

Supplementary file 1. Search string

The search string for work participation was as follows: work disability OR sick leave OR employment status OR work capacity OR vocational rehabilitation OR occupational health OR return to work OR work status OR sick absence OR job satisfaction

OR disability pension OR work ability OR occupational rehabilitation OR occupational physician OR employment record OR occupational stress OR occupational health services OR retirement OR absenteeism OR occupational medicine OR vocational guidance OR

job performance. The search string for SSc was as follows: scleroderma, systemic (MeSH term) OR scleroderma, diffuse (MeSH term) OR systemic sclerosis OR progressive scleroderma OR progressive systemic sclerosis.

Supplementary file 2. Quality assessment of included studies.

Table I. Quality assessment (scoring) of the quantitative studies having work as scope (n=8).

	Sandqvist <i>et al.</i> (2008) (1, 2)	Ouimet <i>et al.</i> (2008) (3)	Nguyen <i>et al.</i> (2010) (4)	Sandqvist <i>et al.</i> (2010) (5)	Bérezné <i>et al.</i> (2011) (6)	Sharif <i>et al.</i> (2011) (7)	Singh <i>et al.</i> (2012) (8)	Decuman <i>et al.</i> (2012) (9)
Study design ^a	0/2	1/2	1/2	0/2	1/2	2/2	1/2	1/2
Sampling ^b	1/3	2/3	1/3	2/3	1/3	1/3	1/3	2/3
Measurements ^c	2.5/3 ^f	2.5/3 ^d	1/3 ^{d,e}	3/3	0.5/2 ^d	2.5/3 ^e	1.5/3 ^d	2/3

Values are the score/total possible score.

^a Study design was scored according to whether the studies were longitudinal (1 for yes, 0 for no) and the type of statistical analysis (1 for multivariate, 0 for not multivariate). The majority of the studies (5/8) had a study design score of 1 because they included multivariate analysis but had a cross-sectional design. ^b Sampling was scored according to whether the studies described sampling/inclusion criteria (1 for yes, 0 for no), recruitment bias (1 for no, 0 for yes) and information about non-participants (1 for yes, 0 for no). 6/8 studies had recruitment bias (1-6) and only 2/8 gave information about non-participants (3, 5). ^c Measurements were scored according to whether they described the work variable (1 for yes, 0 for no), the potential influencing parameters (1 for all assessed parameters, 0 for not), and validity and reliability of measurements (1 for yes, 0 for no). None of the studies reached maximum score because in 2/8, the work variable is not clearly described (4, 6), half of studies lacked a clear description of (all) measurements (3, 4, 6, 8) and 6/8 do not give (all) corresponding psychometric properties (1, 2, 4, 6-9). ^d For some variables, the description of the measurements was clear, for others it was not clear, so a score of 0.5/1 was assigned. ^e For some measurements, the reliability/validity was reported, for others it was not, so a score of 0.5/1 was assigned.

Table II. Quality assessment of the qualitative study having work as scope (10).

Foundation of the research question(s) The choice for a qualitative design Clarity of the aim of the study	The aim of the study is clearly described. It is not clear why the authors have chosen a qualitative research by conducting focus groups. Some of the questions could be answered by a questionnaire.
Sample Data collection methods Analysis	How the sampling was done is not clear but the sample is well described. The authors only perform focus groups. Nevertheless, in qualitative research often only one method is used. The authors describe how they performed analysis. Validity of data-analysis was supported by recording and transcribing data literally, by coding, and by having two researchers performing the analysis (although it was unclear how that was done).
Is sufficient original material given to support the interpretation?	In a supplementary document, the authors give quotations to illustrate the (sub)themes.
Data-saturation and rich-thick description	The authors do not mention if they reached data-saturation (gathering fresh data no longer sparks new insights) or had sufficient rich data (detailed and full data, placed in their relevant context) (11).

Table III. Quality assessment (scoring) of the quantitative studies not having work as main focus.

	Moser <i>et al.</i> (1993) (12)	Sandqvist <i>et al.</i> (2005) (13)	Mouthon <i>et al.</i> (2008) (14)	Minier <i>et al.</i> (2010) (15)	Schouffoer <i>et al.</i> (2011) (16)
Study design ^a	1/2	0/2	1/2	0/2	1/2
Sampling ^b	1/3	2/3	2/3	2/3	1/3
Measurements ^c	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2	1.5/2 ^d

For completeness, results of the quality assessment of the studies not having work as scope are given but they are not further discussed. ^a Study design was scored according to whether the studies were longitudinal (1 for yes, 0 for no) and the type of statistical analysis (1 for multivariate, 0 for not multivariate). ^b Sampling was scored according to whether the studies described sampling/inclusion criteria (1 for yes, 0 for no), recruitment bias (0 for yes, 1 for no), information about non-participants (1 for yes, 0 for no). ^c Measurements were scored according to whether they described the variables studied (1 for yes, 0 for no) and the reliability and validity of measurements (1 for yes, 0 for no). ^d For some measurements, reliability/validity is reported, for others it was not, so a score of 0.5/1 was assigned.

Supplementary file 3.**Description of the study population of the qualitative study**

LcSSc/dcSSc, n/N	15/2
Married/cohabiting, yes, n/N	12/17
Children living in the household, yes, n/N	6/17
Education ^a , n/N	
Compulsory education	6/17
Upper secondary school	2/17
University degree	9/17
Employment status, n/N	
Working 100%	6/17
Working 80%	2/17
Working 75%	2/17
Working 50%	6/17
Working 25%	1/17
Employer, n/N	
Public	11/17
Private	5/17
Self-employed	1/17
Profession, n/N	
Administration	5/17
Nursing and childcare	4/17
Teacher	3/17
Service, mechanics and farming	5/17
Years of present employment, n/N	
<2	2/17
2-5	1/17
6-10	7/17
>10	7/17
Changed employment due to disease, n/N	5/17

^aEducational level: compulsory education (6-16 years of age); upper secondary school (16-18 years of age) or university (≥18 years of age).

References

1. SANDQVIST G, EKLUND M: Daily occupations - performance, satisfaction and time use, and relations with well-being in women with limited systemic sclerosis. *Disabil Rehabil* 2008; 30: 27-35.
2. SANDQVIST G, SCHEJA A, EKLUND M: Working ability in relation to disease severity, everyday occupations and well-being in women with limited systemic sclerosis. *Rheumatology* 2008; 47: 1708-11.
3. OUIMET JM, POPE JE, GUTMANIS I, KOVAL J: Work disability in scleroderma is greater than in rheumatoid arthritis and is predicted by high HAQ Scores. *Open Rheumatol J* 2008; 2: 44-52.
4. NGUYEN C, POIRAUDEAU S, MESTRE-STANISLAS C *et al.*: Employment status and socio-economic burden in systemic sclerosis: a cross-sectional survey. *Rheumatology* 2010; 49: 1-8.
5. SANDQVIST G, SCHEJA A, HESSELSTRAND R: Pain, fatigue and hand function closely correlated to work ability and employment status in systemic sclerosis. *Rheumatology* 2010; 49: 1739-46.
6. BÉREZNÉ A, SEROR R, MORELL-DUBOIS S *et al.*: Impact of systemic sclerosis on occupational and professional activity with attention to patients with digital ulcers. *Arthritis Care Res* 2011; 63: 277-85.
7. SHARIF R, MAYES MD, NICASSIO PM *et al.*: Determinants of work disability in patients with systemic sclerosis: a longitudinal study of the GENISOS cohort. *Semin Arthritis Rheum* 2011; 41: 38-47.
8. SINGH MK, CLEMENTS PJ, FURST DE, MARRANIAN P, KHANNA D: Work productivity in scleroderma: analysis from the University of California, Los Angeles scleroderma quality of life study. *Arthritis Care Res* (Hoboken) 2012; 64: 176-83.
9. DECUMAN S, SMITH V, VERHAEGHE S, DESCHÉPPER E, VERMEIREN F, DE KEYSER F: Work participation and work transition in patients with systemic sclerosis: a cross-sectional study. *Rheumatology* (Oxford) 2012; 51: 297-304.
10. SANDQVIST G, HESSELSTRAND R, SCHEJA A, HAKANSSON C: Managing work life with systemic sclerosis. *Rheumatology* (Oxford) 2012; 51: 319-23.
11. CHARMAZ K: Constructing grounded theory. A practical guide through qualitative analysis. London-California-New Delhi, Sage, 2006: 208.
12. MOSER DK, CLEMENTS PJ, BRECHT ML, WEINER SR: Predictors of psychosocial adjustment in systemic sclerosis - the influence of formal education level, functional ability, hardiness, uncertainty, and social support. *Arthritis Rheum* 1993; 36: 1398-405.
13. SANDQVIST G, AKESSON A, EKLUND M: Daily occupations and well-being in women with limited cutaneous systemic sclerosis. *Am J Occup Ther* 2005; 59: 390-7.
14. MOUTHON L, RANNOU F, BEREZNE A *et al.*: Patient preference disability questionnaire in systemic sclerosis: a cross-sectional survey. *Arthritis Rheum* 2008; 59: 968-73.
15. MINIER T, PENTEK M, BRODSZKY V *et al.*: Cost-of-illness of patients with systemic sclerosis in a tertiary care centre. *Rheumatology* (Oxford) 2010; 49: 1920-8.
16. SCHOUFFOER AA, ZIRKZEE EJM, HENQUET SM *et al.*: Needs and preferences regarding health care delivery as perceived by patients with systemic sclerosis. *Clin Rheumatol* 2011; 30: 815-24.