

Supplemental Material

Table S2. Quality assessment tool for social network analysis studies.

Name of author(s):

Year of publication:

Name of paper/study:

Appraisal question	Criteria for answers			Additional notes
	Yes	No	Other (CD, NR, NA)*	
1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What was the goal of the research? - Why was it thought important? - Its relevance
2. Was there a clear description of the Boundary setting / the Actor identification?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Of networks (nominalist/realist strategy)/ Organizations (how were the participating organizations selected?) (snowball method?)
3. Was the participation rate of eligible actors at least 75%?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - > 75 %
4. Was there a clear statement how data were collected (directly from the subjects as opposed to a proxy)?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Subjects (management role, CEO, external (expert survey)) - Proxy (documents, database)
5. Was the investigated network clearly described?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Was it formed unintended or strategically?
6. Definitions 6.1 Was an acceptable definition of health promotion/activity used in the study?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wide definition of sport (additional interventions possible, e.g., nutritional advice, psychological interventions, counseling)
6.2 Was an acceptable definition of social network analysis or a similar theoretical foundation used in the study?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Definition of social network analysis
6.3 Was an acceptable definition of variables used in the study?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Were the investigated variables clearly defined? (e.g., cooperation, partnership) - Were the network measures clearly defined? (e.g., degrees of network centrality. Valid, reliable?)
7. Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Face-to-face interviews, telephone interviews, questionnaires, tape recordings, video material, notes, etc.

8. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Discussion of how the anonymity of participants/sources was protected - Discussion of confidentiality of data and procedures for protecting
9. Is there a clear statement of findings?				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are the findings explicit? - Is there an adequate discussion of the evidence both for and against the researchers' arguments? - Has the researcher discussed the credibility of their findings? (e.g., triangulation, respondent validation, more than one analyst) - Are the findings discussed in relation to the original research question?
Quality Rating:				
Rater #1 initials:				
Rater #2 initials:				

* CD, cannot determine; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported