickness absence should not be disregarded. For the individual, work often constitutes an important source of social integration and social identity (7). Further, work can afford structure, purpose and meaning in daily life for both healthy individuals and individuals with mental health problems (8-9). Thus, at the personal level, absence from work may have consequences for social and psychological well-being. For society, sickness absence due to mental disorders represents a significant financial burden comparable to or exceeding that of physical disabilities (e.g., blindness, musculoskeletal disorders; 10-11). This is likely due to a combination of increased prevalence of sickness absence, low probability of return to work (RTW) following sickness absence, and a high risk of recurrent sickness absence found in workers with mental disorders (5).

The clinical, social and economic consequences of sickness absence and reduced work functioning in workers with mental disorders have increasingly been recognized by policy makers and researchers alike. This has led to development of a variety of interventions aimed at increasing RTW among sick-listed workers with mental disorders. Although the primary goal of these interventions is the same (i.e., facilitating RTW), the contents and methods vary, and no gold-standard exists (5). At a general level, these interventions often contain one or more of the following four components: 1)

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

Organisational change, defined as enhanced collaboration or integration of central partakers, 2) Graded return to work, 3) Therapeutic elements, e.g., therapeutic conversations or therapy, and 4) Contact to the work place. Whether each of these components by themselves or in combination significantly increase RTW among sick-listed workers with mental disorders has yet to be established.

Within the field of occupational medicine, several reviews and meta-analyses exist of RTW-interventions for sick-listed workers with musculoskeletal disorders and other non-communicable diseases (e.g., 12-13). However, only a handful of reviews and meta-analyses have been conducted for interventions aimed at RTW for sick-listed workers with mental health disorders. Only three of these reviews included a meta-analysis (14-16), and two of these were disorder-specific (i.e., aimed at adjustment disorders: (14) or depression: (15)). Nigatu and colleagues (16) included a broader spectrum of mental disorders in their review and meta-analysis. The authors reviewed the literature on interventions aimed at enhancing RTW in sick-listed workers with common mental disorders, CMD (defined by the authors as depressive disorders, anxiety disorders and adjustment disorders). The authors concluded that there is no evidence to support the effectiveness of available interventions. However, this conclusion was based solely on interventions involving elements of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT). Thus, the authors excluded interventions, that did not include CBT-elements and that were not aimed at sick-listed workers with CMD. As depressive disorders and anxiety disorders only make up two out of the 10 most high-prevalence and high-cost mental disorders affecting workers (4) it may be beneficial to adopt a more comprehensive approach, addressing a larger segment of mental disorders and a wider variety of RTW-interventions.

The aim of the present review and meta-analysis was to collate and update the existing evidence for interventions aimed at facilitating RTW in sick-listed workers with mental disorders. Interventions aimed at a broad spectrum of high-prevalence, high-cost mental disorders (i.e., anxiety disorders,

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

depressive disorders, adjustment disorders, stress-related disorders, personality disorders and somatoform disorders) were included.

METHODS

A systematic review and meta-analysis for studies of interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for sick-listed workers with anxiety disorders, depressive disorders, adjustment disorders, stress-related disorders, personality disorders and somatoform disorders were performed.

A review protocol was prospectively registered with Prospero (registration number: CRD 42017070410). Our review conforms to the PRISMA guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

Search strategy

An extensive search of the electronic databases EconLit, Embase, PsychInfo, PubMed, Svemed+ and Web of Science from January 2000 to June 2017 was conducted. The cut-off date of January 2000 was chosen to ensure relevance of the findings for current occupational and diagnostic practices and policies. The searches were limited to peer-reviewed English-language publications and either randomized controlled trials or controlled trials. Reference lists of identified literature and newer publications citing identified literature were reviewed. The search terms were established using the PICO model (see Appendix 1).

Study selection

For inclusion, the studies had to be peer-reviewed, randomized or controlled studies assessing employment related outcomes of interventions aimed at sick-listed workers with anxiety disorders, depressive disorders, adjustment disorders, stress-related disorders, personality disorders and/or somatoform disorders. When studies were aimed at more than one of these disorders, they were classified as targeting sick-listed workers with CMDs.

Employment related outcomes were defined broadly as 1) time until RTW, 2) proportion of participants achieving RTW, 3) number of sick leave days and 4) self-reported work-readiness. Previous systematic reviews have been used as a foundation for this review, but were not formally included. Grey literature, single case studies and qualitative studies were excluded.

The selection process consisted of three stages. First, the two authors independently screened the titles and abstracts of retrieved studies to determine eligibility. Second, the two authors independently read the full text articles of identified studies to assess whether studies should be included. Third, the authors reviewed reference lists and newer publications citing identified literature. Interobserver agreement was calculated at each stage and disagreements were resolved by consensus.

Quality appraisal

To establish a reliable rating system, the two authors jointly reviewed two studies and developed a quality assessment checklist based on The National Institutes of Health Quality Assessment Tool for Controlled Intervention Studies (see Appendix 2). The methodological quality of the remaining studies was assessed independently by the two authors according to this quality assessment checklist. Interobserver agreement was assessed by calculating the kappa index (κ) with 95 % confidence intervals (CI). Disagreements were resolved through discussion. The summary score for each study

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

was calculated (minimum: 1, maximum: 10) and categorized into three categories. Studies with a score of ≥ 9 were considered of high quality, studies with a score of 6-8 were considered of fair quality and studies with a score of ≤ 5 were considered of poor quality. These categories were used to evaluate whether outcomes significantly varied according to study quality and to determine which weight studies should be given in the synthesis of the findings.

Data extraction and coding

The two authors independently used a prespecified data-extraction sheet to extract data from the included studies (see Appendix 3). Accordingly, data were extracted at five levels: study, participants and controls, design and method, measure of interest, and outcome and effect. In addition, intervention type were coded according to four components: 1) organizational change, i.e., enhanced collaboration or integration of central partakers, 2) graded return to work, 3) therapeutic elements, e.g., therapy or therapeutic support and 4) work place contact before RTW, e.g. meetings with the sick-listed worker and a representative of the employer at the workplace. When studies evaluated more than one intervention with no overlap in participants, each treatment group were included separately and contrasted with the control group.

Statistical procedure

The primary outcome measure used in the meta-analysis was time until RTW. When time until RTW was not available, the proportion of participants who had achieved RTW measured as close to the end of the intervention as possible was used. Studies using alternative outcome measures were included in the meta-analysis if the outcomes could be converted to standardized effect sizes for mean difference between the intervention group and the control group. Effect sizes were calculated as

Glass' delta (Δ), where the mean difference between the intervention-group (a) and the control group (b) is divided by the standard deviation of the control group: $\Delta = \frac{M_a - M_b}{\sigma_b}$. According to Kline (17) this is an appropriate method when interventions affect both the central tendency and variability in the population distribution. The I^2 statistic was calculated to assess heterogeneity between studies. A random effects meta-analysis was applied, as it allows for heterogeneity in the analysis of the overall effectiveness of the interventions. Meta-regression analyses were performed to investigate pre-specified moderators of effectiveness (i.e., target population, intervention content, quality and country of origin). Risk of publication bias was assessed by funnel plot analysis and the Egger's test.

RESULTS

A PRISMA flow diagram of the search results and reasons for study exclusion can be found in supplementary material (see supplementary Figure 1). The literature search yielded 4104 potentially relevant publications (3777 after removal of duplicates), while the review of reference lists and newer publications citing the identified literature yielded an additional 4 potentially relevant publications. After review of titles and abstracts, 118 full-text articles were retrieved for further consideration. Upon review of the full-text articles, 76 articles were excluded, leaving 42 articles (n=38,938) to be included in the present systematic review (see table 1). Agreement about inclusions and exclusion were high. The two authors were in 97.5 % agreement about inclusion and exclusion following the preliminary screening of titles and abstracts and in 95 % agreement of inclusion and exclusion following review of full-text articles.

Of the 42 articles that met the criteria for inclusion and exclusion, 3 articles described studies using the same data as other included articles. For these, data was extracted from the most recent article with relevant data. Thus, the final sample consisted of 39 studies comprising 31 randomized

controlled trials (RCTs) and 8 controlled trials. The studies were published in scientific journals between 2003 and 2017.

Systematic review

The quality assessment revealed that 10 of the included studies could be characterized as high quality studies, 23 studies could be characterized as fair quality studies and 6 could be characterized as low quality studies. All RCTs were evaluated to be of fair or high quality. Two controlled studies were assessed to be of fair quality, while the remaining controlled studies were evaluated to be of poor quality. The two authors were in 97.5 % agreement about the classification of studies into high quality, fair quality and low quality categories. The inter-coder agreement for exact scores on the quality checklist were $\kappa=0.5$, indicating moderate agreement. Table 1 provides an overview of included studies and specific quality ratings of these studies. The majority of the studies were conducted with participants with CMDs and stress-related disorders, while a few studies were conducted exclusively with participants with depression and somatoform disorders. None of the included studies were on interventions aimed at sick-listed workers with personality disorders.

To provide structure for the systematic review, the included studies are reviewed according to study quality and design. Thus, high quality RCT studies, fair quality RCT studies, and controlled studies are reviewed in turn.

Table 1. Quality ratings of included studies.

Study	Randomized trial	Acceptable randomization/control procedure	< 20% dropout	Insignificant difference in drop-out between groups	Good fidelity	Definition of counterfactual treatment is	Valid and reliable measurement of outcomes	Power calculations	Protocol (statistical strategy outlined a priori)	Recognized statistical analyses	Summarized score
Bakker <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	9
Beck <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	8
Blonk <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	8
Brouwers <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	9
De Vente <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	8
de Weerd <i>et al.</i>	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	7
Fleten <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	9
Folke <i>et al.</i>	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	8
Hees <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	10
Hellström <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	10
Kröger <i>et al.</i>	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	7
Lammerts <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	8
Lytsy <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	8

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

Martin <i>et al.</i>	+	0	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	6
Momsen <i>et al.</i>	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	8
Netterstrøm <i>et al.</i> A	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	7
Netterstrøm <i>et al.</i> B	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	7
Noordik <i>et al.</i>	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	8
Nystuen <i>et al.</i>	+	+	0	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	6
Rebergen <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	+	+	8
Reme <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	10
Schene <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	8
Skouen <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	+	7
Stenlund <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	8
van Beurden <i>et al.</i>	+	0	+	+	0	+	0	0	+	+	6
van der Feltz-Cornelis <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	9
van der Klink <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	+	8
van Oostrom <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	10
Vlasveld <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	9
Volker <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	+	+	9
Willert <i>et al.</i>	+	+	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	+	8
Eklund <i>et al.</i>	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	8
Grossi <i>et al.</i>	0	0	+	+	0	+	+	+	0	0	5

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

Karlson <i>et al.</i>	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	0	+	0	4
Lagerveld <i>et al.</i>	0	0	+	+	+	+	+	0	0	0	5
Netterstrøm <i>et al.</i> C	0	+	+	+	+	+	+	0	+	0	7
Schneider <i>et al.</i>	0	+	+	+	0	0	+	0	0	+	5
Suoyrjö <i>et al.</i>	0	+	+	+	0	+	+	0	0	0	5
Wählin <i>et al.</i>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Summary of high quality RCT-studies

Ten RCT-studies were characterized as being of high quality. Table 2 provides an overview of included studies including intervention characteristics and effectiveness. Three of the high quality studies found a positive effect of the studied intervention (18-20), while seven high quality studies report no effect (21-27).

The content and methods employed in these high quality interventions are very different, and no obvious conclusions can be drawn based on these studies alone. However, an interesting observation can be made regarding the target group. No diagnosis-specific intervention were found to have an effect, while 3 interventions aimed at CMDs were found to be effective.

Summary of fair quality RCT-studies

Twenty-one RCT-studies were characterized as fair quality (see Table 2). Seven fair quality studies found a positive effect of the examined intervention (28-34), while 14 fair quality studies showed no effect (35-50).

As with the high quality RCTs, the fair quality RCTs comprise very different interventions. However, a few common characteristics are apparent: the majority of the effective interventions were aimed at newly or short-term sick-listed workers (< 10 weeks at the time of inclusion; 5/7 studies), were disorder specific (7/7 studies), included contact to the work place (6/7 studies), often in combination with therapy), were delivered by a multidisciplinary team (4/7 studies), and included two or more components (5/7 studies).

Characteristics of the fair quality RCTs that did not show effect can be used to nuance the highlighted characteristics for effective studies. About half of the ineffective studies were aimed at newly- or

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

short term sick-listed workers (7/14 studies) and included a multidisciplinary team (6/14). The majority of the ineffective studies were aimed at CMDs (9/14), did not include contact to the work place (12/14), and included only 0 or 1 of the four identified components (13/14 studies).

Overall, the findings from the fair quality RCTs suggest that disorder specific interventions, interventions including contact to the work place as a component, and interventions with more than one component, are more likely to be effective.

Summary of controlled studies

Eight controlled studies were included in the present review (see Table 2). Two controlled studies were characterized as fair quality (51-52), while the remaining six studies were of poor quality (53-59). Five controlled studies found a positive effect of the examined intervention (51-52, 57-59), while 3 controlled studies showed no effect (53-56). Study characteristics varied greatly across controlled studies. No convincing patterns of characteristics emerge from the overview of effective and ineffective controlled studies.

Table 2. Overview of study characteristics and effectiveness.

Publication	Target group	Intervention content	Duration of intervention	Fidelity > 75 %	Intervention given by	Contains:				Outcome	Effective	
						Org. change	Graded return to	Therapy	Work place contact			
High quality RCTs												
Brouwers et al. (n=194)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety disorders and emotional distress)	Early intervention focused on problem solving and coping	5 sessions (50 min.) over 10 weeks	Yes	Social workers	-	-	X	-	Time until RTW	No	
Fleten et al. (n=169)	CMD (depressive disorders and other mental disorders)	Minimal intervention: letters containing generic information about sick leave and a questionnaire	-	Yes	-	-				Time until RTW	Yes	
Reme et al. (n=1193)	CMD (depression and anxiety symptoms)	Integrated CBT and Individual Placement and Support (IPS)	Up to 15 sessions	Yes	Therapists and caseworkers	X	X	X	X	Full RTW at 12 months	Yes	
van der Feltz-Cornelis et al. (n=60)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety disorders and somatoform disorders)	Training of occupational physicians in diagnosing and treating CMDs. Training of psychiatrists in facilitating RTW	-	-	Occupational physicians and psychiatrists	-	-	-	-	Time until RTW	Yes	

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

Volker et al. (n=216)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety disorders and somatoform disorders)	Online intervention consisting of psychoeducation and with a focus on addressing RTW	6-17 online sessions, that could be completed at any time	No	-	-	-	X	-	Time until RTW	No
Bakker et al. (n=433)	Stress	Brief training of primary care physicians in giving advice on achieving RTW	Up to 3 consultations	No	Primary care physicians	-	-	-	-	Time until RTW	No
van Oostrom et al. (n=145)	Stress	Referral to an RTW-coordinator, who facilitated contact to the work place and aided in problem solving	~1 month	Yes	RTW coordinators (social worker or labour expert)	X	-	-	-	Time until RTW	No
Hees et al. (n=117)	Depression	Individual and group sessions with an occupational therapist. Intervention focused on facilitating contact to the work place and engaging in simulated work situations	18 sessions	Yes	Occupational therapists	-	-	X	X	Full RTW at 18 months	No
Vlasveld et al. (n=126)	Depression	Collaborative care provided by occupation care manager. Focus on problem solving, guided self-help and interventions at the work place	6-12 sessions	No	Occupational physician care manager	-	-	X	X	Time until RTW and full RTW at 12 months	No
Hellström et al. (N=326)	Depression and anxiety	Individual Placement and Support (IPS) modified to fit workers with depression and anxiety disorders		Yes	Mentors (nurses, social workers or occupational therapists)	X	-	X	X	Full RTW at 12 months	No
Fair quality RCTs											
de Weerd et al. (n=60)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety)	A meeting focused on problem solving (convergence dialogue meeting) between employee,	-	Yes	Therapists, case-workers	-	-	-	X	Time until RTW	No

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

	disorders, stress-related disorders and somatoform disorders)	therapist and employer in addition to treatment as usual (CBT)									
Lammerts et al. (n=186)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety disorders and stress-related disorders)	Early coordinated intervention focused on problem solving and fast, supported return to work	~ 6 weeks	No	RTW-coordinator, insurance physician and labour expert	X	-	-	-	Time until RTW	No
Lytsy et al. (n=308)	CMD + pain (mental disorders)	TEAM: Multidisciplinary team develop individualized rehabilitation plan focused on problem solving	-	Yes	TEAM: physician, psychologist, occupational therapist and social worker	X	-	-	-	Number of sick leave days in following 12 months	No
		ACT: Acceptance and commitment therapy. Focused on enhancing level of functioning and quality of life			ACT: Therapist	-	-	X	-		
Martin et al. (n=168)	CMD (anxiety disorders, depressive disorders and related mental health problems)	Multidisciplinary team is appointed to develop rehabilitation plan with a focus on problem solving	Max 12 weeks	No	Multidisciplinary team (not specified)	X	-	-	-	Full RTW at 12 months	No
Momsen et al. (n=443)	CMD (CMD not specified and stress-related disorders)	Multidisciplinary team is appointed to develop an individualized RTW plan	-	Yes	RTW coordinator and health professionals	X	-	-	-	Time until RTW	No
Noordik et al. (n=160)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, stress-	Gradual exposure to increasing work load (not partial return to work)	-	No	Occupational physicians	-	-	X	-	Time until RTW	No

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

	related disorders and adjustment disorders)											
Nystuen et al. (n=40)	CMD (non-severe psychological problems)	Solution focused therapy (individually or in groups)	8 weeks (8 sessions of 3-4 hours)	-	Psychologists	-	-	X	-	Number of sick leave days in following 12 months	No	
Rebergen et al. (n=240)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety disorders and adjustment disorders)	Training of occupational physicians in facilitating RTW through problem solving, gradual return to work and contact to the work place. Based on CBT principles	2-20 weeks	Yes	Occupational physicians	-	-	-	-	Time until RTW	No	
van Beurden et al. (n=3228)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, stress-related disorders and other mental disorders)	Training of occupational physicians in following guidelines: see patient, evaluate treatment, prevent recurrences and evaluate process	8 sessions over 12 months	-	Occupational physicians	-	-	-	-	Time until RTW	No ¹	
Beck et al. (n=20)	Stress	Psychotherapy using music to reduce stress	6 session over 9 weeks	Yes	Therapist	-	-	X	-	Self-reported work ready	No	
Blonk et al. (n=128)	Stress	Traditional CBT	11 sessions (45 min), ~ 6 weeks	-	Psychologists	-	-	X	-	Time until RTW	No	
		CBT combined with advice from labour experts on work processes, stress management and RTW	5-6 sessions (1 h), ~ 3 weeks		Psychologists and labour experts		X		Yes			
De Vente et al. (n=82)	Stress	Stress management intervention based on CBT (individual)	-	Yes	Psychologists	-	-	X	-	Number of sick leave days in	No	

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

		Stress management intervention based on CBT (group)								following 4 months	
Netterstrøm et al. A (n=140)	Stress	Stress-inoculation intervention and mindfulness-based training combined with contact to the work place	Stress treatment (3 months) and mindfulness-based stress intervention (8 weeks)	Yes	Occupational physicians and psychologists	X	-	X	X	Full RTW at 3 months	Yes
Netterstrøm et al. B (n=117)	Stress	Stress therapy concept of Kalmia and mindfulness-based training combined with work place dialogue	10 weeks	Yes	Therapists	-	-	X	X	Full RTW at 3 months	Yes
Stenlund et al. (n=136)	Stress	Cognitive behavioural rehabilitation (CBR) in addition to Qigong (mind-body training) given to both intervention and control group	CBR and 1 weekly Qigong session (1 h) for a year	Yes	Physiotherapist trained in Qigong	-	-	X	-	Proportion sick-listed at 12 months	No
Van der Klink et al. (n=192)	Stress	Training of occupational physicians in giving CBT-intervention focused on problem solving and contact to the work place	4-5 consultations (90 min) within the first 6 weeks of sick leave	Yes	Occupational physicians		-	X	X	Time until RTW and full RTW at 3 months	Yes
Willert et al. (n=87)	Stress	Stress-inoculation intervention	8 sessions, ~3 months	No	Psychologists	-	-	X	-	Number of sick leave days in following 4 months	Yes

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

Folke et al. (n=34)	Depression	Acceptance and commitment therapy (group)	6 sessions	-	Psychologists	-	-	X	-	RTW, work ready or not work ready	No
Kröger et al. (n=26)	Depression	Training of therapists in giving an intervention aimed at problem solving, facilitating gradual RTW and viewing the work place as a resource. Inclusion of employer and occupational physician if possible	24 weekly work related CBT-sessions	Yes	Therapists experienced in treating depression and occupational physicians	X	X	X	X	Sick leave days /100	Yes
Schene et al. (n=50)	Depression	Intervention focused on problem solving, preparation for RTW, contact to the work place and early return to work (if possible)	48 weeks	Yes	Occupational physicians and occupational therapists	-	-	X	X	Time until RTW	Yes
Skouen et al. (n=208)	Chronic pain	Multidisciplinary program consisting of psychoeducation and feedback from multidisciplinary team, and follow-up meetings	1 h meeting and 3 follow-up meetings	-	Multidisciplinary team (not specified)	X	-	-	-	Number of sick leave days in following 54 months	No
		Multidisciplinary program consisting of CBT, physical training and interventions at the work place	4 weeks (6 h every day, 5 days a week)			X	-	X	-		
Controlled studies											
Lagerveld et al. (n=168)	CMD (adjustment disorders, anxiety disorders, depressive disorders and other mental disorders)	Work-related CBT. Focus on the work place as a resource and on facilitating gradual RTW	12 sessions over ~ 5,5 months	-	Psychologists	-	X	X	-	Time until RTW	Yes

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

Schneider et al. (n=28856)	CMD (mental disorders)	Gradual RTW		-	Physicians	-	X	-	-	Time until RTW	Yes
Wåhlin et al. (n=311)	CMD (depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, adjustment disorders and stress-related disorders)	Medical, rehabilitating and/or work related intervention-modules (content not specified)		-		?	?	?	?	Self-reported work ability	Yes
Eklund et al. (n=84)	Stress	Rehabilitation involving analysis of the participant's situation, goal setting and RTW	16 weeks	-	Social insurance officers	-	-	X	X	RTW at 12 months	Yes
Grossi et al. (n=24)	Stress	Rehabilitation program consisting of consultations with the course leader, group meetings focused on enhancing coping skills and training in relaxation techniques	3 months (½ day of training and ½ day meetings weekly)	-	Social workers	-	-	X	-	Sickness absence at 12 months	No
Karlson et al. (n=148)	Stress	A dialogue-meeting focused on problem solving between worker, team worker and employer and a group seminar on stress	Meeting (1,5 h) and seminar attendance (½ day)	-	Team workers (not specified)	-	-	-	X	RTW at 80 weeks	No
Netterstrøm et al. B (n=97)	Stress	Anamnesis, clinical examination, stress management program, physical training, training in relaxation techniques, a book on stress and facilitation of	4 months	-	Labour expert	-	-	X	X	Full RTW at 4 months	Yes

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

		contact to the work place (in agreement with participant)										
Suoyrjö et al. (n=218)	Fibromyalgia	Course for in-patients. Individualized interventions providing psychoeducation about fibromyalgia and aimed at enhancing coping skills	15 days over 6 months	-	Physicians, psychologists, physiotherapists, social workers etc.	-	-	X	-	Time until RTW	No	

¹ Not for RTW, but for self-reported belief in RTW

Meta-analysis

For the meta-analysis, primary authors were contacted in order to obtain missing data for 10 studies (18, 26, 30, 33, 35-37, 46, 50, 59). We received data from authors of four studies (18, 33, 35-36, 46), while two authors were not able to comply with the request (37, 50). The remaining authors could not be reached. Thus, appropriate data was available from 33 studies. One of these studies (52) was excluded, as the reported results shifted from significantly negative to significantly positive at different points in time during follow-up. Three of the included studies (29, 41-42) tested the effects of more than one intervention or estimated the effect of the intervention on more than two groups. Thus, the final sample included in the meta-analysis consisted of 32 studies with 35 effect sizes.

Overall effect

The result of the random effects meta-analysis is summarized in Figure 1.

*** Insert Figure 1 here***

The pooled effect size (95 % CI) was 0.14 (0.07, 0.22) with considerable heterogeneity ($I^2=67.8\%$). This result was highly significant ($p<0.001$), implying that the interventions generally shortened time until RTW and increased the fraction of participants who had achieved RTW at follow-up. The test of heterogeneity was significant, indicating that two-thirds of the variation in effect sizes across studies was likely due to other sources than sampling error alone (e.g., study design, intervention content, target population). These findings remained unaltered when the meta-analysis was rerun without studies of poor quality (effect size=0.12, $p<0.001$).

Meta-regressions were performed for the meta-analysis with all 32 studies (35 effect sizes) to assess potential sources of heterogeneity and will be presented in the following section.

Nineteen of the included studies found positive effects of the tested interventions, but only 11 of these were significant. Six studies found negative effects, but only 2 of these effects were significant. Ten studies found no effect. The most effective interventions were presented by Netterstrøm et al. (32-33), who found an increase in proportion of participants achieving RTW in the intervention group (66 % and 67 %) compared to the control group (36 % in both studies). These effects are substantial, corresponding to almost a doubling of the proportion of participants achieving RTW in the intervention group compared to the control group.

Meta-regression estimates of moderators of effect sizes

Meta-regressions were performed to assess the moderating influence of study- and population characteristics on effect sizes. In addition, the meta-regressions provide an opportunity to test the robustness of the findings from the systematic review, where effect size and sample size were not taken into consideration. Table 3 provides results from meta-regressions estimating the moderating effect of diagnosis (reference category: CMD), country of origin (reference category: Netherlands), number of components included in an intervention (reference category: 1), specific components included in an intervention (reference category: no specific components), and study quality (reference category: fair).

Table 3. Meta-regression estimates of effect size moderated by diagnosis, country of origin, number of components in interventions, type of components in interventions and study quality.

Meta-regression estimates of effect size moderated by diagnosis						
	Regression coefficient	SE	95 % lower CI	95 % upper CI	Z-value	p-value
Depression	0.04	0.14	-0.25	0.34	0.30	0.77
Stress	0.22	0.09	0.03	0.42	20.37	0.02*
Other¹	-0.07	0.11	-0.299	0.16	-0.06	0.52
Constant	0.09	0.06	-0.04	0.21	1.44	0.16
Meta-regression estimates of effect size moderated by country of origin						
	Regression coefficient	SE	95 % lower CI	95 % upper CI	Z-value	p-value
Denmark	0.14	0.11	-0.08	0.35	1.28	0.21
Sweden	0.00	0.13	-0.26	0.26	0.00	0.99
Other countries	0.13	0.16	-0.20	0.45	0.79	0.43
Constant	0.10	0.06	-0.03	0.23	1.51	0.23
Meta-regression estimates of effect size moderated by number of components						
	Regression coefficient	SE	95 % lower CI	95 % upper CI	Z-value	p-value
0 components	0.10	0.09	-0.09	0.29	1.05	0.30
2 components	0.36	0.08	0.19	0.53	4.37	0.00**
3 or more	0.25	0.12	0.01	0.49	2.12	0.04*
Constant	-0.00	0.05	-0.11	0.10	-0.09	0.93
Meta-regression estimates of effect size moderated by specific components						
	Regression coefficient	SE	95 % lower CI	95 % upper CI	Z-value	p-value
Org. change	-0.15	0.11	-0.37	0.07	-1.41	0.17
Graded return to work	0.10	0.15	-0.21	0.40	0.66	0.51
Therapy	0.01	0.10	-0.19	0.22	0.13	0.90
Contact to work place	0.21	0.09	0.03	0.39	2.31	0.02*
Constant	0.08	0.08	-0.08	0.24	1.05	0.30
Meta-regression estimates of effect size moderated by study quality						
	Regression coefficient	SE	95 % lower CI	95 % upper CI	Z-value	p-value
High quality	0.05	0.10	-0.15	0.26	0.53	0.60
Poor quality	0.17	0.13	-0.09	0.43	1.31	0.20
Constant	0.11	0.06	-0.01	0.22	1.92	0.06

¹Anxiety, somatoform disorders and personality disorders. * Significant at p=0.05. ** Significant at p=0.01.

As evident from table 3, interventions aimed at workers sick-listed due to stress showed the largest effects. Effect sizes from studies aimed at the remaining diagnoses did not appear to be significantly

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

different from the effect sizes from studies aimed at workers with CMD. Regarding country of origin, the effectiveness of interventions did not appear to vary systematically across countries. There was a non-significant tendency for the most effective studies to have originated from Denmark and other countries (Norway and Germany) as opposed to Sweden and the Netherlands. As for other population characteristics, meta-regressions were performed to estimate the moderating effect of age and the proportion of women. These variables had no significant moderating impacts on effect sizes.

Table 3 further shows that effect sizes varied according to number of components in the interventions. Interventions with zero components did not significantly differ from interventions with 1 component (which had an effect size of 0.00). However, interventions with 2 and 3 or more components appeared to be associated with significantly larger effect sizes (0.36 and 0.25 respectively) compared to interventions with 1 component. In addition, interventions that included contact to the work place showed significantly larger effect sizes compared to interventions including none of the identified components. Interventions including the remaining components did not significantly differ from interventions including no components. Regarding other intervention characteristics, meta-regressions were conducted to estimate the moderating effect of timing of the intervention, the length of intervention, and the study quality rating, but these variables were not associated with significant moderating impacts on effect sizes.

Results from the overall analysis and the meta-regressions remained robust when the analyses were rerun omitting studies of poor quality and omitting interventions aimed at sick-listed workers with stress-related disorders. Omitting studies aimed at sick-listed workers with stress-related disorders reduced the effect size to 0.07 ($p=0.03$), but the qualitative results from the meta-regressions remained with the exception that the component graded return to work became significant and contact to the work place became insignificant.

Publication bias

Publication bias was assessed by a funnel plot (see supplementary Figure 2). A visual inspection of the plot revealed no clear asymmetry indicating no publication bias and Egger's test for asymmetry in small study effects revealed no asymmetry ($p=0.13$).

Levels of evidence based on systematic review and meta-analysis

In this section, a summary and integration of the evidence from the meta-analysis and the systematic review is provided.

The estimation of level of evidence is based on the following classification:

- Strong evidence (++/--): The meta-analysis and the majority (more than 50 %) of the included studies of fair and high quality studies found a significant effect.
- Moderate evidence (+/-): The meta-analysis or the majority of the included studies of fair and high quality found a significant effect.
- Limited or contradictory evidence (?): None of the above criteria were met. No definite conclusions can be made.

Table 4 provides a summary of the evidence based on the meta-analysis and the systematic review.

Table 4. Summary of evidence from the meta-analysis and the systematic review.

Evidence level	Main conclusions and comments

Two or more components	++	The use of more than one component was associated with significantly larger effect sizes in the meta-analysis. This finding was mirrored in the systematic review, where the majority of studies that included two or more components found a positive effect.
Diagnosis		Interventions targeting workers with stress were found to be more effective in the meta-analysis than interventions targeting CMD's. The systematic review mirrored this finding, as the majority of
CMD	+	interventions targeting this population was found to be effective.
Stress	++	A supplementary meta-analysis showed an effect of targeting workers
Depression	+	with CMD, depression and other disorders. However, the systematic
Other disorders	+	review indicated no consistent evidence for an effect of targeting these populations.
Country	?	The country of origin did not appear to have an impact on RTW in the meta-analysis. This finding was mirrored in the systematic review.

DISCUSSION

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

In the present review and meta-analysis, we evaluated the effectiveness of employment related interventions for sick-listed workers with mental disorders. Overall, the results revealed a significant, but relatively small, positive effect of the included interventions. The effect size is similar to the effect size reported by Nigatu et al. (16) in their review of 16 studies testing CBT-interventions aimed at RTW for sick-listed workers with CMDs. However, other disease-specific reviews report diverging findings. Niewenhuijsen et al. (15) reviewed 23 studies of work related interventions for workers with depression and found moderate effects across studies, while Arends et al. (14) reviewed 9 studies and found no effect of CBT and problem solving therapy on time until full RTW for sick-listed workers with adjustment disorders.

The average effect size of 0.14 can be considered small according to the classification of Cohen (60), but effect sizes of this order still carry considerable economic value. A couple of examples may illustrate this; in the two intervention studies by Netterstrøm et al. (32-33), 36 % of the control group had returned to work at 3 month follow-up. An effect size of 0.14 implies an increase by 7 percentage points to 43 % ($0.36 + 0.14 * \sqrt{0.36 * (1 - 0.36)}$) in this case. That is, at a given point in time, 20% more workers in the intervention group have returned to work compared to the control group. Assuming for this example a constant increase in the exit rate from sick-listing to work of 20% implies a 17% reduction in the average time until RTW (the average time until RTW is proportional to the inverse of the exit rate), suggesting a considerable impact on the public budget. Turning to interventions studying time until RWT, the standard deviation in the control group varies, but an effect size of 0.14 in most cases implies a reduction in time until RTW by 15-30 days on average. Effects of this magnitude have large implications for the sick-listed individual, and they lead to large budget savings for government and/or employers, depending on who finance sickness insurance payments. Hence, employment related interventions aimed at sick-listed workers with mental disorders are of considerable economic value to society.

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

Regarding intervention characteristics, we found strong evidence for including contact to the work place and for including more than one of the identified components. In addition, we found moderate evidence for including graded return to work, which by definition also implies contact to the work place. These results are robust and emphasize the need to focus on incorporating contact to the work place as well as one or more additional components in intervention designs.

Research on the specific content of successful RTW-interventions for mental disorders is lacking, and only one other study has addressed intervention content (15). Consistent with the findings in the present review, Nieuwenhuijsen et al. (15) found moderate evidence for including several components in RTW-interventions aimed at sick-listed workers with depression and reported that adding a work-related intervention to a clinical intervention significantly reduced the number of sick leave days. Common to graded return to work and contact to the work place is that they allow sick-listed workers to refamiliarize themselves with their work place and their work activities. By doing so, the worker is effectively practicing management of their work situation and work functions in situ. This may contribute to the relative effectiveness of these components compared to therapy and organisational change, which by themselves include no contact to the work place.

For population characteristics, we found strong evidence for targeting stress, compared to other mental disorders or groups of disorders (i.e., CMDs, depression, somatoform disorders, anxiety and personality disorders). This finding may reflect the small number of identified studies targeting other specific mental disorders (depression: 6, somatoform disorders: 2, anxiety: 1, personality disorders: 0), but it may also be attributed to the nature of stress. Stress can be considered a fundamentally different disorder compared to the other included disorders. Stress is intrinsically tied to perceived external stressors. When these stressors are removed, the stress symptoms often dissipate. The same cannot be said for depression, anxiety, somatoform disorders or personality disorders. In addition, although some overlap is apparent, every mental disorder is associated with unique symptoms and

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

unique impairment (2-3). This further speaks to the challenge of designing an intervention flexible enough to address the needs associated with several different disorders. However, this is exactly the type of intervention requested by local government or other institutions interacting with the sick-listed worker and trying to help them back to work. In local labour markets, they typically do not have sufficient scale to train case workers and/or therapists in interventions aimed at small groups.

The present review and meta-analysis provide new insights for researchers and policymakers alike, attempting to conceive employment related interventions aimed at broader groups of sick-listed workers with mental disorders, and they represent a much needed starting point for planning future research and policy. The results provide convincing evidence for the effectiveness of work related interventions for sick-listed workers with mental disorders, and point to key ingredients in successful interventions that may boost effect sizes considerably beyond the average; namely contact to the work place and using more than one active component.

The overall quality of the present review and meta-analysis might be affected by the following limitations. First, despite the aim to include interventions targeting a broad spectrum of mental disorders, only two studies pertaining exclusively to somatoform disorders, one study pertaining to anxiety, and no studies targeting personality disorders were obtained. Second, the majority of the included studies were conducted with small samples (27 out of 42 studies had sample sizes < 200). Further, due to missing data, the foundations for the meta-analysis and the systematic review differ slightly and results should be interpreted in the light of this discrepancy.

CONCLUSION

In the present review and meta-analysis we assessed the effectiveness of interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for sick-listed workers with mental disorders. The results revealed an overall

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

significantly positive and economically important effect of interventions aimed at enhancing return to work for sick-listed workers with mental disorders. We demonstrated the importance of contact to the work place, graded return to work and the use of multi-component interventions as key ingredients in successful interventions. These findings may inform design of future interventions and may thus represent a step towards establishing systematic guidelines for employment related interventions aimed at sick-listed workers with mental disorders.

References

- (1) Harvey SB, Henderson M, Lelliott P, *et al.* Mental health and employment: much work still to be done. *Br J Psychiatry* 2009;194:201 – 3.
- (2) World Health Organization. The ICD-10 classification of mental and behavioural disorders: clinical descriptions and diagnostic guidelines. WHO; 1992.
- (3) American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (DSM-5®). American Psychiatric Pub; 2013 May 22.
- (4) Goetzel RZ, Long SR, Ozminkowski RJ, *et al.* Health, absence, disability, and presenteeism cost estimates of certain physical and mental health conditions affecting US employers. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2004 Apr 1;46(4):398-412.
- (5) Henderson M, Harvey SB, Øverland S, *et al.* Work and common psychiatric disorders. *J R Soc Med.* 2011 May;104(5):198-207.
- (6) Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. *Transforming Disability into Ability: Policies to promote work and income security for disabled people*. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development Publication Offices; 2003.
- (7) Goffman, E. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. 1959. University of Edinburgh Social Sciences Research Centre.
- (8) Neff W. *Work and human behavior*. 3rd ed. New York: Aldine Press, 1985.
- (9) Eklund M, Hansson L, Ahlqvist C. The importance of work as compared to other forms of daily occupations for wellbeing and functioning among persons with long-term mental illness. *Community Ment Health J.* 2004 Oct 1;40(5):465-77.
- (10) Mykletun A, Overland S, Dahl AA, *et al.* A population-based cohort study of the effect of common mental disorders on disability pension awards. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2006 Aug;163(8):1412-8.

- (11) Eaton WW, Martins SS, Nestadt G, *et al.* The burden of mental disorders. *Epidemiol Rev.* 2008 Sep 19;30(1):1-4.
- (12) Meijer EM, Sluiter JK, Frings-Dresen MH. Evaluation of effective return-to-work treatment programs for sick-listed patients with non-specific musculoskeletal complaints: a systematic review. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health.* 2005 Aug 1;78(7):523-32.
- (13) de Boer AG, Taskila TK, Tamminga SJ, *et al.* Interventions to enhance return-to-work for cancer patients. *Cochrane Libr.* 2015 Jan 1.
- (14) Arends I, Bruinvels DJ, Rebergen DS, *et al.* Interventions to facilitate return to work in adults with adjustment disorders. *Cochrane Libr.* 2012 Jan 1.
- (15) Nieuwenhuijsen K, Faber B, Verbeek JH, *et al.* Interventions to improve return to work in depressed people. *Cochrane Libr.* 2014.
- (16) Nigatu YT, Liu Y, Uppal M, *et al.* Interventions for enhancing return to work in individuals with a common mental illness: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Psychol Med.* 2016 Dec;46(16):3263-74.
- (17) Kline, R. B. *Becoming a behavioral science researcher: A guide to producing research that matters.* New York: Guilford Press, 2009.
- (18) *Fleten N, Johnsen R. Reducing sick leave by minimal postal intervention: a randomised, controlled intervention study. *Occup Environ Med.* 2006 Oct 1;63(10):676-82.
- (19) * van der Feltz-Cornelis CM, Hoedeman R, de Jong FJ, *et al.* Faster return to work after psychiatric consultation for sicklisted employees with common mental disorders compared to care as usual. A randomized clinical trial. *Neuropsychiatr Dis Treat.* 2010;6:375.
- (20) * Reme SE, Grasdahl AL, Løvrvik C, *et al.* Work-focused cognitive-behavioural therapy and individual job support to increase work participation in common mental disorders: a randomised controlled multicentre trial. *Occup Environ Med.* 2015 Aug 10:oemed-2014.

- (21) * Volker D, Zijlstra-Vlasveld MC, Anema JR, *et al.* Effectiveness of a blended web-based intervention on return to work for sick-listed employees with common mental disorders: results of a cluster randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res.* 2015 May;17(5).
- (22) * Hellström L, Bech P, Hjorthøj C, *et al.* Effect on return to work or education of Individual Placement and Support modified for people with mood and anxiety disorders: results of a randomised clinical trial. *Occup Environ Med.* 2017 Oct 1;74(10):717-25.
- (23) * Brouwers EP, Tiemens BG, Terluin B, *et al.* Effectiveness of an intervention to reduce sickness absence in patients with emotional distress or minor mental disorders: a randomized controlled effectiveness trial. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry.* 2006 May 1;28(3):223-9.
- (24) * Hees HL, de Vries G, Koeter MW, *et al.* Adjuvant occupational therapy improves long-term depression recovery and return-to-work in good health in sick-listed employees with major depression: results of a randomised controlled trial. *Occup Environ Med.* 2012 Nov 1:oemed-2012.
- (25) * Bakker IM, Terluin B, Van Marwijk HW, *et al.* A cluster-randomised trial evaluating an intervention for patients with stress-related mental disorders and sick leave in primary care. *PLoS Clin Trials.* 2007 Jun 1;2(6):e26.
- (26) * van Oostrom SH, van Mechelen W, Terluin B, *et al.* A workplace intervention for sick-listed employees with distress: results of a randomised controlled trial. *Occup Environ Med.* 2010 Sep 1;67(9):596-602.
- (27) *Vlasveld MC, van der Feltz-Cornelis CM, Adèr HJ, *et al.* Collaborative care for sick-listed workers with major depressive disorder: a randomised controlled trial from the Netherlands Depression Initiative aimed at return to work and depressive symptoms. *Occup Environ Med.* 2012 Oct 1:oemed-2012.

- (28) *van der Klink JJ, Blonk RW, Schene AH, *et al.* Reducing long term sickness absence by an activating intervention in adjustment disorders: a cluster randomised controlled design. *Occup Environ Med.* 2003 Jun 1;60(6):429-37.
- (29) *Blonk RW, Brenninkmeijer V, Lagerveld SE, *et al.* Return to work: a comparison of two cognitive behavioural interventions in cases of work-related psychological complaints among the self-employed. *Work Stress.* 2006 Apr 1;20(2):129-44.
- (30) * Schene AH, Koeter MW, Kikkert MJ, *et al.* Adjuvant occupational therapy for work-related major depression works: randomized trial including economic evaluation. *Psychol Med.* 2007 Mar;37(3):351-62.
- (31) * Willert MV, Thulstrup AM, Bonde JP. Effects of a stress management intervention on absenteeism and return to work-results from a randomized wait-list controlled trial. *Scand J Work Environ Health.* 2011 May 1:186-95.
- (32) *Netterstrøm B, Friebel L, Ladegaard YK. The effects of a group based stress treatment program (the Kalmia concept) targeting stress reduction and return to work. A randomized, wait-list controlled trial. *J Environ Occup Sci.* 2012:111-20.
- (33) *Netterstrøm B, Friebel L, Ladegaard Y. Effects of a multidisciplinary stress treatment programme on patient return to work rate and symptom reduction: results from a randomised, wait-list controlled trial. *Psychother Psychosom.* 2013;82(3):177-86.
- (34) *Kröger C, Bode K, Wunsch EM, *et al.* Work-related treatment for major depressive disorder and incapacity to work: Preliminary findings of a controlled, matched study. *J Occup Health Psychol.* 2015 Apr;20(2):248.
- (35) * van Beurden KM, van der Klink JJ, Brouwers EP, *et al.* Effect of an intervention to enhance guideline adherence of occupational physicians on return-to-work self-efficacy in

workers sick-listed with common mental disorders. *BMC public health*. 2015

Dec;15(1):796.

- (36) *van Beurden KM, Brouwers EP, Joosen MC, *et al*. Effectiveness of an intervention to enhance occupational physicians' guideline adherence on sickness absence duration in workers with common mental disorders: a cluster-randomized controlled trial. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2017 Dec 1;27(4):559-67.
- (37) * Skouen JS, Kvåle A. Different outcomes in subgroups of patients with long-term musculoskeletal pain. *Nor Epidemiol*. 2009 Oct 9;16(2).
- (38) * Martin MH, Nielsen MB, Madsen IE, *et al*. Effectiveness of a coordinated and tailored return-to-work intervention for sickness absence beneficiaries with mental health problems. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2013 Dec 1;23(4):621-30.
- (39) *Martin MH, Nielsen MB, Pedersen J, *et al*. Stability of return to work after a coordinated and tailored intervention for sickness absence compensation beneficiaries with mental health problems: results of a two-year follow-up study. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2015 Oct 23;37(22):2107-13.
- (40) *Lammerts L, Schaafsma FG, Bonefaas-Groenewoud K, *et al*. Effectiveness of a return-to-work program for workers without an employment contract, sick-listed due to common mental disorders. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2016 Nov 2;42(6):469-80.
- (41) * Momsen AM, Stapelfeldt CM, Nielsen CV, *et al*. Effects of a randomized controlled intervention trial on return to work and health care utilization after long-term sickness absence. *BMC public health*. 2016 Dec;16(1):1149.
- (42) * Lytsy P, Carlsson L, Anderzén I. Effectiveness of two vocational rehabilitation programmes in women with long-term sick leave due to pain syndrome or mental illness: 1-year follow-up of a randomized controlled trial. *J Rehabil Med*. 2017 Feb 5;49(2):170-7.

- (43) * Nystuen P, Hagen KB. Solution-focused intervention for sick listed employees with psychological problems or muscle skeletal pain: a randomised controlled trial [ISRCTN39140363]. *BMC Public Health*. 2006 Dec;6(1):69.
- (44) *De Vente W, Kamphuis JH, Emmelkamp PM, *et al*. Individual and group cognitive-behavioral treatment for work-related stress complaints and sickness absence: a randomized controlled trial. *J Occup Health Psychol*. 2008 Jul;13(3):214.
- (45) * Folke F, Parling T, Melin L. Acceptance and commitment therapy for depression: A preliminary randomized clinical trial for unemployed on long-term sick leave. *Cogn Behav Pract*. 2012 Nov 1;19(4):583-94.
- (46) * Beck BD, Hansen ÅM, Gold C. Coping with work-related stress through Guided Imagery and Music (GIM): Randomized controlled trial. *J Music Ther*. 2015 Sep 30;52(3):323-52.
- (47) * de Weerd BJ, van Dijk MK, van der Linden JN, *et al*. The effectiveness of a convergence dialogue meeting with the employer in promoting return to work as part of the cognitive-behavioural treatment of common mental disorders: a randomized controlled trial. *Work*. 2016 Jan 1;54(3):647-55.
- (48) *Noordik E, van der Klink JJ, Geskus RB, *et al*. Effectiveness of an exposure-based return-to-work program for workers on sick leave due to common mental disorders: a cluster-randomized controlled trial. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2013 Mar 1:144-54.
- (49) * Rebergen DS, Bruinvels DJ, Bezemer PD, *et al*. Guideline-based care of common mental disorders by occupational physicians (CO-OP study): a randomized controlled trial. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2009 Mar 1;51(3):305-12.
- (50) * Stenlund T, Ahlgren C, Lindahl B, *et al*. Cognitively oriented behavioral rehabilitation in combination with Qigong for patients on long-term sick leave because of burnout: REST—a randomized clinical trial. *Int J Behav Med*. 2009 Sep 1;16(3):294.

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

- (51) * Netterstrøm B, Bech P. Effect of a multidisciplinary stress treatment programme on the return to work rate for persons with work-related stress. A non-randomized controlled study from a stress clinic. *BMC public health*. 2010 Dec;10(1):658.
- (52) * Eklund M, Erlandsson LK. Return to work outcomes of the Redesigning Daily Occupations (ReDO) program for women with stress-related disorders—A comparative study. *Women Health*. 2011 Nov 1;51(7):676-92.
- (53) * Grossi G, Santell B. Quasi-experimental evaluation of a stress management programme for female county and municipal employees on long-term sick leave due to work-related psychological complaints. *J Rehabil Med*. 2009 Jul 5;41(8):632-8.
- (54) * Suoyrjö H, Oksanen T, Hinkka K, *et al*. A comparison of two multidisciplinary inpatient rehabilitation programmes for fibromyalgia: a register linkage study on work disability. *J Rehabil Med*. 2009 Jan 5;41(1):66-72.
- (55) * Karlson B, Jönsson P, Pålsson B, *et al*. Return to work after a workplace-oriented intervention for patients on sick-leave for burnout-a prospective controlled study. *BMC Public Health*. 2010 Dec;10(1):301.
- (56) * Karlson B, Jönsson P, Österberg K. Long-term stability of return to work after a workplace-oriented intervention for patients on sick leave for burnout. *BMC Public Health*. 2014 Dec;14(1):821.
- (57) * Lagerveld SE, Blonk RW, Brenninkmeijer V, *et al*. Work-focused treatment of common mental disorders and return to work: a comparative outcome study. *J Occup Health Psychol*. 2012 Apr;17(2):220.
- (58) * Wåhlin C, Ekberg K, Persson J, *et al*. Evaluation of self-reported work ability and usefulness of interventions among sick-listed patients. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2013 Mar 1;23(1):32-43.

REVIEW OF INTERVENTIONS FOR SICK-LISTED WORKERS

- (59) * Schneider U, Linder R, Verheyen F. Long-term sick leave and the impact of a graded return-to-work program: evidence from Germany. *Eur J Health Econ.* 2016 Jun 1;17(5):629-43.
- (60) Cohen, J. Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, Hillsdale, NJ, 1988.