

Supplementary Appendix S6. Newcastle Ottawa Scale Quality assessment of included studies										
Study	Criteria for assessing risk of bias								Total	Quality
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Blokland et al., 2016[18]	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	7	High
Engström et al., 1991[19]	*	*		*		*	*	*	6	Moderate
Faude et al., 2005[20]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		7	High
Gaulrapp et al., 2010[21]	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	7	High
Giza et al., 2005[22]	*	*	*			*	*	*	6	Moderate
Hägglund et al., 2009[23]	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	7	High
Jacobson & Tegner, 2007[24]	*	*	*			*	*		5	Moderate
Junge & Dvorak, 2007[28]	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	7	High
Larruskain et al., 2017[25]	*	*		*		*	*	*	6	Moderate
Östenberg & Roos, 2000[26]		*		*	*	*	*	*	6	Moderate
Tegnander et al., 2008[27]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	8	High
Waldén et al., 2007[23]	*	*	*	*		*	*	*	7	High
<p>Criteria for assessing risk of bias: (1) description or type of football players; (2) definition of injury; (3) representativeness of the exposed cohort; (4) ascertainment of exposure; (5) demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study; (6) assessment of outcome; (7) was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur (e.g. minimum of one complete season); (8) adequacy of follow-up of cohorts / loss of participants to follow-up)</p> <p>Eight stars could be awarded for a given study and were categorized into low quality “≤ 3 stars”, moderate quality “≥4 - ≤ 6 stars”, and high quality studies “≥ 7 stars”[10]</p> <p>*Star(s) awarded for each criterion.</p>										