



t: time in months

<sup>a</sup> Prevention programme was administered at the organisational and managerial levels

<sup>b</sup> Loss to follow-up of only at employee level

° Organisations declined to participate in the 24-month follow-up survey due to the COVID-19 pandemic

#### **Baseline characteristics**

Table 1. Descriptive statistics among managers at baseline (	(n=456)
<b>Table 1.</b> Descriptive statistics among managers at basenne (	(n 30)

Variables, n (%)	Control group (n=154)	р	Intervention group (n=302)		
Gender <sup>a</sup>					
Male	74 (48.1)	0.079	207 (68.5)		
Female	50 (32.5)		95 (31.5)		
Age <sup>a</sup>					
$\leq$ 34 years	23 (14.9)	0.177	57 (18.9)		
35-44 years	67 (43.5)		97 (32.1)		
45-54 years	43 (27.9)		105 (34.8)		
$\geq$ 55 years	19 (12.3)		39 (12.6)		
Educational level <sup>a</sup>			· · · ·		
Primary/upper secondary education	59 (38.3)	0.128	145 (48.0)		
Tertiary education	91 (59.1)		150 (49.7)		
Managerial responsibility for number of employees <sup>a</sup>					
General administrative management	6 (3.9)	0.000	61 (20.2)		
1-10 employees	49 (31.8)		85 (28.1)		
11-20 employees	28 (18.2)		47 (15.6)		
21-50 employees	15 (9.7)		53 (17.5)		
> 50 employees	51 (33.1)		50 (16.6)		
Years in current position <sup>a</sup>					
< 1 year	35 (22.7)	0.010	42 (13.9)		
1-4 years	70 (45.5)		121 (40.0)		
$\geq$ 5 years	46 (29.8)		134 (44.4)		
Self-reported health <sup>a</sup>					
Less than good	25 (16.2)	0.425	51 (16.9)		
Good	80 (51.9)		170 (56.3)		
Very good	48 (31.2)		76 (25.2)		
AUDIT score <sup>b</sup> , mean (s.d)	4.87 (2.99)	0.556	4.69 (2.79)		

s.d.: standard deviation. p: p-value

<sup>a</sup>Differences between the control and the intervention group was calculated using Pearson's chi-square test for categorical variables

<sup>b</sup>Differences between the control and the intervention group was calculated using one-way ANOVA for continuous variable

\*\*The total number of respondents in each column did not equate to the total number of participants in either the control or the intervention group due to internal missing values or invalid values.

 Table 2. Descriptive statistics among employees at baseline (n=2252)

Variables, n (%)	Control group (n=1406)	р	Intervention group (n=846)		
Gender <sup>a</sup>	(11 1100)		(1 010)		
Male	776 (55.2)	0.174	439 (51.9)		
Female	601 (42.7)		396 (46.8)		
Age <sup>a</sup>					
16-24 years	132 (9.4)	0.107	58 (6.9)		
25-34 years	349 (24.8)		227 (26.8)		
35-44 years	369 (26.2)		229 (27.1)		
45-54 years	309 (22.0)		207 (24.5)		
$\geq$ 55 years	222 (15.8)		117 (13.8)		
Educational level <sup>a</sup>					
Primary education	70 (5.0)	0.241	55 (6.5)		
Upper secondary education	756 (53.8)		427 (50.5)		
Tertiary education	544 (38.7)		348 (41.1)		
Self-reported health <sup>a</sup>					
Less than good	243 (17.3)	0.923	145 (17.1)		
Good	489 (34.8)		468 (55.3)		
Very good	356 (25.3)		220 (26.0)		
AUDIT score <sup>b</sup> , mean (s.d)	4.78 (3.41)	0.807	4.82 (3.50)		

s.d.: standard deviation. p: p-value

<sup>a</sup>Differences between the control and the intervention group was calculated using Pearson's chi-square test for categorical variables

<sup>b</sup>Differences between the control and the intervention group was calculated using one-way ANOVA for continuous variable

\*\*The total number of respondents in each column did not equate to the total number of participants in either the control or the intervention group due to internal missing values or invalid values.

#### **Outcome measures**

**Table 3.** Primary outcome measure for managers (total: n=187; control: n=70; intervention: n=117)

Variables, n (%)	Baseline			12-months follow-up		
	Control group	р	Intervention group	Control group	р	Intervention group
Inclination to initiate early alcohol interventions						
Very low	0 (0.0)	0.368	1 (0.9)	0 (0.0)	0.230	0 (0.0)
Low	5 (7.1)		15 (12.9)	6 (0.9)		19 (16.2)
Medium	13 (18.6)		28 (24.1)	13 (18.6)		26 (22.2)
High	30 (42.9)		48 (41.4)	32 (45.7)		38 (32.5)
Very high	22 (31.4)		25 (21.6)	19 (27.1)		34 (29.1)
Organizational alcohol policy knowledge						
Very low	5 (7.1)	0.341	4 (3.4)	1 (1.4)	0.755	1 (0.9)
Low	3 (4.3)		6 (5.1)	2 (2.9)		5 (4.3)
Medium	16 (22.9)		17 (14.5)	5 (7.1)		14 (12.0)
High	23 (32.9)		38 (32.5)	26 (37.1)		35 (29.9)
Very high	23 (32.9)		52 (44.4)	36 (51.4)		62 (53.0)
Initiated a dialogue with an employee the past 12 months						
No	53 (75.7)	0.738	86 (74.1)	56 (80.0)	0.623	90 (76.9)
Yes	17 (24.3)		30 (23.9)	14 (20.0)		27 (23.1)

### p: p-values

Differences between the control and the intervention group were calculated using Pearson's chi-square test for categorical variables

### **Table 4.** Primary outcome measures for employees (total: n=853; control: n=586; intervention: n=267)

	Baseline			12-month follow-up		
Variables, n (%)	<b>Control group</b>	р	Intervention group	Control group	р	Intervention group
Self-perceived organisational support to oneself						
Strongly disagree	40 (6.8)	0.000	9 (3.4)	36 (6.1)	0.000	7 (2.6)
Disagree	82 (14.0)		18 (6.7)	67 (11.4)		15 (5.6)
Neither agree nor disagree	164 (28.0)		56 (21.0)	167 (28.5)		51 (19.1)
Agree	159 (27.1)		102 (38.2)	179 (30.6)		99 (37.1)
Strongly agree	141 (24.1)		82 (30.7)	137 (23.4)		95 (35.6)
Self-perceived organisational support to colleague(s)						
Strongly disagree	36 (6.1)	0.000	10 (3.8)	37 (6.3)	0.000	6 (2.3)
Disagree	81 (13.8)		17 (6.4)	66 (11.3)		19 (7.1)
Neither agree nor disagree	169 (28.8)		55 (20.6)	170 (29.0)		50 (18.7)
Agree	169 (28.8)		107 (40.1)	183 (31.2)		103 (38.6)
Strongly agree	131 (22.3)		78 (29.2)	130 (22.2)		89 (33.3)
Organisational alcohol policy knowledge						
Very poorly	139 (23.7)	0.003	34 (12.7)	88 (15.0)	0.427	31 (11.6)
Poorly	92 (15.7)		38 (14.2)	69 (11.8)		25 (9.4)
Neither poorly nor well	105 (17.9)		59 (22.1)	123 (21.0)		62 (23.2)
Well	134 (22.9)		78 (29.2)	162 (27.7)		84 (31.5)
Very well	116 (19.8)		58 (21.7)	144 (24.6)		65 (24.3)
Alcohol consumption						· · · · ·
Abstainers and low-risk consumption	484 (82.6)	0.640	217 (81.3)	485 (82.8)	0.585	225 (84.3)
Hazardous consumption	102 (17.4)		50 (18.7)	101 (17.2)		42 (15.7)

p: p-values

Differences between the control and the intervention group were calculated using Pearson's chi-square test for categorical variables

# Adverse effects

There are no adverse events associated with this trial.