

## Supplement 5 Additional analysis Runfitcheck

### Data analysis

In sub analysis only the group of runners who reported no injury at baseline was selected. Survival analysis Cox regression was used to assess the differences in time to new RRI between the three groups. Significance and the Wald statistic is reported, when significant the Hazard Ratio will be reported. Generalised estimating equations (GEE) was used to gain insight in the difference in the chance of the occurrence of a new RRI and the development of the severity score between the three groups. Furthermore, GEE was used to see if there were changes over time (the monitor period) in the occurrence of new RRIs and/or the severity score, and whether these differed between groups. Lastly, survival analysis Cox regression and GEE were used to see whether visiting the Runfitcheck had any effect on the chance of the occurrence of new RRI's. In this analysis the six participants from the control group that visited the Runfitcheck, and were excluded from other analysis, were included in the group that visited the Runfitcheck. The GEE accounts for the correlation of repeated outcome measures within subjects over time. All statistical analysis was performed using IBM SPSS (version 25) and significance was accepted at  $p < 0.05$ .

### Results

At the start of the monitor period, 55 percent of participants had no injury ( $n=405$ ). In a subanalysis, only these participants were included. The number of participants with no injury at the start of the study did not differ between the groups, see table 1 in the main document. The sub analyses showed no difference in the chance of RRI occurrence and severity score between the three groups (Table 1).

Table 1: Effect of Runfitcheck on running-related injuries using generalised estimating equations; participants with no injury at T0.

Group	RRI			Severity score		
	Beta	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p	Beta	Wald Chi-Square	p
Control (n=127)	reference			reference		
RFC-o (n=140)	0.283	1.33 (0.84 - 2.09)	0.221	1.703	2.751	0.097
RFC-a (n=138)	0.016	1.02 (0.63-1.63)	0.948	0.889	0.700	0.403

### Use of Runfitcheck

Within the four months of monitoring, 15 percent in the RFC-o group and 29 percent in the RFC-a group had visited the online intervention (Table 2). Even in the RFC-a, group only 16 percent had visited the Runfitcheck once in total and even fewer participants had visited the Runfitcheck more often.

Table 2: Use of the Runfitcheck

	RFC-a (n=122)		RFC-o (n=133)		Control (n=108)	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Heard of the RFC **						
Yes					6	6
No					102	94
Visited the RFC						
Yes	35	29	20	15	-	-
No	87	71	113	85	108	100
Frequency usage						
Not	87	71	113	85	108	100
One time	19	16	11	8		
Once a month	10	8	6	5		
Once every 2 months	4	3	2	2		
Once a week	1	1	1	1		
Multiple times a week	1	1	-	-		

\*n is the number of participants that replied to this questionnaire

\*\*This question was only for the control group

Cox Regression showed no difference in time to the first RRI (Wald Chi-Square 1.333,  $p=0.248$ )

between the group that visited the Runfitcheck and the group that did not visit the Runfitcheck.

The results for the GEE analyses, in which the group that visited the Runfitcheck ( $n=61$ ) was

compared with the group of runners that did not visit the Runfitcheck ( $n = 322$ ) are shown in Table 3.

There was no difference between the two groups in the chance of a new RRI nor in the severity score (Table 3).

Table 3: Effect of visiting the Runfitcheck on running-related injuries using generalised estimating equations

Group	RRI			Severity score		
	Beta	Odds ratio (95% CI)	p	Beta	Wald Chi-Square	p
RFC visited	reference			reference		
RFC not visited	-0.195	0.82 (0.55 - 1.24)	0.354	-2.009	1.425	0.233