	Physically demanding		Non physically demanding		Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio	Risk of Bias
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI	Α
2.1.1 Cohort studies								
Kaila-Kangas 2009	51	916	73	2189	26.7%	1.71 [1.18, 2.47]	_ -	•
Kaila-Kangas 2011	67	1060	25	876	22.3%	2.30 [1.44, 3.67]		•
Sorensen 2011	10	247	26	2328	0.0%	3.74 [1.78, 7.84]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		1976		3065	49.0%	1.91 [1.43, 2.55]	•	
Total events	118		98					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ² = 0.96,	df = 1 (P =	: 0.33); I ² = 0%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.40 (P < 0.00	01)						
2.1.2 Case Control st	tudies							
Ahsan 2013	46	86	42	88	0.0%	1.26 [0.69, 2.28]		
Heliovaara 1991	172	2505	61	2054	0.0%	2.41 [1.79, 3.25]		•
Saftic 2006	21	57	46	278	0.0%	2.94 [1.58, 5.49]		•
Seidler 2003	41	119	42	137	20.2%	1.19 [0.70, 2.01]		•
Seidler 2009	179	355	161	586	30.8%	2.68 [2.04, 3.54]	-	•
Zhang 2013	71	99	57	161	0.0%	4.63 [2.69, 7.97]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		474		723	51.0%	1.84 [0.83, 4.09]		
Total events	220		203					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:		,	: 0.007); I ² = 86%					
2.1.3 Cross Sectiona	l studies							
Kostova 2001	24	279	73	613	0.0%	0.70 [0.43, 1.13]		
Subtotal (95% CI)		0		0		Not estimable		
Total events	0		0					
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Not applicable							
Total (95% CI)		2450		3788	100.0%	1.95 [1.39, 2.74]	•	
Total events	338		301					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.08; Chi ² = 8.92,	df = 3 (P =	: 0.03); I ² = 66%			<u></u>	1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.84 (P = 0.00	01)					ours Heavy Work Favours Light Work	
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Chi ² = 0.0	1, df = 1 (F	P = 0.93), I ² = 0%			rav	odio i iday i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	
Risk of bias legend								
(A) Risk of Bias								

Figure e-2 Forest plot physically demanding work and LRS including only low (green dot) risk of bias studies