

Assessing Open Science practices in physical activity behaviour change intervention evaluations

Emma Norris^{1*}, Isra Sulevani¹, Ailbhe N. Finnerty², Oscar Castro^{2,3}

* Corresponding author: Emma.Norris@brunel.ac.uk

¹ Health Behaviour Change Research Group; Department of Health Sciences; Brunel University, UK

² Centre for Behaviour Change; University College London, UK

³ Future Health Technologies, Singapore-ETH Centre, Campus for Research Excellence And Technological Enterprise (CREATE), Singapore

Keywords: open science, reproducibility, transparency, meta-research, physical activity, behaviour change

Abstract

Objectives: Concerns on the lack of reproducibility and transparency in science have led to a range of research practice reforms, broadly referred to as 'Open Science'. The extent that physical activity interventions are embedding Open Science practices is currently unknown. In this study, we randomly sampled 100 reports of recent physical activity randomised controlled trial behaviour change interventions to estimate the prevalence of Open Science practices.

Methods: One hundred reports of randomised controlled trial physical activity behaviour change interventions published between 2018-2021 were identified, as used within the Human Behaviour-Change Project. Open Science practices were coded in identified reports, including: study pre-registration, protocol sharing, data-, materials- and analysis scripts-sharing, replication of a previous study, open access publication, funding sources and conflict of interest statements. Coding was performed by two independent researchers, with inter-rater reliability calculated using Krippendorff's alpha.

Results: 78 of the 100 reports provided details of study pre-registration and 41% provided evidence of a published protocol. 4% provided accessible open data, 8% provided open materials and 1% provided open analysis scripts. 73% of reports were published as open access and no studies were described as replication attempts. 93% of reports declared their sources of funding and 88% provided conflicts of interest statements. A Krippendorff's alpha of 0.73 was obtained across all coding.

Conclusion: Open data, materials, analysis and replication attempts are currently rare in physical activity behaviour change intervention reports, whereas funding source and conflict of interest

declarations are common. Future physical activity research should increase the reproducibility of their methods and results by incorporating more Open Science practices.

Key messages

What is already known on this topic

- Open Science practices support research being more transparent and reproducible.
- Assessment of Open Science practices in physical activity research is limited.

What this study adds

- We reviewed Open Science practices within 100 reports of physical activity behaviour change intervention randomised controlled trials.
- Open data, materials, analysis and replication attempts are currently rare in physical activity behaviour change intervention research.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy

- Our study draws attention to the practical solutions and resources that are most needed to promote transparency, reproducibility and accessibility in future physical activity research.

Introduction

Across scientific research, there is an increased awareness of highly prevalent problematic research practices, often referred to as questionable research practices,[1] such as *p*-hacking: mining data for significant results [2, 3] and Hypothesising After the Results are Known (or 'HARKing').[4] Open Science is an umbrella term of research behaviours intending to reduce these questionable research practices.[5-8] Open Science research practices can be applied across the whole research process: from conception to publication.[7–9] At research conception, pre-registrations provide time-stamped evidence of study hypotheses, methods and analysis plans [10, 11], with these details made publicly available through online repositories such as Open Science Framework.[12] In contrast to research protocols that specify research details but may be published before or after the study is in-progress or even completed,[13] pre-registrations are completed and published prior to data collection to minimise biases.[14] Open data, open materials (including questionnaires and intervention materials used) and open analysis scripts help make the processes and outputs of research more transparent, accessible and sharable.[15] At publication, Open Access publishing makes reporting of research available to anyone at no cost to the reader.[16]

Questionable research practices are likely rife in physical activity, sport and exercise medicine research.[17-18] A recent study assessed the prevalence of questionable research practices within sport and exercise medicine research, including one hundred and twenty-nine studies published in leading sports medicine journals in 2019.[19] Their analysis found that 82.2% of all reported hypotheses, and 70.8% of the primary hypothesis, were supported by study results, which authors identify as implausibly high.[19] Meta-research has assessed Open Science practices in domains related to physical activity, behaviour change and life sciences.[20] A recent study exploring 250 psychology studies of varying study designs published between 2014 and 2017 found that while open access publication was relatively common (65%), sharing of open materials (14%), data (2%) and analysis scripts (1%), as well as pre-specification of research plans via pre-registration (3%) and study protocols (0%) were low.[21] In addition, transparency of reporting was inconsistent for funding statements (62%) and conflict of interest disclosure statements (39%).[21] Meta-science studies have also assessed these Open Science practices within smoking cessation behaviour change research,[22] social sciences,[20] biomedicine [23] and biostatistics.[24]

However, to our knowledge, no study has evaluated the extent to which Open Science practices are used within physical activity research. Gaining a better understanding of these practices could inform future recommendations and policy development to promote open, transparent science within the physical activity field and to reduce the threat of questionable research practices. Therefore, the aim of this study was to assess Open Science practices within physical activity behaviour change intervention randomised controlled trial reports assessing moderate-to-vigorous physical activity outcomes.

Methods

Study design

This was a retrospective observational study with a cross-sectional design. Sampling units were individual physical activity behaviour change intervention reports. This study applied an established methodology used to assess Open Science practices in smoking cessation interventions,[22] psychological sciences [21] and social sciences.[20] This study was preregistered on the Open Science Framework.[25] All deviations from this protocol are explicitly acknowledged in Supplementary File 1. Deviations included adding an additional item to specify whether a declared study pre-registration was registered ahead of data collection, or whether it was actually

retrospectively registered after data collection had commenced, as well as adding 'funded by a non-profit' options within funding source and conflict of interest assessment items.

Search strategy

All papers included in this study were reports of physical activity behaviour change interventions, evaluated via randomised controlled trials. These reports were identified for inclusion within the Human Behaviour-Change Project (HBCP), which is developing an Artificial Intelligence system to extract information from published intervention studies and make recommendations for real-world practice and future research.[26,27] The selection criteria for the HBCP are comparable to the one used for the present study (i.e., both projects have a broad scope and aim to identify a somewhat random subsample of reports describing randomised controlled trials of physical activity behaviour change interventions). Therefore, we used the same pool of articles remaining after the HBCP's title and abstract screening (see Figure 1 for a complete overview). Physical activity behaviour change intervention reports were identified in the HBCP using Microsoft Academic, one of the biggest, most comprehensive bibliographic databases of scientific literature.[28] The search strategy was performed on 20.01.2021 and included the terms "MVPA or moderate-to-vigorous physical activity or MPA or VPA or moderate physical activity or vigorous physical activity or strenuous physical activity or hard physical activity", with studies additionally filtered using the Randomised Controlled Trial classifier. The terms were identified through a scoping search in which one of the study authors (OC) manually scanned the terms used in 20 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports. Inclusion criteria were reports describing randomised controlled trials of physical activity behaviour change interventions and published between 2018 and 2021. The rationale for the recency of these included papers is to best represent current Open Science practices, given the relatively recent nature of Open Science practices.[1] In addition, we focused on randomised controlled trials only due to their recognition as 'gold-standard' for studying intervention effectiveness.[26] Exclusion criteria were trial protocols, conference submissions, abstract-only entries, qualitative research and economic or process evaluations. Full texts of identified papers within the HBCP were screened by one researcher (EN) to double-check relevance against inclusion and exclusion criteria, with piloting of the screening strategy by two authors (EN & OC). Of the 171 reports remaining after applying these criteria, 100 reports were selected due to time and resource constraints using the Calculator Soup Random Number Generator.[29]

-----INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE -----

Measures

Article characteristics recorded were: i) author name, ii) publication year and iii) country of the corresponding author. Open Science practices were assessed by recording presence of the following in included reports: i) *Pre-registration*: whether pre-registration was reported as carried out, where the pre-registration was hosted (e.g Open Science Framework, ClinicalTrials.gov), whether it could be accessed, what aspects of the study (hypotheses, methods and analysis plans) were pre-registered and whether the pre-registration was logged prospectively (prior to data collection commencing) or retrospectively (after data collection had commenced);[30] ii) *Protocol sharing*: whether a protocol was reported as published and what aspects of the study (hypotheses, methods and analysis plans) were included in the protocol; iii) *Data sharing*: whether data were reported as available, where it was available (e.g online repository such as Open Science Framework, upon request from authors, as a journal supplementary file), whether the data were downloadable and accessible, whether data files were clearly documented and the extent that data reported were sufficient to allow replication of study findings; iv) *Materials sharing*: whether study materials were reported as available, where they were available (e.g online repository such as Open Science Framework, upon request from authors, as a journal supplementary file) and whether the materials were downloadable and accessible; v) *Analysis script-sharing*: whether analysis scripts were reported as available, where they were available (e.g online repository such as Open Science Framework, upon request from authors, as a journal supplementary file) and whether the analysis scripts were downloadable and accessible; vi) *Replication of a previous study*: whether the study was described as being a replication attempt of a previous study; vii) *Open access publication*: whether the study was published as open access, assessed via the Open Access button website [31] which harvests deposited publication from thousands of academic institutions;[32] viii) *Funding sources*: whether funding sources were declared and if research was funded by public organisations (such as research councils or charities), pharmaceutical, activity-related or other companies; and ix) *Conflicts of interest*: whether conflicts of interest were declared and whether conflicts were with public organisations (such as research councils or charities), pharmaceutical, activity-related or other companies. The journal impact factor of identified papers was intentionally not assessed to evaluate papers, due to well-documented issues with manipulation and inflation of these figures.[33,34] All measured variables are shown in Table 1.

-----INSERT TABLE 1 HERE -----

Procedure

Coding of identified intervention reports took place between July and September 2021, with all data extracted onto a Google Form [35]. All reports were independently coded by two researchers (IS coded all 100 papers, EN & OC coded 50 each). Any discrepancies were resolved through discussion, with input from a third researcher who was not involved in the initial coding of that specific paper (EN or OC).

Analysis

Raw numbers and percentages were identified for each variable. Inter-rater reliability of the independent coding by the two researchers, prior to any changes after discrepancy discussions, was calculated using Krippendorff's alpha [36] using R package 'irr' version 0.84.1 [37], as performed in other related research coding studies.[22, 38]

Results

Sample characteristics

Twenty-two out of the 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports were published in 2018, thirty-three in 2019, thirty-seven in 2020 and eight in 2021. The 100 reports evaluated studies conducted in twenty-four different countries, taking place most commonly in the United States of America (n=24), Australia (n=19), Canada (n=10) and the United Kingdom (n=7). A full summary of countries in included reports is presented in Supplementary File 2.

Open Science practices in physical activity behaviour change intervention reports

Final reconciled coding of Open Science practices for all 100 included physical activity behaviour change intervention reports can be found in Supplementary File 3.

Article availability (Open Access)

Seventy-three out of 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports were available via open access, with twenty-seven of them only accessible behind a paywall (Figure 2A).

Pre-registration

Seventy-eight out of 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports included a statement indicating existence of a study pre-registration. Of those, seventy-seven could be accessed. Forty-three of all accessible pre-registrations were recorded prospectively (i.e before data collection commenced) and thirty-four were recorded retrospectively (i.e after data collection can

commenced). Seventy-seven of all accessible pre-registrations declared specifications relating to study methods, twenty-four declared hypotheses and five declared analysis plans. Thirty-seven of all accessible pre-registrations were hosted on ClinicalTrials.gov (48.1%), eighteen on the Australian and New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ANZCTR: 23.4%), fourteen on the International Standard Randomized Clinical Trial Number registry (ISRCTN: 18.2%), three on Netherlands Trial Register (NTR: 3.9%) and one on Deutsches Register Klinischer Studien (DRKS), Iranian Registry of Clinical Trials (IRCT), Registro Brasileiro de Ensaio Clinicos (REBEC), UMIN Clinical Trials Registry (UMIN-CTR) and Chinese Clinical Trial Registry (ChCTR) (1.3% each). One included study was noted as a Registered Report,[39] logged with an International Registered Report Identifier (IRRID: 1.3%) (Figure 2B).

Protocol sharing

Forty-one out of 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports included a statement about protocol availability. All forty-one (100%) of these protocols specified study methods, forty (97.6%) specified analysis plans and fourteen (34.1%) specified hypotheses (Figure 2C).

Data sharing

Thirty-two out of 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports included a data availability statement. Of those, twenty-two stated data was only available upon request from the authors, five stated that data was available within the reports' supplementary files, one stated that data was available via a personal or institutional website, and four stated that data was not available. Only four out of these thirty-two reports included a data availability statement that data files that were actually accessible to download, with two of these providing clear documentation for the data files and two providing sufficient detail needed to reproduce findings (Figure 2D).

Material sharing

Seventeen out of 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports included a materials availability statement. Of those, ten reports stated that materials were available within the reports' supplementary files and seven stated that materials were only available upon request from the authors. Eight out of the ten studies which stated that materials were provided as supplementary files actually provided accessible and downloadable materials, such as full or sample intervention activities (Figure 2E).

Analysis script sharing

One out of 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports included an analysis script availability statement [40], with this provided as a supplementary file (Figure 2F).

Replication study

None of the 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports were described as replication studies (Figure 2G).

Funding

Ninety-three out of the 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports included a statement about funding sources. Most of the reports disclosed public funding only, such as via government-funded research grants, charities or universities (n=85). One report disclosed both public funding and funding from private activity-related companies [41] and one report disclosed funding from private activity-related companies only.[42] Six reports reported receiving no funding (Figure 2H).

Conflicts of interest

Eighty-eight out of the 100 articles provided a conflict of interest statement. Most of these reports stated that there were no conflicts of interests (n=77). Eleven reports stated that there was at least one conflict of interest, including from an activity company (n=5), a public organisation such as government or charities (n=2), a pharmaceutical company (n=1), a non-activity or pharmaceutical company (n=1), a combination of activity, pharmaceutical and other private companies (n=1), or that researchers were involved in the development and evaluation of the reported intervention (n=1) (Figure 2I).[43]

Inter-rater reliability assessment

Inter-rater reliability of all coding across the 100 reports was assessed as good, $\alpha=0.73$.

-----INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE -----

Discussion

This study aimed to assess Open Science practices within physical activity behaviour change intervention reports. It was found that Open Science practices varied amongst the assessed 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention reports. Most reports were open access and pre-registered, with reported funding sources and conflicts of interest. However, research materials, data and analysis scripts were not frequently provided and no replication studies were identified.

Pre-registration of studies was found to be slightly more common for physical activity intervention RCTs (78%), than found in smoking cessation intervention RCTs (73%)[22] and much more common

than in wider psychological research of varying study designs (3%)[21]. In our study, similar amounts of studies were preregistered prospectively (55.7%: prior to data collection commencing) or retrospectively (44.2%: after data collection had commenced),[30] although this distinction between preregistrations has not been assessed in comparable research. The common prevalence of retrospective pre-registration via clinical trials is arguably not true pre-registration, nor transparent from the study's outset.[12, 13] One included study was noted as a Registered Report,[39] where in-principle acceptance to journals is given based on study proposals at conception stage, rather than based on completed studies and their reported findings.[44] No Registered Reports were identified in smoking cessation [22] and psychology,[21] perhaps reflecting a slow increase in Registered Report numbers over time.[15] Protocols were available as separate papers or linked publications in 41% of included physical activity studies, which is higher than in smoking cessation studies (29%);[22] and wider psychology research (0%).[21] The increased prevalence of protocols within physical activity and smoking cessation likely reflects greater availability of health-related protocol publications,[46] via specific journals such as JMIR Research Protocols and via protocols as specific types of publications within wider journals such as BMC Public Health and Trials. High prevalence of protocols in this study is also indicative of randomised controlled trials being both a common study design in health and intervention research [47] and a study design typically accompanied by research protocols.[48]

Open access reports were at similarly moderate levels in physical activity (73%) than in smoking cessation (71%);[22] and psychology (65%),[21] but greater than the 45% observed in the social sciences,[20] the 45% across scientific literature published in 2015 [16] and the 25% in biomedicine.[23] This high rate of open access publishing in physical activity interventions may reflect increasing requirements by health funding bodies for open access publications,[49] as well as increasing usage of preprint servers such as MedRxiv for medical sciences and PsyArXiv for the psychological sciences.[50]

Open materials were less commonly available in physical activity reports (8%) than in smoking cessation reports (13%),[22] psychology (14%);[21] and biomedicine (33%).[23] Open data was also less common across physical activity reports (4%) than in smoking cessation reports (7%),[22] but greater than the 2% of wider psychological research.[21] Provision of raw data as supplementary files to published intervention reports or via trusted third-party repositories such as the Open Science Framework is important to facilitate evidence synthesis. Open analysis scripts were found to be as infrequently provided in physical activity studies than in smoking interventions and wider

psychological research (all 1%).[21,22] No replication attempts were identified in this sample of physical activity intervention reports, same as within smoking cessation reports [22] but less than in the social sciences (1%);[20] and in wider psychology studies (5%).[21]

Declaration of funding sources were declared in physical activity reports (93%) similarly to smoking cessation reports (95%);[22] more so than wider psychology (62%),[21] social sciences (31%)[20] and biomedical science reports (69%).[23] Similarly, a conflict of interest statement was provided as commonly in physical activity reports than in smoking cessation reports (88% in both)[22] and higher than in wider psychology (39%),[21] social sciences (39%)[20] and biomedical sciences reports (65%).[23] Eight percent of studies reported conflicts from private companies including activity, pharmaceutical and other companies, less than the 20% of studies reporting company funding in smoking cessation interventions.[22]

Future steps to increase Open Science in physical activity interventions

This research has demonstrated a need to address the low levels of Open Science engagement in physical activity research, particularly in the areas of open materials, data, analysis scripts and replication attempts. As with any complex behaviour change, this transformation requires systems change across bodies involved in the development, running and publication of physical activity research: researchers, research institutions, funding organisations, journals and beyond.[1, 9] In order to develop effective behaviour change interventions, it is important to use a systematic and comprehensive approach to intervention development, underpinned by a model of behaviour and theoretically predicted mechanisms of action.[51-53] The Capability, Opportunity, Motivation, Behaviour (COM-B) model [54] posits that changing behaviour involves changing one or more of the following: capability (psychological and physical capacity to engage in the behaviour), opportunity (external factors that make the execution of a particular behaviour possible or prompt it) and motivation (internal processes that energise and direct behaviour). We argue that understanding the capability, opportunity and motivation associated with Open Science practices [18] and developing interventions to address these determinants of behaviour change, is key to increase engagement with Open Science.

For example, low perceived capability towards Open Science practices in physical activity researchers can be addressed by providing researchers with training tailored to the context of activity intervention research (e.g., online training on how to make anonymised activity monitor data openly available, how to use preprint servers most relevant to activity research or how to make their activity analysis reproducible). Opportunity to engage in Open Science practices can be facilitated

within institutions, encouraging discussions around Open Science in the context of physical activity research [19] and in science more broadly,[21, 23, 55] as well as developing a research culture valuing and promoting the benefits of open science practices.[16, 23] Motivation for Open Science can be addressed by providing incentives, such as awarding funding to research-embedding open practices.[56] Similarly, Open Science badges recognising open data, materials and pre-registration have been adopted by journals as a simple, low-cost scheme to reward these research behaviours.[57] However, uptake of Open Science badges in physical activity journals is currently low and is ripe for increased uptake in the field.

Strengths and limitations

A strength of this study is the implementation of a comprehensive and previously used approach to identify open science practices. Moreover, two researchers independently carried out the coding of open science practices, reducing the risk of human error and maximising reliability.[58] A limitation is that the search and screening processes were conducted by a single author. However, unlike systematic reviews, we did not attempt to conduct a comprehensive search to identify all relevant research but to select a somewhat random subsample to analyse open science practices and inform specific recommendations for future research. In this regard, it is worth acknowledging that results are based on a relatively small sample of physical activity behaviour change reports, meaning findings may not be applicable to all physical activity research. Last, the assessment of open science practices was entirely dependent on what was described within evaluation reports. Direct requests to authors or additional wider searching of third-party registries such as Open Science Framework may have identified additional information.

Conclusions

Open Science practices in physical activity behaviour change intervention reports were varied. Open access publication and pre-registration of research plans were common, although pre-registration was often done retrospectively i.e after data collection has started, hence not in the most transparent manner. Provision of open data, materials and analysis was rare and replication attempts were non-existent. Funding sources and conflicts of interest were usually declared. Urgent initiatives are needed to increase the uptake of all Open Science practices in physical activity, with a particular focus on open materials, data, analysis scripts and replication attempts.

Statements

Competing interests: The authors declare they have no competing interests.

Contributorship: Emma Norris: Conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, project administration, resources, software, supervision, validation, visualisation, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing; Isra Sulevani: Data curation, formal analysis, writing – review & editing; Ailbhe N. Finnerty: Formal analysis, software, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing; Oscar Castro: Conceptualisation, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, writing – original draft, writing – review & editing.

Acknowledgements: Thanks to the Human Behaviour-Change Project

Funding: No funding existed for this study.

Ethical approval: Not required as this was meta-research of existing research.

Data sharing statement: All data from this study are publicly available.[59]

Patient and Public Involvement: Not appropriate for this study.

References

- [1] M. R. Munafò *et al.*, “A manifesto for reproducible science,” *Nat. Hum. Behav.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 1–9, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1038/s41562-016-0021.
- [2] M. L. Head, L. Holman, R. Lanfear, A. T. Kahn, and M. D. Jennions, “The Extent and Consequences of P-Hacking in Science,” *PLOS Biol.*, vol. 13, no. 3, p. e1002106, Mar. 2015, doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1002106.
- [3] J. P. Simmons, L. D. Nelson, and U. Simonsohn, “False-positive psychology: undisclosed flexibility in data collection and analysis allows presenting anything as significant,” *Psychol. Sci.*, vol. 22, no. 11, pp. 1359–1366, Nov. 2011, doi: 10.1177/0956797611417632.
- [4] K. R. Murphy and H. Aguinis, “HARKing: How Badly Can Cherry-Picking and Question Trolling Produce Bias in Published Results?,” *J. Bus. Psychol.*, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s10869-017-9524-7.
- [5] M. R. Munafò, G. J. Hollands, and T. M. Marteau, “Open science prevents mindless science,” *BMJ*, vol. 363, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1136/bmj.k4309.
- [6] B. A. Nosek, J. R. Spies, and M. Motyl, “Scientific Utopia: II. Restructuring Incentives and Practices to Promote Truth Over Publishability,” *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 615–631, Nov. 2012, doi: 10.1177/1745691612459058.
- [7] FOSTER Open Science, “Open Science Definition | FOSTER,” 2021. <https://www.fosteropenscience.eu/foster-taxonomy/open-science-definition> (accessed Nov. 03, 2021).

- [8] U.-K. Kathawalla, P. Silverstein, and M. Syed, "Easing Into Open Science: A Guide for Graduate Students and Their Advisors," *Collabra Psychol.*, vol. 7, no. 1, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1525/collabra.18684.
- [9] E. Norris and D. B. O'Connor, "Science as behaviour: Using a behaviour change approach to increase uptake of open science," *Psychol. Health*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 1397–1406, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.1080/08870446.2019.1679373.
- [10] S. M. Field, E.-J. Wagenmakers, H. A. L. Kiers, R. Hoekstra, A. F. Ernst, and D. van Ravenzwaaij, "The effect of preregistration on trust in empirical research findings: results of a registered report," *R. Soc. Open Sci.*, vol. 7, no. 4, p. 181351, 2020, doi: 10.1098/rsos.181351.
- [11] Y. Yamada, "How to Crack Pre-registration: Toward Transparent and Open Science," *Front. Psychol.*, vol. 9, p. 1831, 2018, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01831.
- [12] I. Sullivan, A. DeHaven, and D. Mellor, "Open and Reproducible Research on Open Science Framework," *Curr. Protoc. Essent. Lab. Tech.*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. e32, 2019, doi: 10.1002/cpet.32.
- [13] L. Shamseer *et al.*, "Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation.," vol. 349. *The BMJ*, p. 7647, 2015. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7647>.
- [14] M. Bakker *et al.*, "Ensuring the quality and specificity of preregistrations," *PLOS Biol.*, vol. 18, no. 12, p. e3000937, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.3000937.
- [15] B. A. Nosek *et al.*, "Promoting an open research culture," *Science*, vol. 348, no. 6242, pp. 1422–1425, Jun. 2015, doi: 10.1126/science.aab2374.
- [16] H. Piwowar *et al.*, "The state of OA: a large-scale analysis of the prevalence and impact of Open Access articles," *PeerJ*, vol. 6, p. e4375, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.7717/peerj.4375.
- [17] A. R. Caldwell *et al.*, "Moving Sport and Exercise Science Forward: A Call for the Adoption of More Transparent Research Practices," *Sports Med.*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 449–459, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1007/s40279-019-01227-1.
- [18] I. Halperin, A. D. Vigotsky, C. Foster, and D. B. Pyne, "Strengthening the Practice of Exercise and Sport-Science Research," *Int. J. Sports Physiol. Perform.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 127–134, 2018, doi: 10.1123/ijsp.2017-0322.
- [19] F. Büttner, E. Toomey, S. McClean, M. Roe, and E. Delahunt, "Are questionable research practices facilitating new discoveries in sport and exercise medicine? The proportion of supported hypotheses is implausibly high," *Br. J. Sports Med.*, vol. 54, no. 22, pp. 1365–1371, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2019-101863.
- [20] T. E. Hardwicke, J. D. Wallach, M. C. Kidwell, T. Bendixen, S. Crüwell, and J. P. A. Ioannidis, "An empirical assessment of transparency and reproducibility-related research practices in the social sciences (2014–2017)," *R. Soc. Open Sci.*, vol. 7, no. 2, p. 190806, 2020, doi: 10.1098/rsos.190806.
- [21] T. E. Hardwicke, R. T. Thibault, J. E. Kosie, J. D. Wallach, M. C. Kidwell, and J. P. A. Ioannidis, "Estimating the Prevalence of Transparency and Reproducibility-Related Research Practices in Psychology (2014–2017)," *Perspect. Psychol. Sci.*, p. 1745691620979806, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1177/1745691620979806.
- [22] E. Norris, Y. He, R. Loh, R. West, and S. Michie, "Assessing Markers of Reproducibility and Transparency in Smoking Behaviour Change Intervention Evaluations," *J. Smok. Cessat.*, vol. 2021, p. e6694386, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1155/2021/6694386.
- [23] J. D. Wallach, K. W. Boyack, and J. P. A. Ioannidis, "Reproducible research practices, transparency, and open access data in the biomedical literature, 2015–2017," *PLOS Biol.*, vol. 16, no. 11, p. e2006930, Nov. 2018, doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.2006930.
- [24] A. Rowhani-Farid and A. G. Barnett, "Badges for sharing data and code at Biostatistics: an observational study," *F1000Research*, vol. 7, p. 90, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.12688/f1000research.13477.2.
- [25] E. Norris and O. Castro, "Assessing the reproducibility and transparency of physical activity behaviour change interventions," Jul. 2021, doi: 10.17605/OSF.IO/2ZYU3.

- [26] S. Michie *et al.*, “The Human Behaviour-Change Project: harnessing the power of artificial intelligence and machine learning for evidence synthesis and interpretation,” *Implement. Sci.*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 121, Oct. 2017, doi: 10.1186/s13012-017-0641-5.
- [27] S. Michie *et al.*, “The Human Behaviour-Change Project: An artificial intelligence system to answer questions about changing behaviour,” *Wellcome Open Res.*, vol. 5, p. 122, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15900.1.
- [28] Microsoft. “Microsoft Academic”. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/project/academic/> (accessed Apr. 11, 2022).
- [29] Calculator Soup, “Random Number Generator,” Jan. 06, 2021. <https://www.calculatorsoup.com/calculators/statistics/random-number-generator.php>
- [30] E. Loder, S. Loder, and S. Cook, “Characteristics and publication fate of unregistered and retrospectively registered clinical trials submitted to The BMJ over 4 years,” *BMJ Open*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. e020037, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020037.
- [31] Open Access Button, “Open Access Button,” 2021. <https://openaccessbutton.org/> (accessed Jan. 06, 2021).
- [32] C. Bowley, “Bringing Open Access into Interlibrary Loan with the Open Access Button.” LIS Scholarship Archive, Feb. 23, 2018. doi: 10.31229/osf.io/qzbpa.
- [33] V. Larivière and C. R. Sugimoto, “The Journal Impact Factor: A Brief History, Critique, and Discussion of Adverse Effects,” in *Springer Handbook of Science and Technology Indicators*, W. Glänzel, H. F. Moed, U. Schmoch, and M. Thelwall, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2019, pp. 3–24. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-02511-3_1.
- [34] S. Chua *et al.*, “The impact factor of an open access journal does not contribute to an article’s citations,” *F1000Research*, vol. 6, p. 208, Mar. 2017, doi: 10.12688/f1000research.10892.1.
- [35] E. Norris, A. N. Finnerty, and O. Castro, “Google Form for data extraction,” Jun. 28, 2021. <https://osf.io/5vsg6/> (accessed Apr. 06, 2022).
- [36] A. F. Hayes and K. Krippendorff, “Answering the Call for a Standard Reliability Measure for Coding Data,” *Commun. Methods Meas.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 77–89, Apr. 2007, doi: 10.1080/19312450709336664.
- [37] A. N. Finnerty, “Open Science in Physical Activity IRR Script,” Oct. 19, 2021. <https://osf.io/t5gw4/> (accessed Apr. 06, 2022).
- [38] A. J. Wright *et al.*, “Ontologies relevant to behaviour change interventions: a method for their development [version 3; peer review: 2 approved, 1 approved with reservations],” vol. 5, no. 126. Wellcome Open Research, 2020. doi: <https://doi.org/10.12688/wellcomeopenres.15908.3>.
- [39] A. Ek *et al.*, “Effectiveness of a 3-Month Mobile Phone–Based Behavior Change Program on Active Transportation and Physical Activity in Adults: Randomized Controlled Trial,” *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 8, no. 6, p. e18531, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.2196/18531.
- [40] C. Tudor-Locke *et al.*, “Evaluation of Step-Counting Interventions Differing on Intensity Messages,” *J. Phys. Act. Health*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 21–28, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1123/jpah.2018-0439.
- [41] J. W. Kayser *et al.*, “A web-based tailored nursing intervention (TAVIE en m@rche) aimed at increasing walking after an acute coronary syndrome: Multicentre randomized trial,” *J. Adv. Nurs.*, vol. 75, no. 11, pp. 2727–2741, 2019, doi: 10.1111/jan.14119.
- [42] C. F. J. Nooijen *et al.*, “The effectiveness of multi-component interventions targeting physical activity or sedentary behaviour amongst office workers: a three-arm cluster randomised controlled trial,” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 1329, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09433-7.
- [43] L. Poppe *et al.*, “Efficacy of a Self-Regulation–Based Electronic and Mobile Health Intervention Targeting an Active Lifestyle in Adults Having Type 2 Diabetes and in Adults Aged 50 Years or Older: Two Randomized Controlled Trials,” *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 21, no. 8, p. e13363, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.2196/13363.

- [44] C. Chambers, "What's next for Registered Reports?," *Nature*, vol. 573, no. 7773, pp. 187–189, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.1038/d41586-019-02674-6.
- [45] A. M. Scheel, M. R. M. J. Schijen, and D. Lakens, "An Excess of Positive Results: Comparing the Standard Psychology Literature With Registered Reports," *Adv. Methods Pract. Psychol. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 25152459211007468, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.1177/25152459211007467.
- [46] A. P. Basu, J. E. Pearse, and T. Rapley, "Publishing protocols for trials of complex interventions before trial completion – potential pitfalls, solutions and the need for public debate," *Trials*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 5, Jan. 2017, doi: 10.1186/s13063-016-1757-7.
- [47] A. Deaton and N. Cartwright, "Understanding and misunderstanding randomized controlled trials," *Soc. Sci. Med.* 1982, vol. 210, pp. 2–21, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.12.005.
- [48] J. M. Tetzlaff, A.-W. Chan, J. Kitchen, M. Sampson, A. C. Tricco, and D. Moher, "Guidelines for randomized clinical trial protocol content: a systematic review," *Syst. Rev.*, vol. 1, no. 1, p. 43, Sep. 2012, doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-1-43.
- [49] A. Severin, M. Egger, M. P. Eve, and D. Hürlimann, "Discipline-specific open access publishing practices and barriers to change: an evidence-based review." F1000Research, Mar. 26, 2020. doi: 10.12688/f1000research.17328.2.
- [50] A. Flanagin, P. B. Fontanarosa, and H. Bauchner, "Preprints Involving Medical Research—Do the Benefits Outweigh the Challenges?," *JAMA*, vol. 324, no. 18, pp. 1840–1843, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.20674.
- [51] M. A. McVay and D. E. Conroy, "Transparency and openness in behavioral medicine research," *Transl. Behav. Med.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 287–290, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1093/tbm/ibz154.
- [52] S. Michie and M. Johnston, "Theories and techniques of behaviour change: Developing a cumulative science of behaviour change," *Health Psychol. Rev.*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–6, Mar. 2012, doi: 10.1080/17437199.2012.654964.
- [53] T. Willmott and S. Rundle-Thiele, "Are we speaking the same language? Call for action to improve theory application and reporting in behaviour change research," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 479, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1186/s12889-021-10541-1.
- [54] S. Michie, M. M. van Stralen, and R. West, "The behaviour change wheel: A new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions," *Implement. Sci.*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 42, Apr. 2011, doi: 10.1186/1748-5908-6-42.
- [55] A. Orben, "A journal club to fix science," *Nature*, vol. 573, no. 7775, pp. 465–466, Sep. 2019.
- [56] M. R. Munafò, C. D. Chambers, A. M. Collins, L. Fortunato, and M. R. Macleod, "Research Culture and Reproducibility," *Trends Cogn. Sci.*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 91–93, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.tics.2019.12.002.
- [57] M. C. Kidwell *et al.*, "Badges to Acknowledge Open Practices: A Simple, Low-Cost, Effective Method for Increasing Transparency," *PLOS Biol.*, vol. 14, no. 5, p. e1002456, May 2016, doi: 10.1371/journal.pbio.1002456.
- [58] K. L. Gwet, *Handbook of Inter-Rater Reliability, 4th Edition: The Definitive Guide to Measuring The Extent of Agreement Among Raters*. Advanced Analytics, LLC, 2014.
- [59] Norris E, Sulevani I, Castro O. & Finnerty AN. Data from: Assessing Open Science practices in physical activity behaviour change intervention evaluations. 2022. Open Science Framework, February 20, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/T5GW4>.

Table 1. Measured characteristics within identified physical activity behaviour change intervention reports.

Variables	Coder questions	Response options
Article characteristics		
<p>Coder instructions: Check the institutional affiliation of the corresponding author. If there are multiple corresponding authors, choose the first. If no corresponding author is identified, choose the first. If there are multiple affiliations for the selected author, choose the first.</p>		
Country	Which country is the corresponding author based in according to their affiliated?	[list countries]/ Unclear/ Other
Pre-registration		
<p>Definitions: “Pre-registration” refers to the specification of important aspects of the study (typically hypotheses, methods, and/or analysis plan) prior to commencement of the study.</p> <p>Coder instructions: Check specific sections in the paper where these files might be located e.g., supplementary materials, appendices, author notes, methods, and results sections. Search for “registration”.</p>		
Pre-registration statement	Does the article state whether or not the study (or some aspect of the study) was pre-registered?	Yes – the statement says that there was a pre-registration / Yes – the statement says that there was NO pre-registration / No – there is no pre-registration statement / Other*
Pre-registration method	Where does the article indicate the pre-registration is located?	Open Science Framework / AsPredicted / ClinicalTrials.gov / AEA Trial Registry / EGAP Registry / Registered Report / Other*
Pre-registration accessible	Can you access and open the pre-registration	Yes / No / Other*
Pre-registration content	What aspects of the study appear to be pre-registered? (select all that apply)	Hypotheses Methods Analysis Plan Other*
Protocol sharing		
<p>Definition: “protocol” refers to a document containing details about the study design, methods, and analysis plan. It may or may not be pre-registered.</p> <p>Coder instructions: Search the article for the phrase ‘protocol’ and assess whether a link is provided to a protocol document.</p>		
Protocol availability	Does the article link to an accessible protocol?	Yes / No / Other*
Protocol content	What aspects of the study appear to be included in the protocol? (select all that apply)	Hypotheses Methods Analysis Plan Other*
Data sharing		
<p>Definitions: “data” refers to recorded information that supports the analyses reported in the article. A “data availability statement” can be as simple as a url link to a data file, or as complex as a written explanation as to why data cannot be shared.</p>		


Coder instructions: Check the article for a data availability statement/link. They are often located in the “supplementary material”, “acknowledgements”, “author notes”, “methods”, or “results” sections. Search the article for the text “data availab” (to cover “data availability” and “data available”).		
Data availability statement	Does the article state whether or not data are available?	Yes - the statement says that the data (or some of the data) are available / Yes - the statement says that the data are NOT available / No - there is no data availability statement / Other*
Data sharing method	How does the statement indicate the data are available?	Upon request from the authors / Personal or institution website / An online, third-party repository (e.g., OSF, FigShare etc.) / supplementary materials hosted by the journal / Other*
Data accessibility	Can you access, download, and open the data files?	Yes / No / Other*
Data documentation	Are the data files clearly documented?	Yes / No / Other*
Data content	Do the data files appear to contain all of the raw data necessary to reproduce the reported findings?	Yes / No / Unclear / Other*
Materials sharing Definitions: “materials” refers to any study items that would be needed to repeat the study, such as stimuli, survey instruments, and computer code/software used for data collection, presentation stimuli or running experiments		
Materials availability statement	Does the article state whether or not materials are available?	Yes - the statement says that the materials (or some of the materials) are available / Yes - the statement says that the materials are NOT available / No - there is no materials availability statement / Other*
Materials sharing method	According to the statement, how are the materials accessible?	Upon request from the authors / Personal or institution website / An online, third-party repository (e.g., OSF, FigShare etc.) / supplementary materials hosted by the journal / Other*
Materials accessibility	Can you access, download, and open the materials files?	Yes / No / Other*

Analysis script sharing		
<p>Definition: "Analysis scripts" refers to specification of data preparation and analysis steps in the form of highly detail step-by-step instructions for using point-and-click software, analysis code (e.g., R), or syntax (e.g., from SPSS).</p> <p>Coder instructions: Check the article for an analysis script availability statement/link. They are often located in the "supplementary material", "acknowledgements", "author notes", "methods", or "results" sections. Search for the text "analysis script" and "analysis code".</p>		
Analysis script availability statement	Does the article state whether or not analysis scripts are available?	Yes - the statement says that the analysis scripts (or some of the analysis scripts) are available / Yes - the statement says that the analysis scripts are NOT available / No - there is no analysis script availability statement
Analysis script sharing method	According to the statement, how are the analysis scripts accessible?	Upon request from the authors / Personal or institution website / An online, third-party repository (e.g., OSF, FigShare etc.) / supplementary materials hosted by the journal / Other*
Analysis script accessibility	Can you access, download, and open the analysis script files?	Yes / No / Other*
Funding		
<p>Coder instructions: Funding is usually reported in a specific section e.g., "Author information", or "Funding statement". Search the article for the phrase "funding". If you are unsure whether an organisation is an activity-related company, pharmaceutical company, other private company or public organisation, Google the organisation name and code accordingly. If it is unclear to you whether the funding is private or public, choose the 'other' option and enter 'unclear'.</p>		
Funding statement	Does the article include a statement indicating whether there were funding sources?	Yes – the statement says that there was funding from an activity-related company (e.g Nike, Fitbit) / Yes – funding from a pharmaceutical company (e.g Pfizer, GSK)/ Yes – funding from another private company (e.g Google, Coca Cola) / Yes – funding from a public organisation (e.g National Institute of Health Research)/ Yes - the statement says that there was no funding was provided / No – there is no funding statement / Unclear/Other*

Conflict of interest		
<p>Coder instructions: Conflicts of interest are usually reported in a specific section e.g. “Author information” or “Conflict of interest statement”. Search the article for the phrases “conflict of interest” and/or “competing interest”. If you are unsure whether an organisation is an activity-related company, pharmaceutical company, other private company or public organisation, Google the organisation name and code accordingly. If it is unclear to you whether the conflict of interest is private or public, choose the 'other' option and enter 'unclear'.</p>		
Conflict of Interest statement	Does the article include a statement indicating whether there were any conflicts of interest?	Yes – the statement says that there was a conflict of interest from an activity-related company (e.g Nike, Fitbit) / Yes – conflict of interest from a pharmaceutical company (e.g Pfizer, GSK)/ / Yes – conflict of interest from another private company (e.g Google, Coca Cola) / Yes – conflict of interest from a public organisation (e.g National Institute of Health Research)/ Yes - the statement says that there is no conflict of interest / No – there is no conflict of interest statement / Other*
Replication		
<p>Definitions: “replication” refers to repetition of a previous study’s methods in order to ascertain whether similar findings can be obtained.</p> <p>Coder instructions: Search the abstract and introduction for the phrase “replicat” (to cover ‘replication’, ‘replicates’ etc). Confirm the authors are using the phrase with the definition provided above.</p>		
Replication statement	Does the article claim to report a replication study?	The article claims to report a replication study (or studies) / There is no clear statement that the article reports a replication study (or studies) / Other*
Open access		
<p>Coder instructions: To establish the open access status of the article: Go to https://openaccessbutton.org/ and enter the article’s doi (e.g., “10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004574”) if available (if not, enter the article title). If a link is provided, check that you can access the article at the link. If the article is accessible answer “Yes”. If the article is not accessible at the provided link, or no link is provided, answer “No”.</p>		
Open access status	Is the article open access?	Yes – found via open access button / Yes – found via other means / No – could not access article other than through paywall / Other*


*If a response marked with an asterisk is selected, the coder is asked to provide more detail in a free text response box.

Figure 1. Flow diagram for the physical activity behaviour change intervention reports included in the analysis of open science practices



*Steps performed as part of the Human Behaviour Change Project (HBCP) and involving two independent reviewers.

Figure 2A-I.



Supplementary File 1. Updates to pre-registration

During the course of this study and peer review, we made minor adjustments to the pre-registered protocol:

1. We added an additional item: 'Was the declared pre-registration actually pre-registered ahead of data collection?' (Question 8). This specified whether a declared study pre-registration was registered ahead of data collection, or whether it was actually retrospectively registered after data collection had commenced. Responses for this new item were 'Yes – this pre-registration was registered ahead of data collection' or 'No – this pre-registration was retrospectively registered after data collection had commenced'
2. The presence of 'supplementary material' was not sufficient for Material availability alone, as supplementary materials feature a variety of documents from protocols, materials, data etc.
3. Where a data and/or materials availability sub-heading was present in a paper, but no discussion of data and/or materials availability was actually given there; we coded the paper as 'No - there is no data availability statement'/'No - there is no materials availability statement'.
4. We added an option 'Yes - Funded by a non-profit' under Funding sources.
5. We added an option 'Yes - Funded by a non-profit' under Conflict of Interest.
6. We added an option 'Yes - Statement says researchers involved in both development and evaluation of intervention' under Conflict of Interest.

Supplementary File 2. Country of origin of included articles.

Country	n articles
Australia	19
Austria	1
Belgium	4
Brazil	2
Canada	10
China	1
Colombia	1
Costa Rica	1
Germany	3
Hong Kong	1
Iran	1
Ireland	1
Italy	1
Japan	1
Netherlands	5
Norway	4
Singapore	1
South Korea	1
Spain	4
Sweden	4
Switzerland	1
Taiwan	2
UK	7
USA	24
Total	100

Supplementary File 3. Open Science markers assessed in 100 physical activity behaviour change intervention evaluation reports.

Study	Pre-registration available	Protocol available	Data available	Materials available	Analysis script available	Replication study	Open Access	Funding statement	Conflict of interest statement
Alhassan et al. 2019 [1]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No funding	No
Alley et al. 2018 [2]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Andersen et al. 2020 [3]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only		No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Balducci et al. 2019 [4]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – Activity company & pharmaceutical company & other private company
Barrett et al. 2018 [5]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	No	No conflict of interest
Belton et al. 2019 [6]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Berendsen et al. 2020 [7]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Berglind et al. 2020 [8]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Bock et al. 2019 [9]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Boudreau et al. 2020 [10]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest

Catenacci et al. 2019 [11]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – Activity company
Chiang et al. 2020 [12]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Chow et al. 2021 [13]	Yes	No	No	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Coolkens et al. 2018 [14]	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No funding	No
Corder et al. 2020 [15]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Costigan et al. 2018 [16]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Dennett et al. 2018 [17]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Driediger et al. 2019 [18]	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Edney et al. 2020 [19]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No – Supplementary files	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Ek et al. 2020 [20]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Fischer et al. 2019 [21]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Freitas et al. 2021 [22]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest

Fukuoka et al. 2019 [23]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – Public organisation
Galarraga et al. 2020 [24]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No
Garcia-Ortiz et al. 2018 [25]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Golsteijn et al. 2018 [26]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only	No - Upon request only	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – Other private company
Guagliano et al. 2020 [27]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No - Upon request only	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Gutierrez-Martinez et al. 2018 [28]	No	No	No	No - Upon request only	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Ha et al. 2020 [29]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Hamilton et al. 2020 [30]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No
Hardeman et al. 2020 [31]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Harrington et al. 2018 [32]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Isensee et al. 2018 [33]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No

Jago et al. 2019 [34]	Yes	Yes	Yes - Supplement ary files	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Jung et al. 2020 [35]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – Activity company
Kayser et al. 2019 [36]	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Activity company & public organisation	Yes – Activity company
Keller et al. 2020 [37]	Yes	No	Yes – Supplement ary files	Yes – Supplement ary files	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Kernot et al. 2019 [38]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No
Kerr et al. 2018 [39]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Kolle et al. 2020 [40]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Lo et al. 2021 [41]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No funding	No conflict of interest
Looyestyn et al. 2018 [42]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No conflict of interest
Lugones-Sanchez et al. 2020 [43]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Lundqvist et al. 2020 [44]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Lynch et al. 2019 [45]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest

Ma et al. 2019 [46]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Mama et al. 2020 [47]	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Mascarenhas et al. 2018 [48]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No conflict of interest
Maxwell-Smith et al. 2019 [49]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
McNeil et al. 2018 [50]	Yes	No	No - Upon request only	No - Upon request only	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
McNeil et al. 2019 [51]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Meng et al. 2018 [52]	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Mitchell et al. 2019 [53]	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No
Morris et al. 2019 [54]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Muellmann et al. 2019 [55]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Muller-Riemenschneider et al. 2020 [56]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No - Upon request only	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Murawski et al. 2019 [57]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest

Nathan et al. 2020 [58]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Nooijen et al. 2020 [59]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Activity company	Yes – Activity company
Nourizadeh et al. 2020 [60]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No conflict of interest
Ojeda-Rodriguez et al. 2021 [61]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Ozemek et al. 2020 [62]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Pallante et al. 2019 [63]	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
Park et al. 2020 [64]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Patten et al. 2019 [65]	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Plow et al. 2019 [66]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – Pharmaceutical company
Pope et al. 2018 [67]	No	No	No	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Pope et al. 2019 [68]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Poppe et al. 2019 [69]	Yes	Yes	No	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – researchers involved in development &

									evaluation of intervention
Prado et al. 2020 [70]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Reed et al. 2018 [71]	No	No	No	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Reedman et al. 2019 [72]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – Activity company
Reich et al. 2020 [73]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Reid et al. 2021 [74]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Riiser et al. 2020 [75]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Robbins et al. 2019 [76]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Robinson et al. 2019 [77]	Yes	No	No	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Rodriguez-Hernandez et al. 2019 [78]	No	No	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	No	Yes	No funding	No conflict of interest
Rollo et al. 2020 [79]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest

Ruissen et al. 2018 [80]	Yes	No	No	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No
Sala et al. 2021 [81]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Sanchez-Lopez et al. 2020 [82]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No funding	No conflict of interest
Santos et al. 2019 [83]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No conflict of interest
Sebire et al. 2018 [84]	Yes	Yes	No - Personal or institution website	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Seljebotn et al. 2019 [85]	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Singh et al. 2020 [86]	Yes	No	No - Supplementary files	No – Supplementary files	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No
Spring et al. 2018 [87]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Taylor et al. 2020 [88]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	Yes – Public organisation
Tudor-Locke et al. 2020 [89]	Yes	Yes	Yes – Supplementary files	No	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No
Uemura et al. 2021 [90]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest

van den Berg et al. 2019 [91]	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
van Dyck et al. 2019 [92]	Yes	No	No	Yes – Supplementary files	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
van Hoyer et al. 2018 [93]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No - Upon request only	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Vandelanotte et al. 2021 [94]	Yes	Yes	No - Upon request only	No	No	No	No	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Veldman et al. 2020 [95]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Viestler et al. 2018 [96]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Volders et al. 2020 [97]	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Wadsworth et al. 2020 [98]	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No funding	No conflict of interest
Xu et al. 2020 [99]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Yoong et al. 2019 [100]	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes – Public organisation	No conflict of interest
Total	78/100	41/100	4/100	8/100	1/100	0/100	73/100	93/100 reported	88/100 reported

References

- [1] S. Alhassan, C. W. St Laurent, S. Burkart, C. J. Greever, and M. N. Ahmadi, "Feasibility of Integrating Physical Activity Into Early Education Learning Standards on Preschooler's Physical Activity Levels," *J. Phys. Act. Health*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 101–107, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1123/jpah.2017-0628.
- [2] S. J. Alley *et al.*, "The effectiveness of a web 2.0 physical activity intervention in older adults – a randomised controlled trial," *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 4, Dec. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12966-017-0641-5.
- [3] E. Andersen, S. Øvreås, K. A. Jørgensen, J. Borch-Jenssen, and T. Moser, "Children's physical activity level and sedentary behaviour in Norwegian early childhood education and care: effects of a staff-led cluster-randomised controlled trial," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 1651, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09725-Y.
- [4] S. Balducci *et al.*, "Effect of a Behavioral Intervention Strategy on Sustained Change in Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes: The IDES_2 Randomized Clinical Trial," *JAMA*, vol. 321, no. 9, pp. 880–890, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1001/jama.2019.0922.
- [5] S. Barrett, S. Begg, P. O'Halloran, and M. Kingsley, "Integrated motivational interviewing and cognitive behaviour therapy can increase physical activity and improve health of adult ambulatory care patients in a regional hospital: the Healthy4U randomised controlled trial," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 18, p. 1166, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-6064-7.
- [6] S. Belton, A. McCarren, B. McGrane, D. Powell, and J. Issartel, "The Youth-Physical Activity Towards Health (Y-PATH) intervention: Results of a 24 month cluster randomised controlled trial," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 14, no. 9, p. e0221684, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0221684.
- [7] B. A. J. Berendsen, M. R. C. Hendriks, G. M. Rutten, S. P. J. Kremers, H. H. C. M. Savelberg, and N. C. Schaper, "The added value of frequent physical activity group sessions in a combined lifestyle intervention: A cluster randomised trial in primary care," *Prev. Med. Rep.*, vol. 20, p. 101204, Dec. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.pmedr.2020.101204.
- [8] D. Berglind, D. Yacaman-Mendez, C. Lavebratt, and Y. Forsell, "The Effect of Smartphone Apps Versus Supervised Exercise on Physical Activity, Cardiorespiratory Fitness, and Body Composition Among Individuals With Mild-to-Moderate Mobility Disability: Randomized Controlled Trial," *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 8, no. 2, p. e14615, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.2196/14615.
- [9] B. C. Bock *et al.*, "Exercise Videogames, Physical Activity, and Health: Wii Heart Fitness: A Randomized Clinical Trial," *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp. 501–511, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2018.11.026.
- [10] F. Boudreau *et al.*, "Effectiveness of a web-based computer-tailored intervention promoting physical activity for adults from Quebec City: a randomized controlled trial," *Health Psychol. Behav. Med.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 601–622, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1080/21642850.2020.1850287.
- [11] V. A. Catenacci *et al.*, "The Impact of Timing of Exercise Initiation on Weight Loss: An 18-Month Randomized Clinical Trial," *Obes. Silver Spring Md*, vol. 27, no. 11, pp. 1828–1838, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1002/oby.22624.
- [12] S.-L. Chiang, C.-L. Shen, L.-C. Chen, Y.-P. Lo, C.-H. Lin, and C.-H. Lin, "Effectiveness of a Home-Based Telehealth Exercise Training Program for Patients With Cardiometabolic Multimorbidity: A Randomized Controlled Trial," *J. Cardiovasc. Nurs.*, vol. 35, no. 5, pp. 491–501, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.1097/JCN.0000000000000693.
- [13] E. J. Chow *et al.*, "Feasibility of a behavioral intervention using mobile health applications to reduce cardiovascular risk factors in cancer survivors: a pilot randomized controlled trial," *J. Cancer Surviv.*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 554–563, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1007/s11764-020-00949-w.
- [14] R. Coolkens, P. Ward, J. Seghers, and P. Iserbyt, "The Effect of Organized Versus Supervised Recess on Elementary School Children's Participation, Physical Activity, Play, and Social Behavior: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial," *J. Phys. Act. Health*, vol. 15, no. 10, pp. 747–754, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1123/jpah.2017-0591.
- [15] K. Corder *et al.*, "Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the GoActive intervention to increase physical activity among UK adolescents: A cluster randomised controlled trial," *PLOS Med.*, vol. 17, no. 7, p. e1003210, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003210.

- [16] S. A. Costigan, N. D. Ridgers, N. Eather, R. C. Plotnikoff, N. Harris, and D. R. Lubans, "Exploring the impact of high intensity interval training on adolescents' objectively measured physical activity: Findings from a randomized controlled trial," *J. Sports Sci.*, vol. 36, no. 10, pp. 1087–1094, May 2018, doi: 10.1080/02640414.2017.1356026.
- [17] A. M. Dennett *et al.*, "Motivational interviewing added to oncology rehabilitation did not improve moderate-intensity physical activity in cancer survivors: a randomised trial," *J. Physiother.*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 255–263, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.jphys.2018.08.003.
- [18] M. Driediger *et al.*, "The Impact of Shorter, More Frequent Outdoor Play Periods on Preschoolers' Physical Activity during Childcare: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 16, no. 21, p. 4126, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16214126.
- [19] S. M. Edney *et al.*, "A Social Networking and Gamified App to Increase Physical Activity: Cluster RCT," *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 58, no. 2, pp. e51–e62, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2019.09.009.
- [20] A. Ek *et al.*, "Effectiveness of a 3-Month Mobile Phone-Based Behavior Change Program on Active Transportation and Physical Activity in Adults: Randomized Controlled Trial," *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 8, no. 6, p. e18531, Jun. 2020, doi: 10.2196/18531.
- [21] X. Fischer, J.-N. Kreppke, L. Zahner, M. Gerber, O. Faude, and L. Donath, "Telephone-Based Coaching and Prompting for Physical Activity: Short- and Long-Term Findings of a Randomized Controlled Trial (Movingcall)," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 16, no. 14, p. 2626, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16142626.
- [22] P. D. Freitas *et al.*, "A Behavior Change Intervention Aimed at Increasing Physical Activity Improves Clinical Control in Adults With Asthma: A Randomized Controlled Trial," *Chest*, vol. 159, no. 1, pp. 46–57, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2020.08.2113.
- [23] Y. Fukuoka, W. Haskell, F. Lin, and E. Vittinghoff, "Short- and Long-term Effects of a Mobile Phone App in Conjunction With Brief In-Person Counseling on Physical Activity Among Physically Inactive Women," *JAMA Netw. Open*, vol. 2, no. 5, p. e194281, May 2019, doi: 10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.4281.
- [24] O. Galárraga *et al.*, "Small Sustainable Monetary Donation-Based Incentives to Promote Physical Activity: A Randomized Controlled Trial," *Health Psychol. Off. J. Div. Health Psychol. Am. Psychol. Assoc.*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 265–268, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1037/hea0000818.
- [25] L. Garcia-Ortiz *et al.*, "Long-Term Effectiveness of a Smartphone App for Improving Healthy Lifestyles in General Population in Primary Care: Randomized Controlled Trial (Evident II Study)," *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 6, no. 4, p. e107, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.2196/mhealth.9218.
- [26] R. H. J. Golsteijn, C. Bolman, E. Volders, D. A. Peels, H. de Vries, and L. Lechner, "Short-term efficacy of a computer-tailored physical activity intervention for prostate and colorectal cancer patients and survivors: a randomized controlled trial," *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 106, Oct. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12966-018-0734-9.
- [27] J. M. Guagliano *et al.*, "A whole family-based physical activity promotion intervention: findings from the families reporting every step to health (FRESH) pilot randomised controlled trial," *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 17, p. 120, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12966-020-01025-3.
- [28] L. Gutiérrez-Martínez, R. G. Martínez, S. A. González, M. A. Bolívar, O. V. Estupiñan, and O. L. Sarmiento, "Effects of a strategy for the promotion of physical activity in students from Bogotá," *Rev. Saúde Pública*, vol. 52, p. 79, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.11606/S1518-8787.2018052017173.
- [29] A. S. Ha, C. Lonsdale, D. R. Lubans, and J. Y. Y. Ng, "Increasing Students' Activity in Physical Education: Results of the Self-determined Exercise and Learning For FITness Trial," *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.*, vol. 52, no. 3, pp. 696–704, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002172.
- [30] K. C. Hamilton, M. T. Richardson, S. McGraw, T. Owens, and J. C. Higginbotham, "A Controlled Evaluation of a CBPR Intervention's Effects on Physical Activity and the Related Psychosocial Constructs Among Minority Children in an Underserved Community," *J. Phys. Act. Health*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 37–44, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1123/jpah.2019-0135.
- [31] W. Hardeman *et al.*, "Evaluation of a very brief pedometer-based physical activity intervention delivered in NHS Health Checks in England: The VBI randomised controlled trial," *PLOS Med.*, vol. 17, no. 3, p. e1003046, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1003046.

- [32] D. M. Harrington *et al.*, “Effectiveness of the ‘Girls Active’ school-based physical activity programme: A cluster randomised controlled trial,” *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 40, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12966-018-0664-6.
- [33] B. Isensee, V. Suchert, J. Hansen, B. Weisser, and R. Hanewinkel, “Effects of a School-Based Pedometer Intervention in Adolescents: 1-Year Follow-Up of a Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial,” *J. Sch. Health*, vol. 88, no. 10, pp. 717–724, 2018, doi: 10.1111/josh.12676.
- [34] R. Jago *et al.*, “Action 3:30R: Results of a Cluster Randomised Feasibility Study of a Revised Teaching Assistant-Led Extracurricular Physical Activity Intervention for 8 to 10 Year Olds,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 16, no. 1, Art. no. 1, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16010131.
- [35] M. E. Jung *et al.*, “Cardiorespiratory fitness and accelerometer-determined physical activity following one year of free-living high-intensity interval training and moderate-intensity continuous training: a randomized trial,” *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 25, Feb. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12966-020-00933-8.
- [36] J. W. Kayser *et al.*, “A web-based tailored nursing intervention (TAVIE en m@rche) aimed at increasing walking after an acute coronary syndrome: Multicentre randomized trial,” *J. Adv. Nurs.*, vol. 75, no. 11, pp. 2727–2741, 2019, doi: 10.1111/jan.14119.
- [37] J. Keller *et al.*, “Long-term effects of a dyadic planning intervention with couples motivated to increase physical activity,” *Psychol. Sport Exerc.*, vol. 49, p. 101710, Jul. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101710.
- [38] J. Kernot, L. Lewis, T. Olds, and C. Maher, “Effectiveness of a Facebook-Delivered Physical Activity Intervention for Postpartum Women: A Randomized Controlled Trial,” *J. Phys. Act. Health*, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 125–133, Feb. 2019.
- [39] J. Kerr *et al.*, “Cluster randomized controlled trial of a multilevel physical activity intervention for older adults,” *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 32, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12966-018-0658-4.
- [40] E. Kolle *et al.*, “The effect of a school-based intervention on physical activity, cardiorespiratory fitness and muscle strength: the School in Motion cluster randomized trial,” *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 154, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12966-020-01060-0.
- [41] Y.-P. Lo, S.-L. Chiang, C.-H. Lin, H.-C. Liu, and L.-C. Chiang, “Effects of Individualized Aerobic Exercise Training on Physical Activity and Health-Related Physical Fitness among Middle-Aged and Older Adults with Multimorbidity: A Randomized Controlled Trial,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 101, Jan. 2021, doi: 10.3390/ijerph18010101.
- [42] J. Looyestyn, J. Kernot, K. Boshoff, and C. Maher, “A Web-Based, Social Networking Beginners’ Running Intervention for Adults Aged 18 to 50 Years Delivered via a Facebook Group: Randomized Controlled Trial,” *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 20, no. 2, p. e67, Feb. 2018, doi: 10.2196/jmir.7862.
- [43] C. Lugones-Sanchez *et al.*, “Effectiveness of an mHealth Intervention Combining a Smartphone App and Smart Band on Body Composition in an Overweight and Obese Population: Randomized Controlled Trial (EVIDENT 3 Study),” *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 8, no. 11, p. e21771, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.2196/21771.
- [44] S. Lundqvist *et al.*, “Long-term physical activity on prescription intervention for patients with insufficient physical activity level—a randomized controlled trial,” *Trials*, vol. 21, no. 1, p. 793, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s13063-020-04727-y.
- [45] B. M. Lynch *et al.*, “A randomized controlled trial of a wearable technology-based intervention for increasing moderate to vigorous physical activity and reducing sedentary behavior in breast cancer survivors: The ACTIVATE Trial,” *Cancer*, vol. 125, no. 16, pp. 2846–2855, 2019, doi: 10.1002/cncr.32143.
- [46] J. K. Ma, C. R. West, and K. A. Martin Ginis, “The Effects of a Patient and Provider Co-Developed, Behavioral Physical Activity Intervention on Physical Activity, Psychosocial Predictors, and Fitness in Individuals with Spinal Cord Injury: A Randomized Controlled Trial,” *Sports Med.*, vol. 49, no. 7, pp. 1117–1131, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1007/s40279-019-01118-5.
- [47] S. K. Mama *et al.*, “Feasibility and acceptability of a faith-based mind-body intervention among African American adults,” *Transl. Behav. Med.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 928–937, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1093/tbm/iby114.
- [48] M. N. Mascarenhas, J. M. Chan, E. Vittinghoff, E. L. V. Blarigan, and F. Hecht, “Increasing Physical Activity in Mothers Using Video Exercise Groups and Exercise Mobile Apps: Randomized Controlled Trial,” *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 20, no. 5, p. e9310, May 2018, doi: 10.2196/jmir.9310.

- [49] C. Maxwell-Smith *et al.*, “A randomized controlled trial of WATAAP to promote physical activity in colorectal and endometrial cancer survivors,” *Psychooncology.*, vol. 28, no. 7, pp. 1420–1429, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1002/pon.5090.
- [50] J. McNeil *et al.*, “Effects of prescribed aerobic exercise volume on physical activity and sedentary time in postmenopausal women: a randomized controlled trial,” *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 27, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12966-018-0659-3.
- [51] J. McNeil *et al.*, “Activity Tracker to Prescribe Various Exercise Intensities in Breast Cancer Survivors,” *Med. Sci. Sports Exerc.*, vol. 51, no. 5, pp. 930–940, May 2019, doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000001890.
- [52] Y. Meng, M. M. Manore, J. M. Schuna, M. M. Patton-Lopez, A. Branscum, and S. S. Wong, “Promoting Healthy Diet, Physical Activity, and Life-Skills in High School Athletes: Results from the WAVE Ripples for Change Childhood Obesity Prevention Two-Year Intervention,” *Nutrients*, vol. 10, no. 7, p. 947, Jul. 2018, doi: 10.3390/nu10070947.
- [53] B. L. Mitchell *et al.*, “Promoting physical activity in rural Australian adults using an online intervention,” *J. Sci. Med. Sport*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 70–75, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2018.07.002.
- [54] J. L. Morris *et al.*, “A Pedometer-Based Physically Active Learning Intervention: The Importance of Using Preintervention Physical Activity Categories to Assess Effectiveness,” *Pediatr. Exerc. Sci.*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 356–362, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.1123/pes.2018-0128.
- [55] S. Muellmann *et al.*, “Effects of two web-based interventions promoting physical activity among older adults compared to a delayed intervention control group in Northwestern Germany: Results of the PROMOTE community-based intervention trial,” *Prev. Med. Rep.*, vol. 15, p. 100958, Sep. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.pmedr.2019.100958.
- [56] F. Müller-Riemenschneider *et al.*, “Effectiveness of prescribing physical activity in parks to improve health and wellbeing - the park prescription randomized controlled trial,” *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 42, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12966-020-00941-8.
- [57] B. Murawski *et al.*, “Efficacy of an m-Health Physical Activity and Sleep Health Intervention for Adults: A Randomized Waitlist-Controlled Trial,” *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 503–514, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2019.05.009.
- [58] N. K. Nathan *et al.*, “Implementation of a School Physical Activity Policy Improves Student Physical Activity Levels: Outcomes of a Cluster-Randomized Controlled Trial,” *J. Phys. Act. Health*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 1009–1018, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1123/jpah.2019-0595.
- [59] C. F. J. Nooijen *et al.*, “The effectiveness of multi-component interventions targeting physical activity or sedentary behaviour amongst office workers: a three-arm cluster randomised controlled trial,” *BMC Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 1329, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-09433-7.
- [60] R. Nourizadeh, S. Azami, A. Farshbaf-Khalili, and E. Mehrabi, “The Effect of Motivational Interviewing on Women with Overweight and Obesity Before Conception,” *J. Nutr. Educ. Behav.*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 859–866, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jneb.2020.04.219.
- [61] A. Ojeda-Rodríguez *et al.*, “Association between favourable changes in objectively measured physical activity and telomere length after a lifestyle intervention in pediatric patients with abdominal obesity,” *Appl. Physiol. Nutr. Metab.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 205–212, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1139/apnm-2020-0297.
- [62] C. Ozemek, S. J. Strath, K. Riggins, M. P. Harber, M. T. Imboden, and L. A. Kaminsky, “Pedometer Feedback Interventions Increase Daily Physical Activity in Phase III Cardiac Rehabilitation Participants,” *J. Cardiopulm. Rehabil. Prev.*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 183–188, May 2020, doi: 10.1097/HCR.0000000000000472.
- [63] P. Pallante, C. Perales, V. Rigsby, K. Wilson, and D. Rubin, “Implementation of a pilot parent-focused physical activity program with Latino families in a Head Start program,” *Californian J. Health Promot.*, vol. 17, no. 2, Art. no. 2, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.32398/cjhp.v17i2.2286.
- [64] S. K. Park, C. H. Bang, and S. H. Lee, “Evaluating the effect of a smartphone app-based self-management program for people with COPD: A randomized controlled trial,” *Appl. Nurs. Res.*, vol. 52, p. 151231, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.apnr.2020.151231.
- [65] C. A. Patten *et al.*, “Feasibility trial of an unsupervised, facility-based exercise programme for depressed outpatients,” *Psychol. Health Med.*, vol. 24, no. 3, pp. 320–332, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1080/13548506.2018.1499944.

- [66] M. Plow, M. Finlayson, J. Liu, R. W. Motl, F. Bethoux, and A. Sattar, "Randomized Controlled Trial of a Telephone-Delivered Physical Activity and Fatigue Self-management Interventions in Adults With Multiple Sclerosis," *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.*, vol. 100, no. 11, pp. 2006–2014, Nov. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2019.04.022.
- [67] Z. C. Pope, N. Zeng, R. Zhang, H. Y. Lee, and Z. Gao, "Effectiveness of Combined Smartwatch and Social Media Intervention on Breast Cancer Survivor Health Outcomes: A 10-Week Pilot Randomized Trial," *J. Clin. Med.*, vol. 7, no. 6, Art. no. 6, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.3390/jcm7060140.
- [68] Z. C. Pope, D. J. Barr-Anderson, B. A. Lewis, M. A. Pereira, and Z. Gao, "Use of Wearable Technology and Social Media to Improve Physical Activity and Dietary Behaviors among College Students: A 12-Week Randomized Pilot Study," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 16, no. 19, p. 3579, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16193579.
- [69] L. Poppe *et al.*, "Efficacy of a Self-Regulation-Based Electronic and Mobile Health Intervention Targeting an Active Lifestyle in Adults Having Type 2 Diabetes and in Adults Aged 50 Years or Older: Two Randomized Controlled Trials," *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 21, no. 8, p. e13363, Aug. 2019, doi: 10.2196/13363.
- [70] G. Prado *et al.*, "Results of a Family-Based Intervention Promoting Healthy Weight Strategies in Overweight Hispanic Adolescents and Parents: An RCT," *Am. J. Prev. Med.*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 658–668, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2020.06.010.
- [71] J. L. Reed *et al.*, "The Impact of Web-Based Feedback on Physical Activity and Cardiovascular Health of Nurses Working in a Cardiovascular Setting: A Randomized Trial," *Front. Physiol.*, vol. 9, p. 142, 2018, doi: 10.3389/fphys.2018.00142.
- [72] S. E. Reedman, R. N. Boyd, S. G. Trost, C. Elliott, and L. Sakzewski, "Efficacy of Participation-Focused Therapy on Performance of Physical Activity Participation Goals and Habitual Physical Activity in Children With Cerebral Palsy: A Randomized Controlled Trial," *Arch. Phys. Med. Rehabil.*, vol. 100, no. 4, pp. 676–686, Apr. 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2018.11.012.
- [73] B. Reich *et al.*, "Effects of active commuting on cardiovascular risk factors: GISMO—a randomized controlled feasibility study," *Scand. J. Med. Sci. Sports*, vol. 30, no. S1, pp. 15–23, 2020, doi: 10.1111/sms.13697.
- [74] R. D. Reid *et al.*, "A Randomized Controlled Trial of an Exercise Maintenance Intervention in Men and Women After Cardiac Rehabilitation (ECO-PCR Trial)," *Can. J. Cardiol.*, vol. 37, no. 5, pp. 794–802, May 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.cjca.2020.10.015.
- [75] K. Riiser, K. R. Richardsen, A. L. H. Haugen, S. Lund, and K. Løndal, "Active play in ASP—a matched-pair cluster-randomized trial investigating the effectiveness of an intervention in after-school programs for supporting children's physical activity," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 20, no. 1, p. 500, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12889-020-08645-1.
- [76] L. B. Robbins *et al.*, "Intervention Effects of 'Girls on the Move' on Increasing Physical Activity: A Group Randomized Trial," *Ann. Behav. Med. Publ. Soc. Behav. Med.*, vol. 53, no. 5, pp. 493–500, 2019, doi: 10.1093/abm/kay054.
- [77] S. A. Robinson, A. N. Bisson, M. L. Hughes, J. Ebert, and M. E. Lachman, "Time for Change: Using Implementation Intentions to Promote Physical Activity in a Randomised Pilot Trial," *Psychol. Health*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 232–254, Feb. 2019, doi: 10.1080/08870446.2018.1539487.
- [78] M. G. Rodriguez-Hernandez and D. W. Wadsworth, "The effect of 2 walking programs on aerobic fitness, body composition, and physical activity in sedentary office employees," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. e0210447, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0210447.
- [79] M. E. Rollo *et al.*, "The Feasibility and Preliminary Efficacy of an eHealth Lifestyle Program in Women with Recent Gestational Diabetes Mellitus: A Pilot Study," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 17, no. 19, p. 7115, Oct. 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17197115.
- [80] G. R. Ruissen, R. E. Rhodes, P. R. E. Crocker, and M. R. Beauchamp, "Affective mental contrasting to enhance physical activity: A randomized controlled trial," *Health Psychol.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 51–60, 2018, doi: 10.1037/hea0000551.
- [81] M. Sala, B. Geary, and A. S. Baldwin, "A Mindfulness-Based Physical Activity Intervention: A Randomized Pilot Study," *Psychosom. Med.*, vol. 83, no. 6, pp. 615–623, Aug. 2021, doi: 10.1097/PSY.0000000000000885.

- [82] A. M. Sánchez-López, M. J. Menor-Rodríguez, J. C. Sánchez-García, and M. J. Aguilar-Cordero, "Play as a Method to Reduce Overweight and Obesity in Children: An RCT," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 17, no. 1, p. 346, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17010346.
- [83] V. O. A. Santos *et al.*, "Effects of High-Intensity Interval and Moderate-Intensity Continuous Exercise on Physical Activity and Sedentary Behavior Levels in Inactive Obese Males: A Crossover Trial," *J. Sports Sci. Med.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 390–398, Aug. 2019.
- [84] S. J. Sebire *et al.*, "Results of a feasibility cluster randomised controlled trial of a peer-led school-based intervention to increase the physical activity of adolescent girls (PLAN-A)," *Int. J. Behav. Nutr. Phys. Act.*, vol. 15, no. 1, p. 50, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12966-018-0682-4.
- [85] P. H. Seljebotn, I. Skage, A. Riskedal, M. Olsen, S. E. Kvalø, and S. M. Dyrstad, "Physically active academic lessons and effect on physical activity and aerobic fitness. The Active School study: A cluster randomized controlled trial," *Prev. Med. Rep.*, vol. 13, pp. 183–188, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.pmedr.2018.12.009.
- [86] B. Singh, R. R. Spence, C. X. Sandler, J. Tanner, and S. C. Hayes, "Feasibility and effect of a physical activity counselling session with or without provision of an activity tracker on maintenance of physical activity in women with breast cancer - A randomised controlled trial," *J. Sci. Med. Sport*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 283–290, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2019.09.019.
- [87] B. Spring *et al.*, "Multicomponent mHealth Intervention for Large, Sustained Change in Multiple Diet and Activity Risk Behaviors: The Make Better Choices 2 Randomized Controlled Trial," *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 20, no. 6, p. e10528, Jun. 2018, doi: 10.2196/10528.
- [88] A. Taylor *et al.*, "Randomised controlled trial of an augmented exercise referral scheme using web-based behavioural support for inactive adults with chronic health conditions: the e-coachER trial," *Br. J. Sports Med.*, vol. 55, no. 8, pp. 444–450, 2020, doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-103121.
- [89] C. Tudor-Locke *et al.*, "Evaluation of Step-Counting Interventions Differing on Intensity Messages," *J. Phys. Act. Health*, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 21–28, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.1123/jpah.2018-0439.
- [90] K. Uemura, M. Yamada, and H. Okamoto, "The Effectiveness of an Active Learning Program in Promoting a Healthy Lifestyle among Older Adults with Low Health Literacy: A Randomized Controlled Trial," *Gerontology*, vol. 67, no. 1, pp. 25–35, 2021, doi: 10.1159/000511357.
- [91] V. van den Berg, A. S. Singh, A. Komen, C. Hazelebach, I. van Hilvoorde, and M. J. M. Chinapaw, "Integrating Juggling with Math Lessons: A Randomized Controlled Trial Assessing Effects of Physically Active Learning on Maths Performance and Enjoyment in Primary School Children," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 16, no. 14, p. 2452, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16142452.
- [92] D. Van Dyck, K. Herman, L. Poppe, G. Crombez, I. De Bourdeaudhuij, and F. Gheysen, "Results of MyPlan 2.0 on Physical Activity in Older Belgian Adults: Randomized Controlled Trial," *J. Med. Internet Res.*, vol. 21, no. 10, p. e13219, Oct. 2019, doi: 10.2196/13219.
- [93] K. Van Hoya, A. I. Wijtzes, J. Lefevre, S. De Baere, and F. Boen, "Year-round effects of a four-week randomized controlled trial using different types of feedback on employees' physical activity," *BMC Public Health*, vol. 18, p. 492, Apr. 2018, doi: 10.1186/s12889-018-5402-0.
- [94] C. Vandelanotte *et al.*, "Are web-based personally tailored physical activity videos more effective than personally tailored text-based interventions? Results from the three-arm randomised controlled TaylorActive trial," *Br. J. Sports Med.*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 336–343, Mar. 2021, doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2020-102521.
- [95] S. L. C. Veldman *et al.*, "Promoting Physical Activity and Executive Functions Among Children: A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial of an After-School Program in Australia," *J. Phys. Act. Health*, vol. 17, no. 10, pp. 940–946, Aug. 2020, doi: 10.1123/jpah.2019-0381.
- [96] L. Viester, E. A. L. M. Verhagen, P. M. Bongers, and A. J. van der Beek, "Effectiveness of a Worksite Intervention for Male Construction Workers on Dietary and Physical Activity Behaviors, Body Mass Index, and Health Outcomes: Results of a Randomized Controlled Trial," *Am. J. Health Promot. AJHP*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 795–805, Mar. 2018, doi: 10.1177/0890117117694450.
- [97] E. Volders, C. A. W. Bolman, R. H. M. de Groot, P. Verboon, and L. Lechner, "The Effect of Active Plus, a Computer-Tailored Physical Activity Intervention, on the Physical Activity of Older Adults with Chronic Illness(es)—A Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 17, no. 7, p. 2590, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17072590.

- [98] D. D. Wadsworth, J. L. Johnson, A. V. Carroll, M. M. Pangelinan, M. E. Rudisill, and J. Sassi, "Intervention Strategies to Elicit MVPA in Preschoolers during Outdoor Play," *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, vol. 17, no. 2, Art. no. 2, Jan. 2020, doi: 10.3390/ijerph17020650.
- [99] Z. Xu *et al.*, "A Mobile-Based Intervention for Dietary Behavior and Physical Activity Change in Individuals at High Risk for Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Randomized Controlled Trial," *JMIR MHealth UHealth*, vol. 8, no. 11, p. e19869, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.2196/19869.
- [100] S. L. Yoong *et al.*, "A pilot randomized controlled trial examining the impact of a sleep intervention targeting home routines on young children's (3–6 years) physical activity," *Pediatr. Obes.*, vol. 14, no. 4, p. e12481, 2019, doi: 10.1111/ijpo.12481.