

Appendix 1: Method description

This section contains a detailed description of how we went about identifying, screening, compiling and finally analysing the articles. The method description is followed by appendices showing inclusion and exclusion criteria, search strings, template for article compilation, table of included articles and table of excluded full texts.

There are different types of literature reviews with different focuses and approaches. The conduct of this review can be likened to what is known as a "rapid review", which is characterised by systematisation but does not claim to identify all relevant publications in the area of focus [9]. Our focus was on compiling and thematising the results of the articles, and to ensure the quality of the articles, only scientifically reviewed articles were included in the knowledge synthesis. Thus, no book chapters or other types of literature were included.

Search strings

Since the task of compiling the knowledge synthesis took place in parallel with a survey study carried out by the Swedish Agency for Work Environment Expertise, the project began with a number of meetings between the process manager, researchers and information specialist to discuss the assignment and its purpose and research questions. This was also when the work of formulating search strings began, and it was decided to divide the searches into two parts as the assignment covers two research questions. Along the way, the responsible information specialist conducted a test search that resulted in a strong preponderance of medical articles. The search phrases were then revised and tested again, after which decisions on search strings were made in a dialogue between the researchers, information specialist and process manager. With the search strings, we wanted to capture articles that highlighted work environment management in relation to company size in the business sector, or articles that highlighted work environment management in relation to work organisation in the business sector. The final literature searches were conducted by the information specialist in April 2022 in the databases Web of Science, Scopus, Psycinfo, Socindex and Business Source Complete (see Appendix 3). The information specialist adapted the search phrases to the different databases. The searches were limited to include scientifically reviewed articles in English from 2000 to 2022.

To identify articles published in Swedish, a search for the term “arbetsmiljöarbete” was conducted in the database Libris. This search resulted mainly in book articles and no texts were included from the search. However, this should not be interpreted as meaning that there are no articles published in Swedish.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

We searched for articles that examine how work environment management is conducted. To identify as many as possible, the search strings were broad and included both health and safety and work environment management. Based on the purpose and research questions, inclusion and exclusion criteria were developed using the PEO model (see Appendix 2). P stands for population, participant or problem, E stands for exposure and O stands for outcome. Inclusion and exclusion criteria were formulated specifically for each research question, but common to both questions was that the studies should investigate organisations in the business sector and be of relevance in a Swedish context. Articles were also included if they examined both business and public sector organisations, but otherwise articles examining the public sector were excluded. In order to assess relevance to the Swedish context, we started with articles that covered contexts with work environment legislation similar to Sweden's (but we chose to have an open approach, which included other Nordic countries and countries in Western Europe), as well as articles that dealt with themes that are also discussed in the Swedish context. Thus, individual articles from contexts that differ significantly from the Swedish, such as the USA and Iran, have been included. Studies conducted in Asia, Africa and South America have been excluded. For research question 1, which concerns work environment management in relation to company size, articles that examined work environment management in business organisations and that clearly discussed the significance of the results specifically linked to company size were included. In addition, studies investigating the above aspects in small companies and studies on occupational health services were of particular interest, based on the terms of reference. Common reasons for excluding articles were that they did not have sufficient focus on company size and that they dealt with the development of methods or the testing of tools.

Research question 2 deals with work environment management in relation to work organisation in the business sector. We included articles that dealt with the correlation between the company's organisation of its work environment management (e.g. whether it was

proactive/reactive, systematic, based on employee participation) and the company's general work organisation, i.e. the way the work is planned, organised and managed.

Common reasons for excluding articles were that the studies examined public sector organisations and that they dealt with method development or information on medical treatment. The search results were less clearly linked to the research question than with the first research question. We chose to include more articles in the first screening in order to read the texts in their entirety. Several articles were subsequently excluded in the final screening after the full text reading.

Screening of articles

The searches resulted in 1,693 hits for research question 1 and 1,435 hits for research question 2. These articles were imported into Rayyan, a tool used for literature reviews [64]. Article screening took place in two steps, with each research question handled separately. In a first step, duplicates were removed and then the remaining 996 and 1,018 articles were scanned based on title and abstract according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria. The texts were sorted in the categories *included*, *excluded* and *maybe*. The articles categorised as *maybe* were discussed within the research team to reach a joint decision on either inclusion or exclusion. During the initial scan, 45 articles were included for research question 1, which means that 951 articles were excluded. For research question 2, 139 articles were included, while 879 articles were excluded.

Both the included and the excluded articles were then exported to the reference management system RefWorks for further processing. Two articles that were included in the initial scan could not be identified after an order from the library, resulting in these articles being excluded. The remaining articles were downloaded in full text. Three articles overlapped and were included in both searches. These articles were Banwell et al. [34], Sørensen et al. [19] and Zwetsloot et al. [18].

Analysis and processing

The material was processed and analysed separately for each research question. The articles included after the screening process were read in their entirety and summarised in tabular form according to a compilation template (see Appendix 4). The template included the main content, country, industry, company size, method, theory, results and practical tips emphasising the results. When the articles were compiled, parts of the research team went through the compiled

material to make a final judgement on whether the articles should be included or excluded. During the full text reading, 14 articles were eliminated for the first research question, in most cases because they dealt with method development rather than investigating how work environment management was carried out, or because they were not deemed sufficiently relevant in a Swedish context. However, most articles linked to the first research question on company size highlighted work environment management in relation to company size and were thus included.

For research question 2, articles were included if they dealt with how work environment management in the business sector is carried out and also linked this to some aspect of work organisation in general, while articles that only more indirectly touched on work environment management were excluded. For example, an article written by Hannif et al. [65] was excluded because it touched on the importance of a supportive culture to combat negative effects on health and well-being but did not relate this to work environment management in a direct way. This somewhat stricter interpretation of the criteria resulted in several articles being excluded in this phase. This resulted in the exclusion of 117 articles for research question 2. The exclusions were largely due to the same reasons as mentioned for research question 1 and to an unclear link between work environment management and work organisation. Ultimately, 53 articles were included in the knowledge synthesis, of which 31 articles relate to the first research question and 22 articles to the second.

Since the focus of the knowledge synthesis was to identify the results of previous studies without a theoretical basis, conventional content analysis [10] was judged to be the most suitable method of analysis. The compiled material was read separately by members of the research team, who made manual notes on the results of the studies. The researchers then met and compared notes and sorted the articles according to the preliminary categories. The process also involved reading through articles in which there were ambiguities and took place in several rounds. Similarities and differences between the categories were then discussed, which finally led to the identification of the main themes of the report. The terms *health and safety*, *ergonomics* and *safety*, among others, were used for work environment/work environment management. We chose to discuss these concepts as health and safety or work environment management, depending on how they are used, and in some cases provided clarification on the context in which the study was conducted. Articles within the theme *health promotion initiatives* used the terms *workplace health management* or *workplace health promotion*.

When reading through the articles' results for the first research question on work environment management in relation to company size, two different tracks were identified based on different perspectives on the implementation of work environment management. Both tracks concern how work environment management is carried out, but while the articles categorised under *systematics and compliance* are based on the meaning of legislation and regulations, the articles categorised under *health promotion initiatives* are based on how work environment management is carried out with a focus on maintaining or strengthening health in the workplace. Under these themes, the articles were sorted according to whether they compared based on company size, included small companies or dealt with external support from occupational health service providers.

When analysing the material related to the second research question on work organisation, which thus did not focus on company size, the following themes were identified: *learning; culture, cooperation and support; participation and involvement in change processes*. The categorisation of material under these themes is based on the main content of the articles. This means, for example, an article that somewhat examines safety culture but mainly discusses learning is categorised under the theme *learning*.

To summarise, the following themes were identified within the framework of research question 1: *systematics and compliance* and *health promotion initiatives*. For research question 2, the identified themes were *learning; culture, cooperation and support; and participation and involvement in change processes*.

Appendix 2: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Work environment management in relation to company size

	Inclusion	Exclusion
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies examining business sector organisations - Studies dealing with workplaces/organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies examining public sector organisations - Studies on occupational groups/groups of employees or individuals
Exposure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies dealing with how work environment management is conducted and also compare company size or highlight small companies, as well as studies that also highlight initiatives by occupational health services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies on health that do not relate to organisation/workplace - Studies examining the work environment - Studies on work environment management that are not related to company size/organisation - Studies on interventions linked to individuals and not to workplace size - Studies dealing with working life at a general level - Studies analysing causes of accidents
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies relevant in a Swedish context - Studies that clearly discuss the results linked specifically to company size 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies that are not relevant in a Swedish context - Studies that provide advice on specific medical treatment

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies that provide advice and recommendations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies that develop methods, models or interventions
--	---	---

Work environment management in relation to work organisation

	Inclusion	Exclusion
Population	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies examining business sector organisations - Studies dealing with workplaces/organisations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies examining public sector companies/organisations - Studies dealing with occupational groups or industries at a general level - Studies focusing on the situation of individuals
Exposure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies dealing with how work environment management is conducted and that also highlight aspects of work organisation, such as planning and leading, learning, technology adaptation, innovation and development - Studies that also highlight initiatives by occupational health services 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies on interventions linked to individuals and not to the workplace - Studies that identify risks - Studies on work design - Studies dealing with working life at a general level - Studies investigating the incidence of accidents/occupational diseases - Studies on health that do not relate to organisation/workplace - Studies on work organisation that do not highlight work environment management
Outcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies relevant in a Swedish 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Studies that are not relevant in

	<p>context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Studies highlighting the organisation's work environment management in relation to work organisation (fully or in part)- Studies that provide good advice and recommendations	<p>a Swedish context</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Studies that provide advice on specific medical treatment- Studies resulting in the development of an intervention or model
--	---	---

Appendix 3: List of search strings

Limitations: Years: 2000-2022, Source type: Peer-reviewed articles and reviews, Language: English, Search Fields: Title, abstract, keywords

Dates of searches:

Psycinfo, Socindex and Business Source Complete: 21 April 2022

Web of Science and Scopus: 22 April 2022

Search block
S1: “health and safety” OR “safety and health” OR "health-promoting leadership" OR "health-promoting workplace" OR “occupational health service*” OR “safety climate” OR “safety culture*” OR “safety management*” OR “systematic work environment” OR “work environment intervention*” OR “work environment management” OR “workplace health management” OR “workplace safety” OR OHS OR OHSM OR OSH OR “healthy work environment*” OR ergonomic*
S2: “company size*” OR “enterprise size*” OR “firm size*” OR “business size*” OR “organization size*” OR “organisation size*” OR “industry size*” OR “firm-level” OR “medium-sized enterprise*” OR “medium-sized compan*” OR “medium-sized firm*” OR “medium-sized organization” OR “medium-sized organisation*” OR “medium-sized industr*” OR “medium-sized business*” OR “micro business*” OR “micro enterprise*” OR “micro firm*” OR “micro compan*” OR “micro industr*” OR “micro organisation*” OR “micro organization*” OR “private enterprise*” OR “private compan*” OR “private firm*” OR “private industr*” OR “private organization*” OR “private organisation*” OR “private business*” OR “small compan*” OR “small enterprise*” OR “small firm*” OR “small industr*” OR “small business*” OR “small organisation*” OR “small organization*” OR “small-scale enterprise*” OR “small-scale industr*” OR “small medium sized enterprise*” OR “small medium sized compan*” OR “small medium sized firm*” OR “small medium sized organization*” OR “small medium sized organisation*” OR “small medium sized business*” OR “small medium sized industr*” OR “small-to-medium enterprise*” OR “small-to-medium compan*” OR “small-to-medium firm*” OR “small-to-

medium organization*" OR "small-to-medium organisation*" OR "small-to-medium business*" OR "small-to-medium industr*"
S3: "work organisation*" OR "work organization*" OR "work flexibility" OR "learning organisation*" OR "learning organization*" OR "competence development" OR "organisational model*" "organizational model*" OR "agile organisation*" OR "agile organization*" OR "organisational structure*" OR "organizational structure*" OR socio-technolog* OR human-technology-organisation* OR human-technology-organization* OR "organisational change*" OR "organizational change*" OR "organisational development" OR "organizational development" OR "organisational learning" OR "organizational learning" OR "production innovation*" OR "organisation of work" OR "organization of work" OR "workplace innovation" OR "organizational innovation*" OR "organisational innovation*" OR "attractive workplace*"

Database search results	No. of hits
Scopus: S1 AND S2 (title/abstract/keywords)	811
Scopus: S1 AND S3 (title/abstract/keywords)	75
Psycinfo: S1 AND S2 (title/abstract/keywords)	98
Psychinfo: S1 AND S3 (title/abstract/keywords)	247
Socindex: S1 AND S2 (title/abstract/keywords)	7
Socindex: S1 AND S3 (title/abstract/keywords)	27

Business Source Complete: S1 AND S2 (title, abstract, keywords)	184
Business Source Complete: S1 AND S3 (title, abstract, keywords)	236
Web of Science*: S1 AND S2 (title, abstract, keywords)	593
Web of Science*: S1 AND S3 (title, abstract, keywords)	850

The searches were performed by Hanna Dahlin, Librarian at Lund University of Technology

Appendix 4: Compilation template

Compilation template
Reader – name of person who read the article
Research question – either RQ1 or RQ2
Reference – full reference
Summary – main results of the article
Company size – how company size is defined in the article
Industry – which industry/industries were covered
Country – which country/countries were covered
Method – how the study was conducted
Theory – which theoretical premises were used
Results – detailed description of the study's results
Practical tips – Where practical tips have been given, these have been described
? – Any ambiguities are noted here, along with notes on generalisability
Exclusion – If exclusion is recommended, the reader enters the reason here

Appendix 5: Table of included studies

Included articles, research question 1

Author	Title	Country and industry	Company size	Method
Al-Bayati (2021)	Firm size influence on construction safety culture and construction safety climate	USA Construction industry	Fewer than 10 employees, 10–50 employees, 50–100 employees, 100–250 employees and 250 or more employees	Quantitative Survey, 275 respondents
Baldock et al. (2006)	Influences on small-firm compliance-related behaviour: The case of workplace health and safety	UK Multiple industries	Small companies: fewer than 50 employees	Quantitative Telephone survey, 1,087 respondents (owner, manager or, in a few cases, health and safety manager)
Banwell et al. (2019)	A cultural economy approach to workplace health promotion in Australian small and medium sized workplaces: A	Australia	Small companies: fewer than 20 employees; medium-sized companies: 20–199 employees	Qualitative Case studies (10 companies)

	critical qualitative study			Interviews, 44 managers and employees
Barrett et al. (2014)	Small firms and health and safety harmonisation: Potential regulatory effects of a dominant narrative	Australia Multiple industries	Small companies: fewer than 20 employees	Qualitative Literature review and analysis of blogs and websites
Beck et al. (2015)	Patterns and predictors of workplace health promotion: Cross-sectional findings from a company survey in Germany	Germany Multiple industries	One or more employees	Quantitative Survey secondary data, 6,500 companies
Bluff (2019)	How SMEs respond to legal requirements to provide information, training, instruction and supervision to workers about work health and safety matters.	Australia Manufacturing industry, construction industry, healthcare/social work	Small companies: 0–19 employees; medium-sized companies: 20–249 employees	Qualitative Interviews, document analysis and non-participant observation at 46 companies
Bonafede et al. (2016)	OHS management and employers' perception: Differences by firm size in a large Italian company survey	Italy Multiple industries	1–9, 10–49, 50–249, 250 or more employees	Quantitative Telephone survey, 1,010 employers

Boustras et al. (2015)	Management of health and safety in micro-firms in Cyprus—Results from a nationwide survey	Cyprus Multiple industries	1–10 employees	Quantitative Survey, 244 micro companies
Champoux & Brun (2003)	Occupational health and safety management in small size enterprises: An overview of the situation and avenues for intervention and research	Canada Manufacturing industry	Small companies: fewer than 50 employees	Quantitative Telephone survey, 223 owners/managers
Corneliussen (2005)	The impact of regulations on firms: A case study of the biotech industry	Scotland and Norway Biotech	5–30 employees	Qualitative Interviews with founders, managers and senior researchers, 14 companies
Gunnarsson et al. (2011)	Swedish entrepreneurs' use of occupational health services	Sweden Occupational health services and small companies from different industries	Small companies: fewer than 50 employees	Quantitative The survey was conducted in two rounds, five years apart. There were 496 respondents in the first round, and 251 in the second round.

Gunnarsson et al. (2010)	Systematic work environment management: Experiences from implementation in Swedish small-scale enterprises	Sweden Manufacturing industry	Small companies: 4–40 employees	23 companies were examined via before and after studies. Two different implementation methods (supervision and networking). Interviews and WEST.
Harrison et al. (2013)	Occupational health purchasing behaviour by SMEs – a new theoretical model	UK Occupational health services and small and medium-sized companies from different industries	Small and medium-sized companies: 30–250 employees	Quantitative Survey, 387 respondents
Hasle et al. (2011)	The working environment in small firms: Responses from owner-managers	Denmark Construction and metal industries	Small companies: fewer than 50 employees	Qualitative Interviews, 23 companies, often (but not always) with the owner. Also company visits and observations.

Hedlund et al. (2017)	Tightrope walking: External impact factors on workplace health management in small-scale enterprises	Sweden and Norway Service companies and construction industry	Small companies: fewer than 20 employees.	Qualitative Interviews, managers in 18 companies
Landstad et al. (2017)	How managers of small-scale enterprises can create a health promoting corporate culture	Sweden and Norway Service companies and construction industry	Small companies: fewer than 20 employees	Qualitative Interviews, managers in 18 companies
Landstad et al. (2022)	Management by values: A qualitative study of how small business owners in the cleaning sector view and implement their employer responsibilities with respect to occupational safety and health management	Sweden Cleaning industry	Small companies: 1–19 employees	Qualitative Interviews, 9 company owners
Lehaney et al. (2012)	A survey that contributes to the development of a framework to evaluate health and safety strategies in supply chains	UK Multiple industries	Micro companies: 1–9 employees; small companies: 10–49 employees; medium-sized companies: 50–249 employees; large companies:	Quantitative Survey, 112 respondents

			over 250 employees	
MacEachen et al. (2010)	Workplace health understandings and processes in small businesses: A systematic review of the qualitative literature	International	Fewer than 100 employees	Literature study (14 articles)
Nordlöf et al. (2017)	A cross-sectional study of factors influencing occupational health and safety management practices in companies	Sweden Manufacturing industry	Small companies: fewer than 49 employees; medium-sized companies: 50–99 employees; and large companies: over 100 employees	Quantitative Survey, 280 respondents (managers and safety representatives), 197 companies
Nordlöf et al. (2015)	Perceptions of work environment priorities: Are there any differences by company size?	Sweden Manufacturing industry	Small companies: 10–49 employees; medium-sized companies: 50–249 employees	Quantitative Survey, 106 companies (managers and safety representatives)
Pinder et al. (2016)	Occupational safety and health and smaller organisations: Research challenges and opportunities	UK Multiple industries	Micro companies: fewer than 10 employees; small companies: fewer than 50 employees; medium-sized companies: fewer than 250 employees	Qualitative 149 structured interviews, 21 semi-structured interviews with employees and owners, nine ethnographies on 179 micro, small and

				medium-sized companies.
Schmidt et al. (2016)	Utilizing occupational health services in small-scale enterprises: A 10-year perspective	Sweden Occupational health services and small companies in different industries	Small companies: 1–50 employees	Qualitative 15 interviews in four occupational health service providers, 38 small companies interviewed in the first round (67 interviews in total), 25 in the second round, of which 3 with occupational health service providers (after 10 years)
Sørensen et al. (2007)	Working in small enterprises--is there a special risk?	Denmark Multiple industries	1–4, 5–19, 20–49, 50–99, 100–249, more than 250 employees	Quantitative Telephone survey two datasets, owners and safety representatives, 2,799 workplaces
Taylor et al. (2016)	The role of business size in assessing the uptake of health promoting workplace	Australia Both private and	Small companies: fewer than 19 employees; medium-sized	Quantitative Survey, 330

	initiatives in Australia	public sector organisations	companies: 20–200 employees; and large companies: more than 200 employees	respondents, 218 companies
Tenney et al. (2019)	Health links(TM) assessment of total worker health (R) practices as indicators of organizational behavior in small business	USA Multiple industries	Micro companies: 2–10 employees; small companies: 11–50 employees; medium-sized companies: 51–200 employees; large companies: more than 200 employees	Evaluation, 382 companies
Vickers et al. (2005)	Understanding small firm responses to regulation	UK Multiple industries	Micro companies: fewer than 10 employees; small companies: fewer than 50 employees	Qualitative/quantitative Telephone survey, 1,087 companies, 108 interviews
Vinberg et al. (2017a)	Ambiguity among managers in small-scale enterprises: How to handle business and workplace health management	Sweden and Norway Service companies and construction industry	Small companies: fewer than 20 employees	Qualitative Interviews, 13 middle managers
Vinberg et al. (2017b)	Cooperation between occupational health services and small-scale enterprises in Norway and Sweden: A provider	Sweden and Norway Occupational	Small companies: fewer than 20 employees	Quantitative Survey, 138 occupational health service providers

	perspective	health services		
Wiman et al. (2016)	Views of the workplace as a health promotion arena among managers of small companies	Sweden Multiple industries	Small companies: 10–19 employees	Qualitative Interviews, 10 managers
Zwetsloot et al. (2020)	Success factors for OSH implementation. Opening the black box of OSH realization	Europe, Sweden, Denmark, Germany	Self-employed; small companies: 10–49 employees; medium-sized companies: 50–249 employees; large companies: more than 500 employees	Discussion article
Total				31

Included articles, research question 2

Author	Title	Country	Method
Akselsson et al. (2012)	Efficient and effective learning for safety from incidents	Sweden Process industry	Approx. 180 interviews and analysis of 1,900 incident reports in 6 companies
Atak & Kingma (2011)	Safety culture in an aircraft maintenance organisation: A view from the inside	Netherlands Airline industry	Qualitative Case study (1 company) 5 interviews plus

			observations, document analysis
Bottrup (2005)	Learning in a network: A ‘third way’ between school learning and workplace learning?	Denmark Both public and private sector	Action research (11 companies)
Bunner et al. (2021)	Perceived organizational support and perceived safety climate from the perspective of safety professionals: Testing reciprocal causality using a cross-lagged panel design	Austria Health and safety experts	Quantitative Survey, 162 respondents on two occasions 1 year apart
Doytchev & Hibberd (2009)	Organizational learning and safety in design: Experiences from German industry	Germany Industry	Quantitative Survey, 24 companies
Duryan et al. (2020)	Knowledge transfer for occupational health and safety: Cultivating health and safety learning culture in construction firms	UK Construction industry	Qualitative 43 interviews
Eklöf et al. (2004)	Is participative ergonomics associated with better working environment and health? A study among Swedish white-collar VDU users	Sweden Multiple industries	Quantitative Survey, 399 employees responded initially, later follow-up had 379 respondents, 11 companies
Granerud & Rocha (2011)	Organisational learning and continuous improvement of health and safety in certified manufacturers	Denmark Manufacturing	Qualitative Case studies (5 companies)

		industry	
Harrison & Legendre (2003)	Technological innovations, organizational change and workplace accident prevention	Canada Manufacturing industry	Qualitative Case studies (7 companies)
Hasle & Jensen (2006)	Changing the internal health and safety organization through organizational learning and change management	Denmark Multiple industries	Qualitative Case studies (11 companies)
Ingelgård & Norrgren (2001)	Effects of change strategy and top-management involvement on quality of working life and economic results	Sweden Private and public sector organisations	Quantitative Survey, 69 companies
Justesen et al. (2017)	Implementing workplace health promotion – role of middle managers	Denmark Private and public sector organisations	Qualitative/quantitative Case studies (6 companies)
Karlton (2004)	Change processes and ergonomic improvements in small and medium enterprises	Sweden Wood industry	Qualitative/quantitative Case studies (2 companies)
Kiyantaj et al. (2022)	The correlation relationship between concepts of learning organization and safety culture in Iran's nuclear and radiological industries	Iran Nuclear industry	Quantitative Survey, 388 respondents, 45 companies
Kongsvik et al. (2016)	HSE culture in the petroleum industry: Lost in translation?	Norway Oil industry	Qualitative 14 interviews, 2 companies

Kristensen (2011)	Managing OHS: A route to a new negotiating order in high-performance work organizations?	Denmark Industry	Qualitative Case study (1 company)
Mengolini & Debarberis (2012)	Lessons learnt from a crisis event: How to foster a sound safety culture	Netherlands Nuclear industry	Case study (1 company)
Rapaport & Kirschenbaum (2008)	Business continuity as an adaptive social process	Israel Multiple industries	Quantitative Case studies (approx. 13 companies)
Robson et al. (2016)	Important factors in common among organizations making large improvement in OHS performance: Results of an exploratory multiple case study	Canada Multiple industries	Qualitative Case studies (4 companies)
Roy (2003)	Self-directed workteams and safety: A winning combination?	Canada Manufacturing industry	Qualitative Case studies (12 companies)
Vranjes (2022)	Putting workplace bullying in context: The role of high-involvement work practices in the relationship between job demands, job resources, and bullying exposure	Belgium Multiple industries	Quantitative Survey, 28,923 employees, 144 companies
Widerszal-Bazyl & Warszewska-Makuch (2008)	Employee direct participation in organisational decisions and workplace safety	Poland Multiple industries	Quantitative Survey, 192 managers at 192 companies
Total			22

Appendix 6:

Compilation of excluded full texts and reason for exclusion

Reference, research question 1	Reason for exclusion
Alvarez I, Cilleruelo E, Zamanillo I. Is formality in knowledge management practices related to the size of organizations? The Basque Case. <i>Hum Factors Ergonomics Manuf</i> 2016;26(1):127–144.	Focus not on work environment management
Barbeau E, Roelofs C, Youngstrom R, Sorensen G, Stoddard A, LaMontagne AD. Assessment of occupational safety and health programs in small businesses. <i>Am J Ind Med</i> 2004;45(4):371–379.	Method development
Boring P. The relationship between firm productivity, firm size and CSR objectives for innovations. <i>Eurasian Bus Rev</i> 2019;9(3):269–297.	Focus not on work environment management
Bradshaw LM, Curran AD, Eskin F, Fishwick D. Provision and perception of occupational health in small and medium-sized enterprises in Sheffield, UK. <i>Occup Med</i> 2001;51(1):39-44.	Method development
Guo BHW, Yiu TW, González VA. Does company size matter? Validation of an integrative model of safety behavior across small and large construction companies. <i>J Saf Res</i> 2018; 64:73–81.	Method development
Hayman J, Lamm F, Anderson D. Cultural dimensions of occupational safety and health in the New Zealand fishing industry: A study of small fishing businesses. <i>Policy Pract Health Saf</i> 2013;11(1):31–44.	Wrong focus, industry
Macdonald EB, Sanati KA. Occupational Health Services now and in the Future: The need for a paradigm Shift. <i>J Occup Environ Med</i> 2010;52(12):1273–1277.	Not company size
Meggeneder O. Style of management and the relevance for workplace health promotion in small and medium sized enterprises. <i>J Public Health</i> 2007;15(2):101–107.	Wrong focus, does not discuss empirical data

Rigby M, Lawlor T. Health and Safety in Small Firms with Particular Reference to Spain. <i>International Small Business Journal: Researching Entrepreneurship</i> 2001;19(2):31.	Not relevant context
Schwatka NV, Dally M, Shore E, Dexter L, Tenney L, Brown CE, et al. Profiles of total worker health (R) in United States small businesses. <i>BMC Public Health</i> 2021;21(1).	Not relevant context
Schwatka NV, Goldenhar LM, Johnson SK. Change in frontline supervisors' safety leadership practices after participating in a leadership training program: Does company size matter? <i>J Saf Res</i> 2020; 74:199–205.	Not relevant context
Stamatogianni E, Anyfantis ID, Dimopoulos C, Boustras G. Validating the accuracy of ESENER-II in assessing psychosocial risks for the case of micro firms in Cyprus. <i>Saf Sci</i> 2019; 120:783–797.	Not relevant context
Tait R, Walker D. Marketing health and safety management expertise to small enterprises. <i>Saf Sci</i> 2000;36(2):95–110.	Wrong focus, does not discuss empirical data
Thompson J, Schwatka NV, Tenney L, Newman LS. Total Worker Health: A Small Business Leader Perspective. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i> 2018;15(11).	Not relevant context
Total	14

Reference, research question 2	Reason for exclusion
Abdallah A. Application of relevant construction regulations for an ergonomical and safe work environment. <i>Biomed Eng -Appl Basis Commun</i> 2007;19(5):341–348.	Wrong focus, industry
Andersen LP, Karlsen IL, Kines P, Joensson T, Nielsen KJ. Social identity in the construction industry: implications for safety perception and behaviour. <i>Constr Manage Econ</i> 2015;33(8):640–652.	Wrong focus, forms of employment
Anholon R, Silva D, Pinto JS, Rampasso IS, Domingos M, Dias J. COVID-19 and the administrative concepts neglected: reflections for leaders to enhance organizational development. <i>Kybernetes</i> 2021;50(5):1654–1660.	Focus not on work environment management

Arezes PM, Dinis-Carvalho J, Alves AC. Workplace ergonomics in lean production environments: A literature review. <i>Work</i> 2015;52(1):57–70.	Method development
Arnoud J, Falzon P. Shared services centers and work sustainability: which contributions from ergonomics? <i>Work</i> 2012; 41:3914–3919.	Focus not on work environment management
Askenazy P. Innovative workplace practices and occupational injuries and illnesses in the United States. <i>Econ Ind Democr</i> 2001;22(4):485–516.	Focus not on work environment management
Asplund F, Ulfvengren P. Work functions shaping the ability to innovate: Insights from the case of the safety engineer. <i>Cogn Technol Work</i> 2021;23(1):143–159.	Focus not on work environment management
Azadeh A, Fam IM, Nouri J, Azadeh MA. Integrated health, safety, environment and ergonomics management system (HSEE-MS): An efficient substitution for conventional HSE-MS. <i>J Sci Ind Res</i> 2008;67(6):403–411.	Wrong focus, risks
Bahn S. Moving from contractor to owner operator: impact on safety culture – a case study. <i>Empl Relat</i> 2013;35(2):157–172.	Wrong focus, forms of employment
Banwell C, Sargent G, Dixon J, Strazdins L. A cultural economy approach to workplace health promotion in Australian small and medium sized workplaces: A critical qualitative study. <i>Crit Public Health</i> 2019;29(1):100–109.	Not work organisation
Bergsten EL, Mathiassen SE, Larsson J, Kwak L. Implementation of an ergonomics intervention in a Swedish flight baggage handling company—A process evaluation. <i>PLoS ONE</i> 2018;13(3).	Method development
Bertolini M, Bevilacqua M, Ciarapica FE, Giacchetta G. Development of Risk-Based Inspection and Maintenance procedures for an oil refinery. <i>J Loss Prev Process Ind</i> 2009;22(2):244–253.	Focus not on work environment management
Bitencourt RS, de Macedo Guimarães LB. Macroergonomic analysis of two different work organizations in a same sector of a luminary manufacturer. <i>Work</i> 2012;41:2686–2694.	Focus not on work environment management

Bonnet-Belfais M, Cholat J-, Bouchard D, Goulfier C, Casselle A, Schram J. How to integrate the aging of employees into occupational health policies: The approach of a French company. <i>Work</i> 2014;49(2):205–214.	Focus not on work environment management
Boulagouas W, Chaib R, Djebabra M. Proposal of a temporality perspective for a successful organizational change project. <i>Int J Workplace Health Manag</i> 2021;14(5):555–574.	Not relevant context
Boulagouas W, García-Herrero S, Chaib R, Herrera García S, Djebabra M. On the contribution to the alignment during an organizational change: Measurement of job satisfaction with working conditions. <i>J Saf Res</i> 2021; 76:289–300.	Focus not on work environment management
Boyd C. HRM in the airline industry: strategies and outcomes. <i>Pers Rev</i> 2001;30(4):438.	Focus not on work environment management
Broberg O, Hermund I. The OHS consultant as a facilitator of learning in workplace design processes: Four explorative case studies of current practice. <i>Int J Ind Ergonomics</i> 2007;37(9):810–816.	Focus not on work environment management
Brunoro CM, Bolis I, Sigahi TFAC, Kawasaki BC, Sznelwar LI. Defining the meaning of ‘sustainable work’ from activity-centered ergonomics and psychodynamics of work's perspectives. <i>Appl Ergon</i> 2020;89.	Method development
Bustos C, Fischer D, Ballardín L, Nielsen R. The ergonomic process of an automotive company in Brazil: a study case. <i>Work</i> 2012;41:5449–5452.	Not relevant context
Carroll JS, Fahlbruch B. “The gift of failure: New approaches to analyzing and learning from events and near-misses.” Honoring the contributions of Bernhard Wilpert. <i>Saf Sci</i> 2011;49(1):1–4.	Focus not on work environment management
Catley B, Bentley T, Forsyth D, Cooper-Thomas H, Gardner D, O'Driscoll M, et al. Managing workplace bullying in New Zealand: Perspectives from occupational health and safety practitioners. <i>J Manage Organ</i> 2013;19(5):598–612.	Focus not on work environment management

Chatigny C. Devising work schedules for a collective: Favouring intergenerational collaboration among counsellors in a shelter for female victims of conjugal violence. <i>Work</i> 2011;40:101–110.	Wrong focus, occupational group
Ciampa V, Balducci C, Avanzi L, Fraccaroli F. The effect of perceived organizational change on psychological well-being and work-related stress: A longitudinal study. <i>Psicologia Sociale</i> 2018;13(3):251–265.	Not identified
Cole DC, Wells RP. Interventions for musculoskeletal disorders in computer-intense office work: a framework for evaluation. <i>Work Stress</i> 2002;16(2):95–106.	Method development
Colombini D, Occhipinti E. Preventing upper limb work-related musculoskeletal disorders (UL-WMSDS): New approaches in job (re)design and current trends in standardization. <i>Appl Ergon</i> 2006;37(4):441–450.	Method development
Cousins * R, MacKay CJ, Clarke SD, Kelly C, Kelly PJ, McCaig RH. 'Management Standards' work-related stress in the UK: Practical development. <i>Work Stress</i> 2004;18(2):113–136.	Not organisation
Cunha L, Nogueira S, Lacomblez M. Beyond a man's world: Contributions from considering gender in the study of bus drivers' work activity. <i>Work</i> 2014;47(4):431–440.	Wrong focus, occupational group
Cunha L, Silva D, Santos M, Pereira C. Do we want to keep working in 12-h shifts? The follow-up of the work schedule change in a Portuguese industrial company. <i>Int J Ind Ergonomics</i> 2020;77.	Focus not on work environment management
Dale AM, Rohlman DS, Hayibor L, Evanoff BA. Work Organization Factors Associated with Health and Work Outcomes among Apprentice Construction Workers: Comparison between the Residential and Commercial Sectors. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i> 2021;18(17).	Focus not on work environment management
DeJoy DM, Wilson MG, Vandenberg RJ, McGrath-Higgins A, Griffin-Blake C. Assessing the impact of healthy work organization intervention. <i>J Occup Organ Psychol</i> 2010;83(1):139–165.	Method development

de Gois Leite CM, de Carvalho RJ. The ambivalence of the work of the hotel managers: an approach to ergonomics. <i>Work</i> 2012;41:5668–5670.	Focus not on work environment management
Delgoulet C, Cau-Bareille D, Chatigny E, Gaudart C, Santos M, Vidal-Gomel C. Ergonomic Analysis on Work Activity and Training. <i>Work</i> 2012;41(2):111–114.	Not study (editorial)
Demerouti E, Soyer L, Vakola M, Xanthopoulou D. The effects of a job crafting intervention on the success of an organizational change effort in a blue-collar work environment. <i>J Occup Organ Psychol</i> 2021;94(2):374–399.	Method development
Dinten C, Abrahao RF, de Oliveira J. Work organization and technological resources in broiler production - An ergonomics approach. <i>Sci Agric</i> 2006;63(1):46–54.	Focus not on work environment management
Distelhorst G, Hainmueller J, Locke RM. Does Lean Improve Labor Standards? Management and Social Performance in the Nike Supply Chain. <i>Manage Sci</i> 2017;63(3):707–728.	Focus not on work environment management
Dollard MF, Bailey T. Building psychosocial safety climate in turbulent times: The case of COVID-19. <i>J Appl Psychol</i> 2021;106(7):951–964.	Method development
Domingues P, Sampaio P, Arezes PM. Management systems integration: survey results. <i>Int. J Qual Reliab Manag</i> 2017;34(8):1252–1294.	Focus not on work environment management
Dos Santos Grecco CH, Vidal MCR, Cosenza CAN, Dos Santos, I. J. A. L., De Carvalho PVR. Safety culture assessment: A fuzzy model for improving safety performance in a radioactive installation. <i>Prog Nucl Energy</i> 2014;70:71–83.	Method development
Dossey M. Human Factors Programs within Contra Costa County. <i>Process Saf Prog</i> 2009;28(3):214–220.	Focus not on work environment management
El Mouayni I, Etienne A, Lux A, Siadat A, Dantan J. A simulation-based approach for time allowances assessment during production	Not organisation

system design with consideration of worker's fatigue, learning and reliability. <i>Comput Ind Eng</i> 2020;139.	
Enehaug H, Spjelkavik O, Falkum E, Froyland K. Workplace Inclusion Competence and Employer Engagement. <i>Nord J Work</i> 2022;12(1):71–93.	Focus not on work environment management
Eriksson T. Healthy personnel policies. <i>Int J Manpow</i> 2012;33(3):233–245.	Not study
Ewer K. Can conflict coaching make a difference to conflict outcomes in hierarchical organisational structures? AUSTRALASIAN DISPUTE RESOLUTION JOURNAL 2018;28(4):260–267.	Not identified
Fleischer M, Troege M. Organising Product Stewardship in Large Chemical Companies. <i>J Bus Chem</i> 2004;1(2):26–36.	Focus not on work environment management
Flores D, Haire E. The Development of an organizational safety culture in the United States forest service. <i>J For</i> 2021;119(5):506–519.	Wrong focus, industry
Flouris T, Yilmaz AK. Change Management as A Road Map for Safety Management System Implementation in Aviation Operations: Focusing on Risk Management and Operational Effectiveness. <i>Int J Civ Aviat</i> 2009;1(1):1–19.	Wrong focus, industry
Forsman M, Hansson GA, Medbo L, Asterland P, Engstrom T. A method for evaluation of manual work using synchronised video recordings and physiological measurements. <i>Appl Ergon</i> 2002;33(6):533–540.	Method development
Frick B, Simmons R, Stein F. The cost of shift work: Absenteeism in a large German automobile plant. <i>Ger J Hum Resour Manag</i> 2018;32(3):236–256.	Focus not on work environment management
Fuller CW, Vassie LH. Assessing the maturity and alignment of organisational cultures in partnership arrangements. <i>Empl Relat</i> 2002;24(5):540–555.	Method development

Fuller P, Randall R, Dainty A, Haslam R, Gibb A. Applying a longitudinal tracer methodology to evaluate complex interventions in complex settings. <i>Eur J Work Organ Psychol</i> 2019;28(4):443–452.	Method development
Gembalska-Kwiecien A. Advancement of tools supporting improvement of work safety in selected industrial company. <i>Manag Syst Prod</i> 2018;26(1):31–34.	Not relevant context
Gerbec M. Supporting organizational learning by comparing activities and outcomes of the safety-management system. <i>J Loss Prev Process Ind</i> 2013;26(6):1113–1127.	Method development
Gerbec M. Safety change management—A new method for integrated management of organizational and technical changes. <i>Saf Sci</i> 2017; 100:225–234.	Method development
Gracia FJ, Silla I, Renele M, Goilean C, Mesquita M. Safety culture and safety performance in high-reliability organizations: A synthesis of IDOCAL'S contributions to the literature. <i>Revista Psicologia Organizações e Trabalho</i> 2020;20(4):1210–1220.	Wrong focus, specific research institute
Green S, Howard G, Perkins H, Traylor H. COVID-19 and employee psychological safety: Exploring the role of signaling theory. <i>Ind Organ Psychol-Us</i> 2021;14(1):199–201.	Focus not on work environment management
Gunarathne N, Samudrage D, Wijesinghe DN, Lee K. Fostering social sustainability management through safety controls and accounting. <i>Account Res J</i> 2016;29(2):179–197.	Not relevant context
Hannif Z, Lamm F, Vo A. Unhealthy Work? The policy-practice divide in Australian Call Centres. <i>New Zealand Journal of Empl Relat</i> 2010;35(2):41–59.	Focus not on work environment management
Heese M. Got the results, now what do you do? Safety culture transformation from theory into practice. <i>Aviation Psychology and Applied Human Factors</i> 2012;2(1):25–33.	Not work organisation
Izso L, Antalovits M, Suplicz S. Impact Assessment of Eight Year Application of the SOL Safety Event Analysis Methodology in a Nuclear Power Plant. <i>Acta Polytech Hungarica</i> 2019;16(1):165–187.	Method development

Jain A, Leka S, Zwetsloot G. Corporate social responsibility and psychosocial risk management in Europe. <i>J Bus Ethics</i> 2011;101(4):619–633.	Not work organisation
Jilcha K, Kitaw D. Industrial occupational safety and health innovation for sustainable development. <i>Eng Sci Engineering Science and Technology, an International Journal</i> 2017;20(1):372–380.	Not relevant context
Jimenez M, Romero L, Fernandez J, Espinosa MD, Dominguez M. Extension of the Lean 5S Methodology to 6S with An Additional Layer to Ensure Occupational Safety and Health Levels. <i>Sustainability</i> 2019;11(14).	Method development
Kalman HK. Integrating evaluation and needs assessment: A case study of an ergonomics program. <i>Perform Improv Q</i> 2016;29(1):51–69.	Focus not on work environment management
Khandan M, Aligol MH, Shamsi M, Poursadeghiyan M, Biglari H, Koohpaei A. Occupational health, safety, and ergonomics challenges and opportunities based on the organizational structure analysis: A case study in the selected manufacturing industries in Qom Province, Iran, 2015. <i>Ann Trop Med Public Health</i> 2017;10(3):606–611.	Not relevant context
Kontogiannis T, Malakis S. Remaining safe by working at the edge of compliance and adaptation: Reflective practices in aviation and air traffic control. <i>Theor Issues Ergon Sci</i> 2013;14(6):565–591.	Focus not on work environment management
Leva MC, Sordo D, Mattei F. Day-to-day performance management in a small regional airport and management of change for safer operations. <i>Cogn Technol Work</i> 2015;17(2):237–248.	Method development
Lofquist EA, Greve A, Olsson UH. Modeling attitudes and perceptions as predictors for changing safety margins during organizational change. <i>Saf Sci</i> 2011;49(3):531–541.	Focus not on work environment management
Lu JL. Manufacturing Work and Organizational Stresses in Export Processing Zones. <i>Ind Health</i> 2009;47(5):543–550.	Not relevant context
Lund HL. Strategies for Sustainable Business and the Handling of Workers' Interests: Integrated Management Systems and Worker	Wrong focus, trade union activities

Participation. <i>Econ Ind Democr</i> 2004;25(1):41–74.	
Luria G, Morag I. Safety management by walking around (SMBWA): A safety intervention program based on both peer and manager participation. <i>Accid Anal Prev</i> 2012; 45:248–257.	Method development
Luria G, Zohar D, Erev I. The effect of workers' visibility on effectiveness of intervention programs: Supervisory-based safety interventions. <i>J Saf Res</i> 2008;39(3):273–280.	Method development
Magnavita N. Medical surveillance, continuous health promotion and a participatory intervention in a small company. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i> 2018;15(4).	Wrong focus, individual level
Manu P, Ankrah N, Proverbs D, Suresh S. Mitigating the health and safety influence of subcontracting in construction: The approach of main contractors. <i>Int J Project Manage</i> 2013;31(7):1017–1026.	Wrong focus, industry
Martin L. Bending the rules or fudging the paperwork? Documenting learning in SMEs. <i>J Workplace Learn</i> 2001;13(5):189–197.	Focus not on work environment management
McClain N. The Death-Based Model of Organizational Learning: Accident, Pandemic, and Workplace Change in New York Public Transit. <i>Am Behav Sci</i> 2022:1.	Public sector
McDonald N. The evaluation of change. <i>Cogn Technol Work</i> 2015;17(2):193–206.	Focus not on work environment management
Mearns K, Flin R, O'Connor P. Sharing 'worlds of risk'; improving communication with crew resource management. <i>J Risk Res</i> 2001;4(4):377–392.	Wrong focus, risk
Mendes RWB, Pueyo V, Béguin P, Duarte FJCM. Innovation, systemic appropriation and prevention in the granite mining sector: The case of humidification. <i>Work</i> 2017;57(3):351–361.	Not relevant context
Milczarek M. Workers' active involvement in the improvement of occupational safety and health in a textile enterprise – A case study.	Method development

Int J Occup Saf Ergonomics 2006;12(1):69–77.	
Milijić N, Mihajlović I, Nikolić D, Živković Ž. Multicriteria analysis of safety climate measurements at workplaces in production industries in Serbia. Int J Ind Ergonomics 2014;44(4):510–519.	Focus not on work environment management
Mohseni-Haghighi H, Lichtenstein B, Morteza pour D, Kamali-Sarvestani R. Using “Invisible Theater” to Improve Safety in an Industrial Factory. OD Practitioner 2018;50(2):20–27.	Method development
Munck-Ulfsfält U, Falck A, Forsberg A, Dahlin C, Eriksson A. Corporate ergonomics programme at Volvo Car Corporation. Appl Ergon 2003;34(1):17–22.	Not study (technical note)
Nagesh P, Murthy MSN. Stress Management at IT Call Centers: A Case Study. ICFAI Journal of Soft Skills 2008;2(4):51–68.	Wrong focus, individual
Neumann WP, Ekman M, Winkel J. Integrating ergonomics into production system development - The Volvo Powertrain case. Appl Ergon 2009;40(3):527–537.	Focus not on work environment management
Neumann WP, Winkel J, Medbo L, Magneberg R, Mathiassen SE. Production system design elements influencing productivity and ergonomics – A case study of parallel and serial flow strategies. Int J Oper Prod Manag 2006;26(8):904–923.	Focus not on work environment management
Nöhammer E, Drexel M, Stummer H. Co-Creating the good job or the extra mile: Does Co-Creational implementation of WHP improve working conditions? Manag Rev 2020;31(2):232–258.	Public sector
Petit J, Dugué B. Psychosocial risks: acting upon the organisation by ergonomic intervention. Work 2012; 41:4843–4847.	Method development
Randelin M, Saaranen T, Naumanen P, Louhevaara V. Towards sustainable well-being in SMEs through the web-based learning program of ergonomics. Educ Inf 2013;18(1):95–111.	Wrong focus, specific teacher programme
Rasmussen K, Glasscock DJ, Hansen ON, Carstensen O, Jepsen JF, Nielsen KJ. Worker participation in change processes in a Danish industrial setting. Am J Ind Med 2006;49(9):767–779.	Method development
Rocha R, Mollo V, Daniellou F. Contributions and conditions of	Method development

structured debates on work on safety construction. <i>Saf Sci</i> 2019; 113:192–199.	
Schobel M, Silla I, Teperi AM, Gustafsson R, Piirto A, Rollenhagen C, et al. Human and organizational factors in European nuclear safety: A fifty-year perspective on insights, implementations, and ways forward. <i>Energy Res Soc Sci</i> 2022;85.	Wrong focus, industry
Schouw D, Mash R, Kolbe-Alexander T. Transforming the workplace environment to prevent non-communicable chronic diseases: participatory action research in a South African power plant. <i>Glob Health Action</i> 2018;11(1).	Wrong focus, risks
Sharma A, Shin H, Santa-María MJ, Nicolau JL. Hotels' COVID-19 innovation and performance. <i>Ann Tourism Res</i> 2021;88.	Focus not on work environment management
Sharpanskykh A, Stroeve SH. An agent-based approach for structured modeling, analysis and improvement of safety culture. <i>Comput Math Organ Theory</i> 2011;17(1):77–117.	Method development
Smith RT. Growing an ergonomics culture in manufacturing. <i>Proc Inst Mech Eng, Part B</i> 2003;217(7):1027–1030.	Method development
Soklaridis S, Ammendolia C, Cassidy D. Looking upstream to understand low back pain and return to work: Psychosocial factors as the product of system issues. <i>Soc Sci Med</i> 2010;71(9):1557–1566.	Focus not on work environment management
Sorensen G, Peters S, Nielsen K, Nagler E, Karapanos M, Wallace L, et al. Improving Working Conditions to Promote Worker Safety, Health, and Wellbeing for Low-Wage Workers: The Workplace Organizational Health Study. <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i> 2019;16(8).	Method development
Sorensen G, Dennerlein JT, Peters SE, Sabbath EL, Kelly EL, Wagner GR. The future of research on work, safety, health and wellbeing: A guiding conceptual framework. <i>Soc Sci Med</i> 2021;269.	Method development
Sorensen G, McLellan DL, Sabbath EL, Dennerlein JT, Nagler EM, Hurtado DA, et al. Integrating worksite health protection and health	Method development

promotion: A conceptual model for intervention and research. Preventive Medicine: An International Journal Devoted to Practice and Theory 2016; 91:188–196.	
Sørensen OH, Hasle P, Bach E. Working in small enterprises--Is there a special risk? Saf Sci 2007;45(10):1044–1059.	Not work organisation
Stashishyn S, Ivanov S. Organisation derobotised: Innovation and productivity in a workplace environment. Int J Organ Innov 2013;5(4):45–51.	Wrong focus, does not discuss empirical data
Stimec A, Grima F. The impact of implementing continuous improvement upon stress within a Lean production framework. Int J Prod Res 2019;57(5):1590–1605.	Focus not on work environment management
Storkersen KV. Safety management in remotely controlled vessel operations. Mar Policy 2021;130.	Wrong focus, industry
Strauss-Raats P. Temporary safety. Regulating working conditions in temporary agency work. Saf Sci 2019; 112:213–222.	Wrong focus, occupational group
Sznelwar L, Hubault F. Work activities as a resource for work organization design and for strategic decisions? Work 2012; 41:6127–6132.	Wrong focus, theory
Tuomivaara S, Ketola R, Huuhtanen P, Toivonen R. Perceived competence in computer use as a moderator of musculoskeletal strain in VDU work: An ergonomics intervention case. Ergonomics 2008;51(2):125–139.	Wrong focus, individual
Tuomivaara S, Ketola R, Huuhtanen P, Toivonen R. Perceived competence in computer use as a moderator of musculoskeletal strain in VDU work: An ergonomics intervention case. Ergonomics 2008;51(2):125–139.	Focus not on work environment management
Turney L. Mental health and workplace bullying: The role of power, professions and ‘on the job’ training. AeJAMH 2003;2(2).	Focus not on work environment management
Ulfvengren P, Corrigan S. Development and implementation of a Safety Management System in a lean airline. Cogn Technol Work	Method development

2015;17(2):219–236.	
Van Eerd D, Ferron EM, D'Elia T, Morgan D, Ziesmann F, Amick BC. Process evaluation of a participatory organizational change program to reduce musculoskeletal and slip, trip and fall injuries. <i>Appl Ergon</i> 2018; 68:42–53.	Public sector
Vickers I. Cleaner production: organizational learning or business as usual? An example from the domestic appliance industry. <i>Bus Strategy Environ</i> 2000;9(4):255–268.	Focus not on work environment management
Vitello M, Galante LG, Capoccia M, Caragnano G. Ergonomics and workplace design: application of Ergo-UAS System in Fiat Group Automobiles. <i>Work</i> 2012; 41:4445–4449.	Method development
Vuori J, Toppinen-Tanner S, Mutanen P. Effects of resource-building group intervention on career management and mental health in work organizations: Randomized controlled field trial. <i>J Appl Psychol</i> 2012;97(2):273–286.	Public sector
Wagner A, Tsarouha E, Ög E, Preiser C, Rieger MA, Rind E. Work-related psychosocial demands related to work organization in small sized companies (SMEs) providing health-oriented services in Germany – a qualitative analysis. <i>BMC Public Health</i> 2022;22(1).	Focus not on work environment management
Weissbrodt R, Arial M, Graf M, Iff S, Giauque D. Preventing psychosocial risks at work: An evaluation study of labour inspectorate interventions. <i>Saf Sci</i> 2018; 110:355–362.	Wrong focus, occupational group
Zwetsloot G, Schmitt-Howe B, Nielsen KT. Success factors for OSH implementation. Opening the black box of OSH realization. <i>Policy Pract Health Saf</i> 2020;18(2):196–210.	Not work organisation
Total	117