

## Risk of bias assessment

Study	Item 1: Study setting and study period	Item 2: Eligibility criteria and player selection	Item 3: Exposure definition and measurement	Item 4: Injury definition, measurement and reporting	Cumulative number of items with bias
Best <i>et al</i> , 2005 <sup>20</sup>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Bird <i>et al</i> , 1998 <sup>21</sup>	0	0	1	1	<b>2</b>
Brooks <i>et al</i> , 2005 <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Brooks <i>et al</i> , 2005 <sup>22</sup>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Brooks <i>et al</i> , 2005 <sup>23</sup>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Fuller <i>et al</i> , 2008 <sup>24</sup>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Fuller <i>et al</i> , 2009 <sup>25</sup>	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
Fuller & Molloy, 2011 <sup>26</sup>	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
Fuller <i>et al</i> , 2013 <sup>27</sup>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Jakoet & Noakes 1998 <sup>28</sup>	0	0	0	1	<b>1</b>
Kerr (2008) <sup>29</sup>	0	1	1	0	<b>2</b>
Schwellnus <i>et al</i> , 2014 <sup>30</sup>	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>

The four items were adapted from Walden *et al.*,<sup>17</sup> originally based on the “Strengthening the reporting of observational studies in epidemiology” (STROBE) statement<sup>18</sup>. Studies were assessed on each item for low risk (0) or high risk (1) of bias. High risk of bias could be caused by, but is not limited to, item 1: unclear reporting on the amateur or elite level of players, unclear reporting of number of seasons; item 2: large dropout (>25%) during study, unclear or biased selection of teams; item 3: approximate or unclear registration and calculation of exposure hours; item 4: unclear (skin) injury definition, retrospective reporting of injuries (e.g. telephone interviews). Studies with a cumulative score of 0 were defined as low risk of bias, studies with a score of 1-2 were defined as a medium risk of bias and studies with a score >3 were defined as high risk of bias.