

Supplemental Table 1: Summary of results for all included studies.

Study	n	Mean age yrs ± SD [Range]; % female	Participant characteristics	Sleep 1° or 2° outcome; Sleep complaint required	Intervention vs comparator	Outcome Measurements	Study Outcome Immediate*	Study Outcome sustained*	Results
BIOFEEDBACK									
Duivendoorden 1991	119	NR	Cardiac patients after myocardial infarction	2 N	EMG Frontalis Biofeedback vs. PE	SRS	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between groups on self-reported sleep quality over the 6 weeks.
Ebben 2009	10	20; 70%	Healthy	1 N	HRV Biofeedback vs. NTC	PSG, PSQI	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference in any of the outcomes between groups except with stage 1 sleep (p<0.05) and sleep disturbance scores (p=0.003)
Freedman 1976*	18	[17-39]; 56%	Insomnia	1 Y	Biofeedback vs Williams exercises	PSG	Negative ^A	Negative ^A	Sig. improvement in 1/5 of the PSG measurements reported at 2 weeks but not at 2 month follow-up.
Haralambous 1987	26	50.9 [25-76]; 50%	Tinnitus	2 N	EMG Biofeedback vs. WL	SRS	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. improvement between groups.
Hauri 1981	43	41.3 ± 14.6; 63%	Insomnia	1 Y	EMG Biofeedback vs. NTC	PSG, SD	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. improvement with intervention in any objective sleep measurements. All groups compared together.
					SMR Biofeedback vs. NTC		Negative ^{NA}	N/A	
Lamontagne 1975	23	19; 29%	Cannabis user; college students	2 N	EEG alpha vs. Sham Biofeedback	SRS	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference in sleep outcomes compared to active sham NFB control. Both groups improved.
					EMG vs. Sham Biofeedback		Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference in sleep outcomes compared to active sham NFB control. Both groups improved.

Lamontagne 1977	75	20.5 [17-25]; NR	Cannabis user; college students	2 N	EEG alpha vs. Sham Biofeedback	SRS	Negative ^A	Negative ^A	No sig. improvement between groups in immediate or sustained effects.
					EEG alpha vs. NTC		Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	
					EMG vs. Sham Biofeedback		Negative ^A	Negative ^A	
					EMG vs. NTC		Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	
Levin 1998	58	43 [18- 60]; 60%	Insomnia	1 Y	Brain music Biofeedback vs. Placebo brain music	PSG, SD, SRS	Mixed ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in pre-post sleep measurements with intervention and not control ($p < 0.05$). No between group comparisons given.
Nicassio 1982*	22	43.5 [17-64]; 78%	Insomnia	1 Y	EMG biofeedback vs. Biofeedback placebo	SRS, SD	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between biofeedback and placebo.
					EMG biofeedback vs. NTC		Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in sleep outcomes with biofeedback compared to control ($p < 0.05$).
Sanavio 1988	24	39 [23- 59]; 58%	Insomnia	1 Y	Biofeedback vs. CBT	SD	Negative ^A	Negative ^A	No sig. improvement between groups.
VanderPlate 1983	36	20; 100%	Insomnia; undergraduates	1 Y	EMG Biofeedback vs. Self- monitoring	SBQ, SD	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in 5/8 of the sleep outcomes compared to self- monitoring group.
					EMG Biofeedback vs. Sham		Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in 5/8 of the sleep outcomes compared to pseudofeedback.
					EMG Biofeedback vs. WL		Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in 3/5 of the sleep outcomes reported compared to WL.

Yilmaz 2010	39	55.57 ± 7.17 [45-70]; 88%	Osteoarthritis of the knee	2 N	EMG Biofeedback with PE vs. PE	Nottingham Health Profile: Sleep subscale	Mixed ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in outcome over time with treatment (p<0.05) and a post-intervention difference between groups (p<0.02). No between group x time comparison given.
GUIDED IMAGERY									
Casida 2013	40	60.7 ± 15.6; 38%	Post-operative cardiopulmonary bypass surgery	1 N	Guided Imagery vs. UC	VAS, AG	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference between group difference or overall time effect.
Renzi 2000	86	48 [25-72]; 51%	Anorectal disease surgery	2 N	Guided Imagery vs. UC	SRS	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. difference between intervention and control at endpoint (p=0.01). Between group over time comparisons not given.
Woolfolk 1983*	44	43.3 [19-71]; 68%	Insomnia	1 Y	Guided Imagery vs. WL	SD	Negative ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	Sig. improvement in only 1/6 sleep outcomes compared to control. Sig improvement in 5/6 sleep outcomes compared to control at 24 weeks follow-up
					Guided Imagery + Muscle tension-release vs. WL		Negative ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	No sig. differences in sleep outcomes post-intervention. Sig improvement in 5/6 sleep outcomes compared to control at 24 weeks follow-up
HYPNOTHERAPY									
Abrahamsen 2008	41	56 ± 12.2; 85%	Orofacial, persistent idiopathic pain	2 N	Hypnotherapy + PMR + Guided Imagery vs. PMR + Guided Imagery	PSQI	Negative ^A	N/A	Pre-post improvement in sleep quality in both groups but no sig. between-group differences (p < 0.11)
Abrahamsen 2009	40	38.6 ± 10.8; 100%	Temporo-mandibular disorders	2 N	Hypnotherapy + PMR + Guided Imagery vs. PMR + Guided Imagery	PSQI	Negative ^A	N/A	Sig. pre-post reduction (p < 0.006) and control groups on NWAK - Pain; no other significant effects of time or group, but tendency of greater improvement of other sleep outcomes in HT group.

Abramowitz 2008	32	31.7; 0%	PTSD with insomnia	2 Y	Hypnotherapy vs. Zolpidem	VSSQQ	Positive ^A	Mixed ^A	Quality of sleep improved with HT (p=0.003) and improved compared to control (p<0.0005). Improvement in number of awakenings and TST.
Barabasz 1976	NR	NR	Mild depressive neurosis	1 Y	Hypnotherapy + Cerebral Electrotherapy, vs. Cerebral Electrotherapy	SRS	Positive ^A	N/A	Both groups that isolated the HT effect significantly improved self-reported sleep (p<0.05).
Castel 2012	93	50.2 ± 6.2; 97%	Fibromyalgia	2 N	Hypnotherapy + CBT vs. CBT	MOS-SS	Negative ^A	Negative ^A	Sig. improvement in sleep scores for CBT plus hypnotherapy and CBT alone (p<0.001). No sig difference between these two.
Elkins 2008	51	58; 100%	Breast cancer survivors with hot flashes	2 N	Hypnotherapy vs. NTC	MOS-SS	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement (p<0.001) in sleep with HT versus the control group.
Elkins 2013	174	54.6; 100%	Postmenopausal with hot flashes	2 N	Hypnotherapy vs. Structured attention control	PSQI	Positive ^A	Positive ^A	Sig. improvement both after intervention (p<0.001) and at 12 week follow-up.
Farrell-Carnahan 2010	38	56.7 ± 11.7; 86%	Cancer survivors with insomnia	1 Y	Hypnotherapy, self vs. WL	ISI, SRS	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference between groups.
Picard 2013	59	481. ± 9.3; 100%	Fibromyalgia	2 N	Hypnotherapy vs. WL	MOS-SS	Negative ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	No sig. difference between groups following treatment (p>0.05), but sig improvement seen at 6 months (p<0.01).
Stanton 1989	45	[23-67; 58%]	Insomnia	1 Y	Hypnotherapy vs. Stimulus control	SRS	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in SOL with HT compared to stimulus control (p<0.05).
					Hypnotherapy vs. Sham Hypnotherapy		Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in SOL with HT compared to sham HT (p<0.05).

Whitehouse 1996	35	24.8; 60%	Medical students	2 N	Hypnotherapy, self vs. WL	SD	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	Trend towards improvement in quality (p=0.06). Not all SD outcomes reported.
MEDITATION: MINDFULNESS									
Andersen 2013	247	54.2 ± 10.3; 100%	Post-surgery breast cancer	1 N	Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) vs. UC	MOS-SS	Mixed ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	3/9 subscale values sig diff from control at endpoint, although change scores for same time not sig. No sig. diff between groups in mixed model over time or at 6 and 12 month follow-ups
Britton 2010	21	47.7 ± 7.6; 77%	Depression - remitted	1 Y	Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT) vs. WL	PSG, SD	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. differences in most of the outcomes measured by PSG and by SD.
Britton 2012	24	47.7 ± 8.0; 79%	Depression - antidepressant user	1 Y	Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy (MBCT) vs. WL	PSG, SD	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference in most PSG measurements. SD showed improvement in SE and TWT compared to control (p<0.05) but not in other measures.
Carmody 2011	92	53 ± 4.9; 100%	Late peri- and post-menopause with hot flashes	2 N	Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) vs. WL	WHIRS	Positive ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	Sig improvement compared to control (p=0.009). Intervention group score moved to below cutoff for problematic sleep disturbance. No sig difference at 20 wk follow-up
Esmer 2010	25	55.1 ± 10.3; 44%	Failed back surgery syndrome	2 N	Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) vs. UC	PSQI-Abridged	Positive ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	Sig. improvement in sleep after the intervention (p = 0.047) and was maintained at 40 weeks.
Gross 2010	122	55 ± 11.3; 46%	Solid organ transplant recipients	1 N	Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) vs. HE	PSQI	Positive ^A	Positive ^A	Sig. improvement in sleep between intervention and control (p=0.02) immediately and at 1 year follow-up (p<0.01).
Gross 2011	27	47 [21-65]; 75%	Insomnia	1 Y	Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) vs. Eszopiclone	AG	Negative ^A	Negative ^A	No sig. difference between groups after intervention and no sig difference at 5 mth follow-up.

Klatt 2009	45	43.41 ± 2.17; 77%	Stressed working adults	2 N	Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) vs. WL	PSQI	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. pre-post improvement in 5/7 of the sleep measurements. No between group comparison was done.
Lengacher 2012	84	58 ± 9.4; 100%	Breast cancer	2 N	Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) vs. WL	M.D. Anderson Symptom Inventory	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference between MBSR and control at 6 weeks (p=0.98). Improvement in both groups.
Malarkey 2013	170	51; 88%	University faculty & staff with risk for cardiovascular disease	2 N	Low dose Mindfulness-Based Intervention vs. Lifestyle education	PSQI	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. changes in PSQI global score.
Nakamura 2013	35	52.6 ± 9.8; 75%	Cancer survivor with sleep disturbance	1 Y	Mindfulness; Mind-Body Bridging vs. SHE	MOS-SS	Mixed ^A	Positive ^A	Sig. improvement with MBB versus control immediately (p<0.001) and at 2 month follow-up (p=0.018). Near significance with MD versus control immediately (p=0.065). Sig improvement at 2 month follow-up (p=0.04).
Shapiro 2003	54	57 ± 9.7 [38-77]; 100%	Breast cancer	1 N	Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction (MBSR) vs. Free choice control	SRS	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. improvement between groups.
Stotter 2013	28	42.8 ± 12.6; 79%	Depression, moderate recurring or episodic	2 N	Mindfulness-Based Touch Therapy & Mindfulness Counselling + UC vs. UC	HRSD-Sleep	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in 1/3 outcomes compared to control at endpoint. No between group x time comparison given.
Wolever 2012*	205	44.3 ± 9.4; 75%	Working adults	2 N	MD - Mindfulness at Work vs. NTC	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. decrease in sleep difficulties compared to control (p<0.05)

MEDITATION: OTHER

Chan 2012	51	46.7 ± 8.1; 78%	Depression	1 Y	Dejian Mind-Body Intervention vs. CBT	HRSD-Sleep & SD, SRS	Mixed ^A	N/A	Sig. pre-post improvement in the majority of measurements (p<0.05). No between group comparison done.
					Dejian Mind-Body Intervention vs. WL		Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	
Milbury 2013	40	53.0 ± 6.6; 100%	Cancer, breast - post-chemotherapy w/ cognitive impairment	2 N	Tibetan sound meditation vs. WL	PSQI	Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	No sig. pre-post or between group effect on sleep.
Nakamura 2011	58	53.8 ± 10.4; 6%	Veterans with sleep disturbance	1 Y	Mind-Body Bridging vs. SHE	MOS-SS	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in overall score and 2/6 of the subscales compared to control (p<0.01).
Pinniger 2013	64	39.5 [18-68]; 89%	Stress, anxiety and/or depression, self-reported	1 N	Clinically Standardized Meditation vs. WL	ISI	Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	No sig. difference between groups.
Rybarczyk 1999 + Rybarczyk 2001	237	64.5 [50-87]; 82%	Chronic health condition; >50 years old	2 N	Mind-body wellness vs. WL	MSCL - sleep difficulties	Positive ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	Sig. difference between groups immediately after intervention (p<0.05) and at 1 yr follow-up (p<0.05).
Schoicket 1988	65	52.14 ± 13.14 [28-75]; 77%	Insomnia	1 Y	Meditation vs. SHE	SD	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between groups. All groups saw an improvement in sleep over time (p<0.05)
					Meditation vs. Stimulus control		Negative ^A	N/A	
Wiriyasombat 2011	77	69.77 ± 6.46; 78%	Elderly	1 N	Vipassana meditation vs. NTC	SRS - Thai Elderly Spiritual Well-Being Study	Negative ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	No sig. change at post-intervention. Sig improvement at 4 month follow-up in intervention (<0.001).

MEDITATION: TM

Brooks 1985	18	33.3; 0%	Veterans, post-Vietnam	2 N	Transcendental meditation vs. Psychotherapy	SRS	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in insomnia with intervention compared to control (p<0.01).
Travis 2009	38	22.4 ± 8.0; 74%	College students	2 N	Transcendental meditation vs. WL	ESS	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in sleep after intervention compared to control (p=0.001).
MOVEMENT: YOGA									
Afonso 2012	44	[50 - 65]; 100%	Post-menopause with insomnia	1 Y	Yoga vs. Passive stretching	ISI	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between intervention and active control
					Yoga vs. WL		Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Yoga presented significantly lower ISI when compared to WL (p<0.05).
Bower 2012	31	53.9 ± 5.3; 100%	Breast cancer survivor with fatigue	2 N	Iyengar yoga vs. HE	PSQI	Negative ^A	Negative ^A	No sig. difference between groups in sleep disturbance.
Carson 2009	29	54.4 ± 7.5; 100%	Breast cancer survivor with hot flashes	2 N	Yoga vs. NTC	SRS	Positive ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	Sig. improvement in sleep disturbance between intervention and control (p=0.0071). No sig at 1 month follow up
Chandwani 2010	56	52.7 ± 9.1; 100%	Breast cancer undergoing radiation	2 N	Yoga vs. WL	PSQI	Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	No sig. differences in sleep disturbance over time and between groups.
Chattha 2008	108	48.5 ± 3.8; 100%	Peri-menopause	2 N	Integrated yoga therapy vs. PE	SRS - Vasomotor Symptom Checklist	Negative ^A	N/A	Nearing sig. difference between groups over time (p=0.08).
Chen KM 2009	128	69.2 ± 6.2; 84%	Elderly - community dwelling	1 N	Silver yoga vs. NTC	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in PSQI score for intervention compared to control (p<0.001).
Chen KM 2010	55	75.4 ± 6.70; 53%	Transitional frail elders	1 N	Silver yoga vs. NTC	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in PSQI score for intervention compared to control (p<0.005).

Cohen L 2004	38	51; 31%	Lymphoma	1 N	Tibetan yoga vs. WL	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement after intervention in total PSQI score between intervention and control ($p<0.004$). 4/7 subscales of PSQI were sig. improved compared to control.
Dhruva 2012	16	54.2 ± 13.0; 88%	Cancer, undergoing chemotherapy	2 N	Pranayama yoga vs. WL	GSDS	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in sleep disturbance in yoga group ($p<0.04$). No between group comparison given.
Elavsky 2007	150	49.9 ± 3.6; 100%	Menopause	1 Y	Iyengar yoga vs. PE	PSQI	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. differences in sleep outcomes between walking, yoga, and no intervention.
					Iyengar yoga vs. NTC		Negative ^{NA}	N/A	
Garfinkel 1998	42	48.9 ± 45; 76%	Carpal tunnel syndrome	2 N	Iyengar yoga vs. UC	SRS	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference between groups with sleep disturbance.
Hariprasad 2013*	87	75.3 ± 6.9; 60%	Elderly in nursing home	1 N	Yoga vs. WL	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in PSQI between intervention and control ($p<0.001$).
Innes 2012	20	58.4 ± 2; 100%	Post- menopausal (overweight, physically inactive)	1 N	Iyengar yoga vs. Education film	PSQI, SRS	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in 4/7 of the PSQI subscale measurements between intervention and control ($p<0.05$).
Kohn 2013	37	53 ± 12; 91%	Stress with related symptoms and diagnoses	2 N	Yoga + UC vs. UC	ISI	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference regarding changes in ISI from baseline was noted between groups.
Manjunath 2005	55	71.5 ± 8.2; 70%	Elderly	1 N	Yoga vs. WL	SRS	Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	No sig. pre-post or between group effect on sleep.
Mustian 2013	321	54.1 ± NR; 96%	Cancer survivor	1 Y	Yoga for Cancer Survivors + UC vs. UC	PSQI, AG	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in 6/11 measurements of sleep between intervention and control.

Sakuma 2012	82	32.6 ± 11.5; 100%	Child-care workers	2 N	Yoga vs. NTC	GHQ-30	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference between groups.
Vadiraja 2009	75	NR; 100%	Breast cancer patients, stage 2 and 3	2 N	Yoga vs. supportive counseling	EORTC	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement yoga group compared to the control at the end of the trial (p=0.001)
Wolever 2012*	205	44.3 ± 9.4; 75%	Working adults	2 N	YG - Viniyoga Stress Reduction Program vs. NTC	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. decrease in sleep difficulties compared to control (p<0.05)
Yurtkuran 2007	37	38 ± 14.2; 55%	Hemodialysis	2 N	Yoga vs. NTC	VAS	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in sleep outcome with treatment compared to control (p = 0.04).
MOVEMENT: QI QONG									
Chen 2013	96	45.0 ± 8.1; 100%	Breast cancer undergoing radiotherapy	2 N	Qigong vs. WL	PSQI	Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	No sig. pre-post or between group effect on sleep. No sig at 1 month follow-up.
Liu 2012	12	55.6 [20-70]; 100%	Fibromyalgia	2 N	Qigong vs. Sham Qigong exercise	PSQI	Mixed ^A	N/A	Borderline sig. improvement in sleep quality with the qi gong group compared to the sham qi gong group (p=0.058).
Lynch 2012	73	52.81; 94%	Fibromyalgia	2 N	Qigong - Level 1 Chaoyi Fanhuan Qigong vs. WL	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	Sig. imp in PSQI global vs WL immediately (p<0.001) and 2 mth (p<0.001), 4 mth (p =.003), and 6 mth (p=.008) follow-up.
MOVEMENT: RESSEGUIER									
Maddali Bongji 2010	41	45.5 ± 11.8; 93%	Fibromyalgia	2 N	Rességuier method vs. WL	SRS	Mixed ^{NA}	Mixed ^{NA}	Sig. pre-post improvement on sleep at end of intervention (p < 0.001) and at end of 6 mth follow up (p < 0.01). Pre-post difference in control group not significant. No between group comparisons given.
MOVEMENT: TAI CHI									

Frye 2007	72	69.2 ± 9.26 [52-82]; 64%	Elderly	2 N	Tai Chi vs. PE: LIE exercise	PSQI	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between the Tai Chi and the LIE exercise group.
					Tai Chi vs. NTC		Positive ^{NA}		Sig. improvement with Tai Chi compared to non-active control (p<0.05).
Irwin 2008	112	59 – 86; 69%	Elderly - community- dwelling	1 Y	Tai Chi vs. HE	PSQI	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in Global and 4/7 sub scores compared to control.
Jones 2012	98	53.3; 93%	Fibromyalgia	2 N	8-form Yang style Tai Chi vs. HE	PSQI	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement on sleep quality with Tai chi compared to education control (P<0.0001).
Li 2004	118	75.4 ± 7.8; 82%	Elderly	1 Y	8-form Yang style Tai Chi vs. PE	PSQI, ESS	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in overall PSQI score (p<0.001) and in 7/9 of the subscales compared to control.
Nguyen 2012	73	68.9 ± 5.1; 50%	Elderly - community- dwelling	1 N	24-form Tai Chi vs. NTC	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in sleep with Tai Chi versus control (p < 0.001)
Wang WC 2010	29	76.53 ± 9.74; 69%	Cerebral vascular disorder, elderly	2 N	Yang style Tai Chi vs. Rehabilitation	PSQI	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. improvement compared to control.
Yeh 2008	18	64.2 ± 16.2; 50%	Chronic heart failure	1 N	Tai Chi + UC vs. UC	Sleep spectrogram technique	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in outcome compared to control (p<0.05).
MULTIPLE MBI									
Carlson 2001	44	34.6; 77%	Myofascial pain	2 N	Physical self-regulation: Breathing, postural relaxation, proprioceptive retraining vs. UC	PSQI	Mixed ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	Both intervention and control improved after treatment. No sig. difference at 26 weeks follow-up.

Chen YL 2010	15	38.64 ± 3.7; 68%	Chronic pain	2 N	PMR + Guided imagery vs. WL	SRS	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	75% improvement in sleep quality compared to 28.57% in control group, but no statistics reported
Cohen 2007	114	51.8 ± 11.6 [27-74]; 100%	Breast cancer	2 N	Relaxation + Guided imagery vs. CBT	SRS	Positive ^A	Positive ^A	Sig. improvement in sleep difficulties after intervention (p<0.001) and at 6 month follow-up (p<0.01).
					Relaxation + Guided imagery vs. NTC		Positive ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	
Field 2013	75	26.6 ± 5.5; 100%	Prenatal depression	2 N	Yoga + Tai Chi vs. WL	SRS VAS	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in sleep compared to control (p=0.05)
Richards 1998	70	65.8 [55-79]; 0%	CVD pts in critical care units, Elderly	1 N	PMR + Guided imagery vs. UC	PSG	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference between groups.
					PMR + Guided imagery vs. Massage		Negative ^A	N/A	
Richardson 2003	36	58.4 ± 14.3; 53%	Critically ill	1 N	PMR + Relaxation Imagery vs. UC	VSH	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference between groups
Sendhikumar 2013	20	32.3 ± 9.911 [20-55]; 35%	Guillain-Barre syndrome	2 N	Pranayama Yoga + Meditation + UC vs. UC	PSQI	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in treatment group compared to control (p=0.048).
Sumter 2009	33	NR; 100%	Prison Inmates	2 N	Mindfulness - breath, mantra, walking, yoga vs. NTC	SRS	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in 1/2 outcomes compared to control at endpoint. No between group x time comparison given.

Sun 2013	75	69.7 ± 8.0; 75%	Elderly - community dwelling	1 Y	PMR + meditation + SHE vs. SHE	PSQI, ESS	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in sleep after intervention compared to control (p<0.001).
Toussaint 2012	21	48 [27-56]; 90%	Fibromyalgia	2 N	Amygdala training + UC vs. UC	ESS	Negative ^{NA}	N/a	No sig. differences between groups.
Yang 2010	79	49.6 ± 10.8 [22-71]; 31%	Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma	2 N	PMR + Guided imagery vs. Chinese calligraphy handwriting	SDS Modified	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in insomnia compared to calligraphy.
					PMR + Guided imagery vs. NTC		Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in insomnia compared to NTC
RELAXATION: PMR									
Bae 2012	24	23.5 ± 8.6; 44%	Atopic dermatitis	2 N	PMR + UC vs. UC	SRS (loss of sleep)	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Loss of sleep was sig. decreased with PMR (P = 0.007) (but not Control). Group x time data NR
Borkovec 1976	33	NR	Sleep disturbance in college students	1 Y	PMR vs. Placebo	PSG, SD	Mixed ^A	Positive ^A	Sig. improvement in sleep latency and PSG stage 1 sleep (p<0.05). No between group comparisons given. Sig. improvement in sleep latency at 1 year with intervention (p<0.01).
					PMR vs. WL		Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement within group for almost all PSG measurements (p<0.05). No between group comparisons given.
Cannici 1983	30	55.8 [21-80]; 63%	Cancer patients with insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs. UC	SD	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. difference between groups in 8/9 of SD outcomes measured.
Ducloux 2013	18	66 ± 10.7; 67%	Metastatic cancer	1 Y	PMR vs. WL	SRS	Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	No sig. between group difference regarding post-intervention sleep satisfaction scores.

Edinger 2001	70	54.5 ± 10.2; 44%	Insomnia, persistent	1 y	PMR vs. CBT and placebo desensitization	PSG, SD, SRS	Negative ^A	N/A	Active control sig. better than Mindbody group on objective measures. PMR was compared to both groups together in analysis and not separately to each group.
Engle-Friedman 1992	NR	60.26; NR	Insomnia, Elderly	1 Y	PMR + Support + SHE vs. Support + SHE	PSG, SD	Negative ^A	NR	No sig. difference between the treatment and active controls. All showed some improvement.
					PMR + Support + SHE vs. Support + SHE + Stimulus control		Negative ^A	NR	
					PMR + Support + SHE vs. NTC		Positive ^{NA}	NR	
Espie 1989	70	48.1 ± 10.6; 50%	Insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs. Stimulus control	SRS	Positive ^A	Negative ^A	Sig. improvement in all three of the active groups (p<0.001). PMR only intervention that showed improvement in both the rested measurement and sleep enjoyment measurement. No sig. improvement seen at 3, 6, and 17 mth follow-up.
					PMR vs. Paradoxical intention		Positive ^A	Negative ^A	
					PMR vs. Placebo desensitization		Positive ^A	Negative ^A	
Field 1999	26	29.5 ± 2.7; 100%	Pregnant	2 N	PMR vs. Massage	SRS	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. improvement in sleep with PMR.
Francis 2012	60	NR; 50%	Admitted in hospital ward	1 Y	PMR vs. NTC	PSQI	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in some of the PSQI subscales (P<0.05).
Freedman 1976*	18	[17-39]; 56%	Insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs Williams exercises	PSG	Negative ^A	Negative ^A	Sig. improvement in 1/5 of the PSG measurements reported at 2 weeks but not at 2 month follow-up.

Greeff 1998	22	45.5 ± 9.5; 0%	Chronic alcoholics with insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs. NTC	SRS Tworetzky	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in sleep quality with intervention vs control (p<0.001).
Ireland 1985	28	55.9 [28-76]; 53%	Tinnitus	2 N	PMR vs. WL	SD	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig. change in sleep onset.
Lacks 1983	64	40.6; 75%	Insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs. Stimulus control	SD	Negative ^A	N/A	Stimulus control sig. better than PMR
					PMR vs. Paradoxical intention		Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between PMR and paradoxical intention
					PMR vs. Placebo desensitization		Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between PMR and placebo desensitization
Lichstein 1999	30	52 [21-80]; 58%	Insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs. NTC	SD	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in 2/5 of the sleep outcomes measured.
Lick 1977	40	47.48 ± 10.88; [29-72]; 65%	Insomnia	1 Y	PMR; PMR+ tape vs. Placebo	SRS	Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement in 2/4 of the sleep outcomes with intervention compared to placebo (p<0.05)
					PMR; PMR + tape vs. NTC		Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in most of the sleep outcomes with intervention compared to NTC (p<0.05)
Nicassio 1982*	22	43.5 [17-64]; 78%	Insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs. NTC	SRS, SD	Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement with PMR versus no treatment controls (p <0.05).
Wang WH 2012	130	[30-68]; 18%	Obstructive sleep apnea	2 Y	PMR vs. UC	ESS, PSQI	Negative ^{NA}	N/A	No sig improvement with PMR alone compared to control.
					PMR + HE vs. UC		Positive ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement with PMR+ education compared to control with both outcomes (p<0.05).

					PMR vs. HE		Negative ^A	N/A	No sig improvement with PMR alone compared to HE.
					PMR + HE vs. HE		Positive ^A	N/A	Sig. improvement with PMR + HE compared to education only with both outcomes (p<0.05).
Waters 2003	53	46.3; 70%	Insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs. Medication	SD	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in 5/6 outcomes over time. Between group comparison was not reported.
					PMR vs. sleep restriction and stimulus				
					PMR vs. SHE				
Wilson 1982	64	38.8 [20-55]; 66%	Depression	2 N	PMR vs. Amitriptyline	SRS	Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between groups.
					PMR vs. Placebo		Negative ^A	N/A	No sig. difference between groups.
Woolfolk 1983*	44	43.3 [19-71]; 68%	Insomnia	1 Y	PMR vs. WL	SD	Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	No sig. differences in sleep outcomes post-intervention or at 24 week follow-up
RELAXATION: OTHER									
Giblin 1983	20	70.4 [56-80]; 90%	Insomniacs taking hypnotic meds for 6+ months	1 Y	Autogenic Relaxation vs. NTC	SRS	Negative ^{NA}	NFU	No sig. difference between groups.
Gustavsson 2006	33	43; 100%	Musculoskeletal neck pain	2 N	Applied Relaxation vs. UC	SRS	Negative ^{NA}	Negative ^{NA}	No sig. difference between groups after intervention and no sig difference at 20 week follow-up.

Lindh-Astrand 2013	58	54.9 ± 5.5; 100%	Postmenopausal with hot flashes	2 N	Applied Relaxation vs. NTC	Women's Health Questionnaire	Positive ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	Sig. better improvement in sleep-related quality of life scores both after intervention (p<0.05) and at 3 mth follow-up (p<0.01).
Rambod 2013	83	49.9 ± 12.5; 36%	Hemodialysis	1 N	Benson vs. UC	PSQI	Mixed ^{NA}	N/A	Sig. improvement in 5/7 of the outcomes seen at the endpoints between groups (p<0.05). No between group over time comparisons given.
Rybarczyk 2002	41	67.8; 58%	Insomnia	1 Y	Home-based audio relaxation treatment vs. CBT	SRS	Negative ^A	Negative ^A	Only 1/6 outcomes were sig. improved from control. No sig. at 4 mth follow-up.
					Home-based audio relaxation treatment vs. WL		Positive ^{NA}	Positive ^{NA}	Sig. improvement in 2/6 outcomes compared to control (p<0.05) immediately after treatment and in 3/6 outcomes at 4 mth follow-up.
AG: actigraphy; CBT: cognitive behavioral therapy; EEG: electroencephalography; EMG: electromyography; EORTC: European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer; ESS: Epworth Sleepiness Scale; GHQ: general health questionnaire; GI: guided imagery; GSDS: General Sleep Disturbance Scale; HE: health education; HRSD: Hamilton Psychiatric Rating Scale for Depression; HRV: Heart rate variability; HT: hypnotherapy; ISI: Insomnia Severity Index; MBCT: Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy; MBSR: Mindfulness Based Stress Reduction; MOS-SS: Medical Outcomes Study Sleep Scale; NTC: No treatment control; PE: physical exercise; PMR: progressive muscle relaxation; PSG: Polysomnography; PSQI: Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index; PTSD: posttraumatic stress disorder; SBQ: Sleep Behavior Questionnaire; SD: sleep diary; SDS: symptom distress scale; SHE: sleep hygiene education; SMR: sensorimotor rhythm; SRS: self-reported scale; UC: usual care; VAS: visual analog scale; VSSQQ: Visual Subjective Sleep Quality Questionnaire; WHIIRS: Women's Health Initiative Insomnia Rating Scale; WL: waitlist									
*The studies were classified as positive if >25% of measured sleep items had p value <0.05 compared to control group, mixed if close to 25% of measured items were positive; OR both intervention and control group improved but were not significantly different from each other OR intervention improved and not control but no reported direct comparison), or negative if <25% of measured items had p value <0.05 compared to the control group).									
A = active control comparison NA = non-active control comparison									