

Table I - Characteristics of the studies.

Author	Sport	Study type	Sample	Data sources	Influence of oral health in physical performance
Oliveira RS <i>et al.</i> , 2007 [10]	Canoeing Handball	Cross-sectional	Canoeing: n=17 Handball: n=20	Structured questionnaire	Canoeing 33.33% Handball 87.5%
Gay-Scoda C <i>et al.</i> , 2011 [11]	Football	Cross-sectional	n=30	Clinical examination and interviews	Plaque index (p=0.022) showed statistically significant correlation with intrinsic injuries, and with Gingival Index showed statistically significant correlations (p=0.022 and p=0.032) to muscle injuries
Souza BC <i>et al.</i> , 2012 [12]	Soccer	Longitudinal Observational	n=15	Clinical evaluation	Showed correlation between periodontal inflammation and serum level of creatinin kinase
Needleman I <i>et al.</i> , 2013 [13]	Athletes from London 2012 Olympic Games	Cross-sectional	n=278	Clinical evaluation and Questionnaire	18%
Nascimento BL <i>et al.</i> , 2015 [14]	Triathlon	Cross-sectional	n=254	Structured questionnaire	38.6%
Solleved H <i>et al.</i> , 2015 [15]	Soccer	Cross-sectional	n=215	Structured questionnaire	When there were two or more types of oral health problems there were higher odds of having repeated exercise associated muscle cramps, muscle or tendon reinjury and multiple types of reinjury (odds ratio ranging from 2.48 to 3.40)
Alshail F <i>et al.</i> , 2016 [16]	Soccer	Cross-sectional	n=27	Clinical evaluation and Structured questionnaire	Increased bleeding on probing and probing pocket depth were associated with increased serum creatin kinase levels in young soccer players (p<0.01)
Chantaramane A <i>et al.</i> , 2016 [17]	Soccer	Cross-sectional	n=25	Clinical evaluation and Questionnaire	18%
Needleman I <i>et al.</i> , 2016 [18]	Football	Cross-sectional	n=187	Clinical evaluation and Questionnaire	6.9%
Alves, DCB <i>et al.</i> , 2017 [19]	Soccer Basketball	Cross-sectional	Soccer: n=42 Basketball: n=40	Semi-structured questionnaire	Soccer: 73.8% Basketball: 40%
Gallagher J, 2018 [8]	UK elite athletes from different sports	Cross-sectional	n=352	Clinical evaluation and Questionnaire	32.0%

Table II - Compliance of the studies included in the qualitative analysis with the method domain of the Strobe guidelines.

Method Domain	Oliveira, RS et al., 2007	Gay-Scoda C et al., 2011	Souza BC et al., 2012	Needleman I et al., 2013	Nascimento BL et al., 2015	Solleved H et al., 2015	Alshail F et al., 2016	Chantarama nee A et al., 2016	Needleman I et al., 2016	Alves, DCB et al., 2017	Gallagher J, 2018	Galvão, AM et al., 2018
Study design	-	+	+	+	-	-	+	+	+	+	+	+-
Setting	-	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	-	-
Participants	-	-	+	+	-	+-	-	-	+	-	+	-
Variables	-	+	+	+-	+-	+	+	+	+-	+	+	-
Data sources/ measurement	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
Bias	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-
Study size	-	-	+	+	-	+-	-	-	+	-	+	-
Quantitative variables	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	+	-	+	+	-
Statistical methods	-	+	+	+	-	+	+-	+	+	-	+	-
TOTAL (%)	0%	67%	100%	94%	17%	78%	50%	56%	72%	44%	78%	6%

Table III - Compliance of the studies included in the qualitative analysis with the result domain of the Strobe guidelines.

Result Domain	Oliveira, RS <i>et al.</i> , 2007	Gay-Scoda C <i>et al.</i> , 2011	Souza BC <i>et al.</i> , 2012	Needleman I <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Nascimento BL <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Solleved H <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Alshail F <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Chantaram anee A <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Needleman I <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Alves DCB <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Gallagher J, 2018	Galvão, AM <i>et al.</i> , 2018
Participants	+	-	+-	+	-	+	-	+-	+	-	+	-
Descriptive data	+-	-	+-	+-	+-	+-	+-	+-	+	+-	+	+-
Outcome data	+	+	+	+	+-	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Main results	-	-	-	+-	-	-	-	-	+-	+-	+-	-
TOTAL (%)	63%	25%	50%	75%	25%	63%	38%	50%	88%	50%	88%	38%

Table IV - Quality assessment tool for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Quality assessment tool for observational cohort and cross-sectional studies	Oliveira, RS <i>et al.</i> , 2007	Gay-Scoda C <i>et al.</i> , 2011	Souza BC <i>et al.</i> , 2012	Needleman I <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Nascimento BL <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Solleved H <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Alshail F <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Chantaraman ee A <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Needleman I <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Alves, DCB <i>et al.</i> , 2017	Gallagher J, 2018	Galvão, AM <i>et al.</i> , 2018
1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	Yes	NR	NR	Yes	NR	Yes	NR
4. Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	Yes	NR	Yes	Yes	NR	Yes	NR	NR	NR	NR	Yes	NR
5. Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
11. Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
14. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No
TOTAL (%)	57%	29%	57%	57%	29%	71%	29%	43%	57%	57%	71%	29%

Table V - Newcastle-Ottawa Scale or assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies.

Newcastle-Ottawa Scale		Oliveira RS <i>et al.</i> , 2007	Gay- Scoda C <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2011	Souza BC <i>et al.</i> , 2012	Needlema n I <i>et al.</i> , 2013	Nasciment o BL <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Solleved H <i>et al.</i> , 2015	Alshail F <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Chantaram anee A <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2016	Needlema n I <i>et al.</i> , 2016	Alves, DCB <i>et</i> <i>al.</i> , 2017	Gallagher J, 2018	Galvão, AM <i>et al.</i> , 2018
Selection	Representative	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
	Homogeneity	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
	Exposure	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Outcome	Assessment	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1
Total (%)		50%	50%	75%	50%	25%	75%	50%	50%	75%	25%	100%	50%