Purpose:
Previous systematic reviews of interventions targeting sedentary behaviour (SB) in office workers have focused reporting on indicators of efficacy. In this review, the RE-AIM framework is utilised to report on additional indicators that have the potential to inform and improve further implementation and translation of interventions targeting sedentary office workers. The review aims to gain an understanding of the proportion of RE-AIM indicators that are reported in the literature to identify whether gaps in reporting exist, which indicators are under-reported and which existing methods may be useful in collecting data on under-reported indicators.

Methods:
An integrative, systematic review approach was used to facilitate the inclusion of both qualitative and quantitative articles. Articles were included if they involved adult office workers, were conducted in an office setting, and changes in sedentary behaviour had been measured as a primary outcome. Five electronic databases were searched yielding 7234 articles, with 75 articles (61 individual interventions) meeting the inclusion criteria. The Covidence program was used to aid the blinded, double screening process and analysis was conducted with a validated RE-AIM coding sheet across 28 indicators.

Results/findings:
Reach indicators were the most frequently reported of the RE-AIM dimensions, which were reported on average 59% of the time. Efficacy/effectiveness was the second most reported dimension at 49% reporting across all of the indicators. Implementation indicators were reported an average of 44% of the time, with indicators of adoption and maintenance reported as the lowest at 13% and 8%, respectively.

Conclusions:
The results of this review indicate that, within interventions targeting SB in office workers, there is an imbalance in the reporting across indicators of the RE-AIM framework. Evaluating all interventions across RE-AIM indicators may be an essential first step in the effective translation of interventions as we move towards understanding intervention effectiveness under real-world conditions. Additionally, minimal reporting of indicators of adoption and maintenance fuels arguments that a more pragmatic "practice-based" approach to intervention design may be warranted. In light of the significant gaps in reporting, the research team have created specific recommendations to facilitate improved future reporting of office-based SB interventions.