**S2 Table.** **Assessment of methodological quality of the studies on Physical Activity interventions**

**Consensus on Health Economic Criteria (CHEC) checklist (\*)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Eckert et al. 2021 [126] | D'Amico et al. 2016 [135] | Khan et al. 2019 [125] |
| **1. Study population clearly described?** | x | x | x |
| **2. Competing alternatives clearly described?** | x | x | x |
| **3. Well-defined research question in answerable form?** | x | x | x |
| **4. Economic study design appropriate to stated objective?** | x | x | x |
| **5. Chosen time horizon appropriate to include relevant costs and consequences?** | x | x | x |
| **6. Actual perspective chosen appropriate?** | x | x | x |
| **7. All important and relevant costs for each alternative identified?** | x | x | x |
| **8. All costs measured appropriately in physical units?** | x | x | x |
| **9. Costs valued appropriately?** | x | x | x |
| **10. All important and relevant outcomes for each alternative identified?** | x | x | x |
| **11. All outcomes measured appropriately?** | x | x | x |
| **12. Outcomes valued appropriately?** | x | x | x |
| **13. Incremental analysis of costs and outcomes of alternatives performed?** | x | x | x |
| **14. All future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?** | NA | NA | NA |
| **15. All important variables, whose values are uncertain, appropriately subjected to sensitivity analysis?** | x | x | x |
| **16. Do conclusions follow from the data reported?** | x | x | x |
| **17. Study discusses generalizability of results to other settings and patient/client groups?** | x |  | x |
| **18. Article indicates that there is no potential conflict of interest of study researcher(s) and funder(s)?** | x | x | x |
| **19. Ethical and distributional issues discussed appropriately?** |  |  |  |
| **Quality Score** | 17 | 16 | 17 |
| **Quality Level (H=High; M=Medium; L=Low)** | H | M | H |
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(NA = Not Applicable)