Response to Reviewer 2

Point 1: Is the use of two reviewers in the selection process a standard of the literature or not?

Response 1:
“Two reviewers will participate in the selection process. Mendeley desktop will be used to store references and subsequently identify and remove duplicates. All titles and abstracts will be screened for eligibility by one reviewer and for those that remain unclear full texts will be sought. Abstracts and full texts of potentially eligible studies will then be screened independently by two reviewers against the studies’ eligibility criteria, taking into account the intervention type, study population, and the reported outcomes.”

Point 2: There is an issue regarding the interpretation of the estimates. Employees are not randomly assigned into workplaces. Failure to account for sorting of employees will bias any estimated effects. The size of the bias is not known. This problem can be addressed using information on employees’ wage and work histories (https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2012.09.005). This issue should be noted in the revised version.

Response 2: Please provide your response for Point 2. (in red)

“…subjective indicators of well-being can effectively indicate the incidence of short-term absences (Bockerman et al., 2012). Similarly, there is growing attention in the premise of psychological interventions for psychological well-being through the development of positive cognitive/affective states (e.g. work engagement, resilience, optimism) and their importance in creating resilient workplaces and engaged workforce (Youssef & Luthans, 2007; Knight et al., 2017; di Fabio, 2017; Cartwright & Cooper, 2014; Huang et al., 2016; Bakker & Demerouti, 2018). Psychological well-being promotion in organisations has been associated with the development and interplay of resources at the individual-, group-, leader-, and organisational levels (Day & Nielsen et al., 2018; Nielsen et al., 2017). Resources can be generically defined as “anything perceived by the individual to help attain his or her goals” (Halbesleben et al., 2014, p.6) and Nielsen et al.’s (2017) meta-analysis, drawing from current developments in occupational health psychology and HRM perspectives, supports a four level model of resources in psychologically healthy organization. Their model describes the positive impact of personal resources (e.g. positive psychological capital, self-efficacy, resilience), group resources (e.g. social support), leader resources (e.g. transformation leadership) and organisational resources (e.g. autonomy and mutually beneficial HRM practices) on employees’ well-being and performance (Day & Nielsen et al., 2018; Nielsen et al., 2017). For this reason, psychological well-being promotion in the workplace is largely dependent on the focus of the interventions, how their effectiveness is measured and how they may be integrated within individuals’ organizational contexts, and their wider sociocultural environments. For example, individual-level interventions may assess their effectiveness within or across different occupational settings, intervention types (e.g. CPD-based, mindfulness-based, stress management), outcomes (e.g. cognitive, affective and behavioural responses) or population target characteristics (e.g. targeting employees “at risk” or universally all organizational members) (Wan Mohd Yunus et al., 2018; Vanhove et al.,
However, due to the nature of those interventions randomisation most frequently refers to the allocation of participants in certain types of interventions”

“Summary measures: The included studies will report individual-level interventions with primary individual-level outcomes. For each study, between-group effect sizes will be computed, using Cohen’s d. When necessary standard deviations will be reconstructed from p-values or t- statistics.

Analysis: We will use a random-effects model and a 95% confidence interval with two-tailed tests.

Effect sizes interpretation: Effect sizes will be reported either as odds ratios (for dichotomous data) or weighted (or standardized) mean differences (for continuous data) and their 95% confidence intervals will be calculated for analysis. Effect sizes will show the changes reported from baseline standardised measures of psychological resources, poor mental well-being outcomes (e.g. depression, perceived anxiety) and work-related well-being, (e.g. perceived stress, burnout, work-engagement). When available, between-group effect sizes (Cohen’s d) will be computed for follow-up differences in outcome measures.”

Point 3: The paper does not pay attention to the potential heterogeneity in the estimated effects. The relationships can differ significantly e.g. by gender and/or age

Response 3:
“Heterogeneity: Heterogeneity will be assessed statistically using the standard chi-squared $x^2$, $I^2$ and the $Q_{within}$ statistic. A significant $Q_{within}$ value would reject the null hypothesis of homogeneity, while the $I^2$ statistic shows the proportion of observed variance that is not due to sampling error and indicates heterogeneity in percentages (ranging from no heterogeneity to high levels of heterogeneity) (Higgins et al., 2003). Small study effect: Funnel plots will be used to assess small study effect for the overall effects. Adjusted effect sizes will be calculated for funnel plots demonstrating significant asymmetry (calculated as Egger’s intercept) and the Duval and Tweedie trim and fill will be used to quantify the magnitude of publication bias (Borenstein et al., 2009).”

Point 4: The concluding section of the paper should provide practical policy implications that stem from the results.

Response 4:
“Practical Policy Implications
The present study will offer an assessment of the effectiveness of individual-level interventions for the promotion of psychological well-being in the workplace. This knowledge will be valuable for researchers and professionals seeking to design such interventions as it will offer:

- recommendations on the use of digital interventions, their strengths and limitations.
- guidance in identifying specific indicators of psychological well-being in the workplace that can be targeted via an individual-level intervention.
- an understanding of the theories that guide such interventions and the role of theory in their development.
- an exploration of a range of individual-level outcomes, assessed via standardised measures, and their associations with other individual and organisational outcomes.”