

Appendix 1. Review Objectives and Questions

	Primary	Secondary
Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To systematically explore the validity and reliability of observational methods being developed for assessment of postural loads. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – To establish the methodological quality of the included studies. – To collect a full list of observational methods in postural load assessment. – To study how the collected methods have been evaluated in validity and reliability domains.
Questions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – How valid and reliable are the observational methods in postural load assessment? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – What is the Methodological Quality of the included studies? – What is the Measurement Error and Reliability of the assessment methods? – What is the Content Validity and Criterion Validity of the assessment methods? – What is the Cross-Cultural Adaptation Quality of the assessment methods?

Appendix 2. Systematic Review Search Strategy

	Clinimetric/Psychometric Properties		Dimensions		Observational Tool	
General keywords	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - psychometric property OR - clinimetric property OR - validity OR - reliability 	AND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - posture OR - postural load OR - static physical workload OR - sedentary physical workload 	AND	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PRAMUD - LEBA - ErgoPart - PERA - OES - AWBA - ERIN - NERPA - WERA - AULA - ALLA - QEC - WEPAS - PAI - CPWE - OUBPS - LUBA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WSEC - REBA - PI - ACGIH HAL - OCRA - PATH - SI - PLIBEL - HARBO - PEO - RULA - ERGAN - PT - AET - OWAS - VIDAR
PubMed (MeSH)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - psychometrics OR - clinimetrics OR - reproducibility of results 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - posture OR - workloads OR - static workloads OR - sedentary 			
Science Direct (Keywords)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - psychometric property OR - clinimetric property OR - validity OR - reliability 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - posture OR - postural load OR - static physical workload OR - sedentary physical workload 			
CINAHL (Descriptors)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - validity OR - reliability 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - posture OR - physical load OR - sedentary lifestyle 			
Ergonomics Abstracts (Thesaurus)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - test validity OR - test reliability 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - postural loading OR - static physical load OR - sedentary 			
Embase (Emtree)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - validity OR - reliability 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - posture OR - physical workload OR - sedentary behavior 			

Appendix 3. Inclusion and Non-Inclusion Criteria for the Studies

	Inclusion	Non-Inclusion
P	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Age \geq 6 years old - Male and Female 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies including people <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with physical or mental impairments • suffering Musculoskeletal disorders
I	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The study reported the development of an observational method to assess the postural load - The study investigated the validity and reliability of an observational method for postural load assessment - Observational methods integrated with a machine-learning algorithm 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies with a focus on <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion Capture Systems • Electrogoniometers and Inclinometers • Smartphone Applications • Photogrammetry • Medical Scanning Systems
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not Applicable 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not Applicable
O	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development of postural load assessment observational method - Validity and Reliability of the observational method 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Measurement of Joint Range of Motion - Assessment of Balance and Gait Parameters
S	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Methodological studies - Cross-Sectional and case-control studies - Experimental and Controlled Trials - Clinimetric and Psychometric studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies relying solely on subjective approaches - All types of reviews - Conference Proceedings - Grey Literature

P: Population; **I:** Instrument/Intervention; **C:** Comparison; **O:** Outcome Measure; **S:** Study Design.

Appendix 4. Summary of Overall Quality of Evidence (Abbreviations)

Abbreviation	Full Title	Abbreviation	Full Title
PRAMUD	Personal Risk Assessment of MUsculoskeletal Disorders	LUBA	Loading on the Upper Body Assesement
LEBA	Loading on the Entire Body Assessment	VIDAR	Videooch Datorbaserad ARbetsanalys
PERA	Postural Ergonomic Risk Assessment	REBA	Rapid Entire Body Assessment
OES	Overall Ergonomic Score	OCRA	OCcupational Repetitive Action
AWBA	Agricultural Whole-Body Assessment	PATH	Posture, Activity, Tools and Handling
ERIN	Evaluación del Riesgo Idividual	SI	Strain Index
NERPA	Novel Ergonomic Postural Assessment Method	PLIBEL	Method for the Identification of Musculoskeletal Stress Factors which may have Injurious Effects
WERA	Workplace Ergonomic Risk Assessment	PEO	Portable Ergonomic Observation
QEC	Quick Exposure Check	RULA	Rapid Upper Limb Assessment
WEPAS	WEaving Posture Analyzing System	ERGAN	ERGonomic ANalysis
PAI	Posture Assessment Instrument	PT	Posture Targeting

CPWE	Computerized Postural Workload Evaluation	OWAS	Ovako Working Posture Analysing System
OUBPS	Ontario Universities Back Pain Study		

Appendix 4 - MacDermid's Checklist

Design requirements:

- Q1. Was the relevant background research cited to define what is currently known about the psychometric properties of the measures under study, and the need or potential contributions of the current research question?
- Q2. Were appropriate inclusion/exclusion criteria defined?
- Q3. Were specific psychometric hypotheses identified?
- Q4. Was an appropriate scope of psychometric properties considered?
- Q5. Was an appropriate sample size used?
- Q6. Was appropriate retention/follow-up obtained? (Studies involving retesting or follow-up only)
- Q7. Documentation: Were specific descriptions provided or referenced that explain the measures and its correct application/interpretation (to a standard that would allow replication)?
- Q8. Standardized Methods: Were administration and application of measurement techniques within the study standardized and did they are considered potential sources of error/misinterpretation?
- Q9. Were analyses conducted for each specific hypothesis or purpose?
- Q10. Were appropriate statistical tests conducted to obtain point estimates of the psychometric property?
- Q11. Were appropriate ancillary analyses were done to describe properties beyond the point estimates (Confidence intervals, benchmark comparisons, SEM/MID)?
- Q12. Were the conclusions/clinical recommendations supported by the study objectives, analysis and results?

N/A: not applicable; 2= fully meet criteria; 1 = partially meet criteria; 0= not meeting criteria at all.

MacDermid's Checklist

Author/ Year		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Q 12	Total Score		
														Total	%	Quality
Yazdanirad et al., 2022	PRAMUD	2	1	1	1	2	N/A	1	2	1	2	2	1	16	73	MQ
Kee et al., 2021	LEBA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	10	42	LQ
Chander et al., 2017	PERA	1	N/A	1	1	N/A	1	1	2	1	1	N/A	2	11	61	MQ
Savino et al., 2016	OES	2	N/A	1	N/A	1	2	1	1	2	1	N/A	1	12	67	MQ
Kong et al., 2015	AWBA	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	12	50	LQ
Rodríguez et al., 2013	ERIN	1	1	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	16	67	MQ
Sanchez-Lite et al., 2013	NERPA	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	10	42	LQ
Rahman et al., 2011	WERA	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	14	58	MQ
David et al., 2008	QEC	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	19	79	HQ
Choobineh et al., 2004	WEPAS	2	1	2	2	1	N/A	1	1	2	2	N/A	2	16	80	HQ
Branson et al., 2002	PAI	1	0	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	14	58	MQ
Chung et al., 2002	CPWE	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	46	LQ
Neumann et al., 2001	OUBPS	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	16	67	MQ
Kee et al., 2001	LUBA	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	15	63	MQ
Kadefors et al., 2001	VIDAR	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	9	38	LQ
Hignett et al., 2000	REBA	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	16	67	MQ

MacDermid's Checklist

Author/ Year		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Q 12	Total Score		
														Total	%	Quality
Occhipinti et al.,1996	OCRA	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	16	67	MQ
Buchholz et al.,1996	PATH	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	16	67	MQ
Moore et al.,1995	SI	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	14	58	MQ
Kemmlert et al.,1995	PLIBEL	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	16	66	MQ
Fransson-Hall et al.,1995	PEO	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	15	62	MQ
Mc Atamney et al.,1993	RULA	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	19	79	HQ
Holzmann et al.,1982	ERGAN	1	1	1	1	1	1	N/A	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	50	LQ
Corlett et al.,1979	PT	1	1	2	0	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	16	67	MQ
Karhu et al.,1977	OWAS	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	0	2	16	66	MQ

Appendix 5 - COSMIN Checklist – Box B (Reliability)

Design requirements:

- Q1. Was the percentage of missing items given?
- Q2. Was there a description of how missing items were handled?
- Q3. Was the sample size included in the analysis adequate?
- Q4. Were at least two measurements available?
- Q5. Were the administration's independent?
- Q6. Was the time interval stated?
- Q7. Were patients stable in the interim period on the construct to be measured?
- Q8. Was the time interval appropriate?
- Q9. Were the test conditions similar for both measurements? e.g. type of administration, environment, instructions.
- Q10. Were there any important flaws in the design or methods of the study?
- Q11. For continuous scores: Was an intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) calculated?
- Q12. for dichotomous/nominal/ordinal scores: Was kappa calculated?
- Q13. For ordinal scores: Was a weighted kappa calculated?
- Q14. For ordinal scores: Was the weighting scheme described? e.g. linear, quadratic.;

N/A: not applicable; 1 = yes; 0= no.

COSMIN Checklist – Box B (Reliability)

Study		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Q 12	Q 13	Q 14	Total Score		
																Total	%	Quality
Yazdanirad et al., 2022	PRAMUD	1	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	63	MQ
Kee et al., 2021	LEBA	0	0	1	2	N/A	2	1	1	2	1	2	N/A	N/A	1	13	59	MQ
Chander et al., 2017	PERA	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	4	50	LQ
Savino et al., 2016	OES	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	N/A	N/A	N/A	13	59	MQ
Kong et al., 2015	AWBA	0	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	N/A	N/A	15	63	MQ
Rodríguez et al., 2013	ERIN	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	N/A	17	65	MQ
Sanchez-Lite et al., 2013	NERPA	0	0	1	2	N/A	2	1	1	2	1	2	N/A	N/A	1	13	59	MQ
Rahman et al., 2011	WERA	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	0	1	N/A	N/A	14	58	MQ
David et al., 2008	QEC	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	21	75	MQ
Choobineh et al., 2004	WEPAS	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	17	77	MQ
Branson et al., 2002	PAI	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	N/A	N/A	16	67	MQ
Chung et al., 2002	CPWE	0	0	1	1	N/A	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	N/A	1	11	46	LQ
Neumann et al., 2001	OUBPS	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	N/A	N/A	17	71	MQ
Kee et al., 2001	LUBA	1	1	2	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	8	67	MQ
Kadefors et al., 2001	VIDAR	1	1	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	1	1	N/A	1	N/A	7	44	LQ
Hignett et al., 2000	REBA	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	21	75	MQ

COSMIN Checklist – Box B (Reliability)

Study		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Q 12	Q 13	Q 14	Total Score		
																Total	%	Quality
Occhipinti et al.,1996	OCRA	1	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	5	63	MQ
Buchholz et al.,1996	PATH	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	N/A	N/A	16	67	MQ
Moore et al.,1995	SI	1	1	0	1	1	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	1	1	N/A	1	N/A	8	50	LQ
Kemmlert et al.,1995	PLIBEL	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	17	60	MQ
Fransson-Hall et al.,1995	PEO	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	15	53	MQ
Mc Atamney et al.,1993	RULA	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	2	N/A	N/A	20	83	HQ
Holzmann et al.,1982	ERGAN	1	1	0	1	1	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	N/A	1	1	10	52	MQ
Corlett et al.,1979	PT	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	N/A	17	65	MQ
Karhu et al.,1977	OWAS	1	1	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	1	1	N/A	1	N/A	7	44	LQ

Appendix 6 - COSMIN Checklist - Box C (Measurement Error)

Design requirements:

Q1. Was the percentage of missing items given?

Q2. Was there a description of how missing items were handled?

Q3. Was the sample size included in the analysis adequate?

Q4. Were at least two measurements available?

Q5. Were the administration's independent?

Q6. Was the time interval stated?

Q7. Were patients stable in the interim period on the construct to be measured?

Q8. Was the time interval appropriate?

Q9. Were the test conditions similar for both measurements? e.g. type of administration, environment, instructions.

Q10. Were there any important flaws in the design or methods of the study?

Q11. for CTT: Was the Standard Error of Measurement (SEM), Smallest Detectable Change (SDC) or Limits of Agreement (LoA) calculated?

N/A: not applicable; 1 = yes; 0 = n.

COSMIN Checklist - Box C (Measurement Error)

Study		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Total Score		
													Total	%	Quality
Yazdanirad et al., 2022	PRAMUD	1	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	2	7	70	MQ
Kee et al., 2021	LEBA	0	0	1	2	N/A	2	1	1	2	1	0	10	50	LQ
Chander et al., 2017	PERA	1	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	3	50	LQ
Savino et al., 2016	OES	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	0	13	59	MQ
Kong et al., 2015	AWBA	0	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	16	73	MQ
Rodríguez et al., 2013	ERIN	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	55	MQ
Sanchez-Lite et al., 2013	NERPA	0	0	1	2	N/A	2	1	1	2	1	1	11	55	MQ
Rahman et al., 2011	WERA	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	14	64	MQ
David et al., 2008	QEC	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	18	82	HQ
Choobineh et al., 2004	WEPAS	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	2	0	16	72	MQ
Branson et al., 2002	PAI	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	14	64	MQ
Chung et al., 2002	CPWE	0	0	1	1	N/A	1	1	1	2	1	1	9	45	LQ
Neumann et al., 2001	OUBPS	1	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	14	64	MQ
Kee et al., 2001	LUBA	1	1	2	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	9	64	MQ
Kadefors et al., 2001	VIDAR	1	1	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	1	1	6	43	LQ
Hignett et al., 2000	REBA	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	17	77	HQ

COSMIN Checklist - Box C (Measurement Error)

Study		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Total Score		
													Total	%	Quality
Occhipinti et al.,1996	OCRA	1	1	2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	1	6	60	MQ
Buchholz et al.,1996	PATH	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	13	59	MQ
Moore et al.,1995	SI	1	1	0	1	1	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	1	N/A	6	43	LQ
Kemmlert et al.,1995	PLIBEL	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	13	54	MQ
Fransson-Hall et al.,1995	PEO	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11	50	LQ
Mc Atamney et al.,1993	RULA	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	17	77	HQ
Holzmann et al.,1982	ERGAN	1	1	0	1	1	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	8	44	LQ
Corlett et al.,1979	PT	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	12	55	MQ
Karhu et al.,1977	OWAS	1	1	0	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	1	2	7	50	LQ

Appendix 7 - COSMIN Checklist – Box D (Content Validity)

Design requirements:

- Q1. Was there an assessment of whether all items refer to relevant aspects of the construct to be measured?
- Q2. Was there an assessment of whether all items are relevant for the study population? (e.g. age, gender, disease characteristics, country, setting)
- Q3. Was there an assessment of whether all items are relevant for the purpose of the measurement instrument? (discriminative, evaluative, and/or predictive)
- Q4. Was there an assessment of whether all items together comprehensively reflect the construct to be measured?
- Q5. Were there any important flaws in the design or methods of the study?

N/A: not applicable; 1 = yes; 0 = n.

COSMIN Checklist – Box D (Content Validity)

Study		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Total Score		
							Total	%	Quality
Yazdanirad et al., 2022	PRAMUD	2	1	2	2	1	8	80	HQ
Kee et al., 2021	LEBA	1	1	1	2	1	6	60	MQ
Chander et al., 2017	PERA	2	2	1	2	2	9	90	HQ
Savino et al., 2016	OES	1	1	2	1	1	6	60	MQ
Kong et al., 2015	AWBA	1	1	1	N/A	1	4	50	LQ
Rodríguez et al., 2013	ERIN	2	1	1	1	1	6	60	MQ
Sanchez-Lite et al., 2013	NERPA	1	0	1	0	1	3	30	LQ
Rahman et al., 2011	WERA	1	1	0	2	1	5	50	LQ
David et al., 2008	QEC	2	2	1	2	1	8	80	HQ
Choobineh et al., 2004	WEPAS	2	1	1	2	1	7	70	MQ
Branson et al., 2002	PAI	1	1	2	1	1	6	60	MQ
Chung et al., 2002	CPWE	1	0	1	0	1	3	30	LQ
Neumann et al., 2001	OUBPS	2	1	1	2	1	7	70	MQ
Kee et al., 2001	LUBA	2	2	1	1	2	8	80	HQ
Kadefors et al., 2001	VIDAR	1	1	1	0	1	4	40	LQ
Hignett et al., 2000	REBA	1	2	1	2	1	7	70	MQ

COSMIN Checklist – Box D (Content Validity)

Study		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Total Score		
							Total	%	Quality
Occhipinti et al.,1996	OCRA	2	1	1	2	1	7	70	MQ
Buchholz et al.,1996	PATH	2	1	2	2	1	8	80	HQ
Moore et al.,1995	SI	2	1	1	1	1	6	60	MQ
Kemmlert et al.,1995	PLIBEL	2	2	1	2	1	8	80	HQ
Fransson-Hall et al.,1995	PEO	1	2	1	1	1	6	60	MQ
Mc Atamney et al.,1993	RULA	2	1	2	2	1	8	80	HQ
Holzmann et al.,1982	ERGAN	1	1	1	1	1	5	50	LQ
Corlett et al.,1979	PT	2	1	1	1	1	6	60	MQ
Karhu et al.,1977	OWAS	2	2	1	2	1	8	80	HQ

Appendix 8 - COSMIN Checklist – Box H (Criterion Validity)

Design requirements:

Q1. Was the percentage of missing items given?

Q2. Was there a description of how missing items were handled?

Q3. Was the sample size included in the analysis adequate?

Q4. Can the criterion used or employed be considered as a reasonable ‘gold standard’?

Q5. Were there any important flaws in the design or methods of the study?

Q6. for continuous scores: Were correlations, or the area under the receiver operating curve calculated?

Q7. for dichotomous scores: Were sensitivity and specificity determined?

N/A: not applicable; 1 = yes; 0 = n.

COSMIN Checklist – Box H (Criterion Validity)

Study		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Total Score		
									Total	%	Quality
Yazdanirad et al., 2022	PRAMUD	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	11	79	HQ
Kee et al., 2021	LEBA	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	29	LQ
Chander et al., 2017	PERA	1	1	N/A	1	2	1	2	8	57	MQ
Savino et al., 2016	OES	2	1	1	1	0	1	N/A	6	50	LQ
Kong et al., 2015	AWBA	0	1	1	1	1	N/A	N/A	4	40	LQ
Rodríguez et al., 2013	ERIN	1	1	2	1	1	N/A	1	7	58	MQ
Sanchez-Lite et al., 2013	NERPA	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	5	36	LQ
Rahman et al., 2011	WERA	1	1	1	1	0	1	N/A	5	42	LQ
David et al., 2008	QEC	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	11	79	HQ
Choobineh et al., 2004	WEPAS	1	2	1	2	2	N/A	1	9	75	MQ
Branson et al., 2002	PAI	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	8	57	MQ
Chung et al., 2002	CPWE	0	0	2	2	0	N/A	1	5	41	LQ
Neumann et al., 2001	OUBPS	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	9	64	MQ
Kee et al., 2001	LUBA	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	9	64	MQ
Kadefors et al., 2001	VIDAR	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	7	50	LQ
Hignett et al., 2000	REBA	1	2	1	2	1	1	2	10	71	MQ

COSMIN Checklist – Box H (Criterion Validity)

Study		Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Total Score		
									Total	%	Quality
Occhipinti et al.,1996	OCRA	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	10	71	MQ
Buchholz et al.,1996	PATH	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	9	64	MQ
Moore et al.,1995	SI	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	36	LQ
Kemmlert et al.,1995	PLIBEL	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	10	71	MQ
Fransson-Hall et al.,1995	PEO	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	9	64	MQ
Mc Atamney et al.,1993	RULA	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	11	79	HQ
Holzmann et al.,1982	ERGAN	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	8	57	MQ
Corlett et al.,1979	PT	1	1	2	1	1	N/A	1	7	58	MQ
Karhu et al.,1977	OWAS	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	5	36	LQ