Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance
placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

Br J Sports Med

Supplementary Table 4. Risk of bias of included cross-sectional studies.

Study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Overall score
Brito, 2021	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	4
Cafiero, 2021	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	4
Çelik 2021	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	5
Lopes, 2021	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	4
Martinez, 2021	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	3
Milovancev, 2021	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	4
Schwellnus, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	4

Y, yes; N, no; N/A, not applicable. Total score: 8.

1. Were the criteria for inclusion in the sample clearly defined?
2. Were the study subjects and the setting described in detail?
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?
4. Were objective, standard criteria used for measurement of the condition?
5. Were confounding factors identified?
6. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?
8. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance
placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

Br J Sports Med

Supplementary Table 5. Risk of bias of included case control studies.

Study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Overall score
Anastasio, 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	9
Babszky, 2021	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	5
Costello, 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	8
Gervasi, 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	8
Teran, 2020	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	7

Y, yes; N, no; N/A, not applicable. Total score: 10.

1. Were the groups comparable other than the presence of disease in cases or the absence of disease in controls?
2. Were cases and controls matched appropriately?
3. Were the same criteria used for identification of cases and controls?
4. Was exposure measured in a standard, valid and reliable way?
5. Was exposure measured in the same way for cases and controls?
6. Were confounding factors identified?
7. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?
8. Were outcomes assessed in a standard, valid and reliable way for cases and controls?
9. Was the exposure period of interest long enough to be meaningful?
10. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?

Supplementary Table 6. Risk of bias of included case-series studies.

Study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Overall score
Hwang, 2021	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	6
Kuitunen, 2021	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	3
Starekova, 2021	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	8

Y, yes; N, no; N/A, not applicable. Total score: 10.

1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?
2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series?
3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?
4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants?
5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants?
6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study?
7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?
8. Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported?
9. Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information?
10. Was statistical analysis appropriate?

Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

Br J Sports Med

Supplementary Table 7. Risk of bias of included cohort studies.

Study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Overall score
Andrianova, 2021	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N/A	N	3
Atherstone, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	8
Cavigli, 2021	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	3
Clark, 2021	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	4
Csulak, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	8
Daniels, 2021	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	5
Egger, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N/A	N	6
Erickson, 2021	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	4
Fikenzer, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	7
Gualano, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	7
Hendrickson, 2021	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	5
Hull, 2021	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N/A	Y	5
Jones, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N	6
Komici, 2021	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	N	6
Krzywański, 2022	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N/A	Y	4
Mascia, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	7
Meyer, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	5
Moulson, 2021	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	7
Pedersen, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	5
Peidro, 2021	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N	4
Petek 2021	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N	5
Rajpal, 2021	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N	4
Robinson, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	5
Schreiber, 2021	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	Y	6
Schumacher, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N	7
Shah, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N/A	N	6
Spinicci, 2021	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	5
Vago, 2021	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N/A	Y	4

Y, yes; N, no; N/A, not applicable. Total score: 11.

1. Were the two groups similar and recruited from the same population?

Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance
placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

Br J Sports Med

2. Were the exposures measured similarly to assign people to both exposed and unexposed groups?
3. Was the exposure measured in a valid and reliable way?
4. Were confounding factors identified?
5. Were strategies to deal with confounding factors stated?
6. Were the groups/participants free of the outcome at the start of the study (or at the moment of exposure)?
7. Were the outcomes measured in a valid and reliable way?
8. Was the follow up time reported and sufficient to be long enough for outcomes to occur?
9. Was follow up complete, and if not, were the reasons to loss to follow up described and explored?
10. Were strategies to address incomplete follow up utilized?
11. Was appropriate statistical analysis used?