

Appendix A: Search strategy

Key terms and the combination of the search strategy to identify existing literature.

KEY TERM 1	AND	KEY TERM 2	KEY TERM 3	KEY TERM 4
		AND	AND	
Military OR Special Forces OR Special Operations		Musculoskeletal OR non-battle related	Injury OR injuries	Epidemiology OR surveillance OR incidence

PubMed search strategy results

1. Special Forces OR Special Operations OR Military (222830)
2. Musculoskeletal OR non-battle related (87048)
3. Injury OR injuries (148332)
4. Epidemiology OR Surveillance OR Incidence (2966474)
5. #1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4
= 408 articles

Appendix B: Risk of Bias Tool

Three issues of the risk of bias tool were identified.

1. The purpose of item one of the RoB tool is to determine the external validity of the study by whether the study's sample population is representative of the national population. This item was deemed redundant in the instance of this systematic review as the purpose of this study is to investigate SOF, which is a highly specialised population and not representative of the national population.
2. There is no item in the RoB tool to clarify whether the objective of the study was clearly described. This is important to establish as studies that do not clearly describe their objective in the introduction may be appraised with selective reporting of outcomes and subsequent subjective reporting bias.
3. The tool only offers a yes or no outcome for each item which in some instances may not always be appropriate or clear. For example, part of an item could be addressed but not in full.

The authors discussed these issues, and a collaborative decision was made to modify the RoB tool. Modifications were done by substituting item one with another question clarifying whether the objective of the study was clearly stated. Additionally, an option of 'partially' was added as an outcome for each item.

Appendix B: Risk of bias tool continued**Original Risk of Bias Tool**

Items		
1. Was the study's target population a close representation of the national population in relation to relevant variables?	Yes	No
2. Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population?	Yes	No
3. Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR was a census undertaken?	Yes	No
4. Was the likelihood of nonresponse bias minimal?	Yes	No
5. Were data collected directly from the subjects?	Yes	No
6. Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?	Yes	No
7. Was the study instrument that measured valid and reliable?	Yes	No
8. Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?	Yes	No
9. Was the length of the shortest prevalence period for the parameter of interest appropriate?	Yes	No
10. Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the parameter of interest appropriate?	Yes	No
11. Summary item on the overall risk of study bias.		

Modified Risk of Bias Tool

Items		
1. Was the purpose of the study clearly defined in the abstract and introduction? *	Yes	No
2. Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population?	Yes	No
3. Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR was a census undertaken?	Yes	No
4. Was the likelihood of nonresponse bias minimal?	Yes	No
5. Were data collected directly from the subjects?	Yes	No
6. Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?	Yes	No
7. Was the study instrument that measured valid and reliable?	Yes	No
8. Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?	Yes	No
9. Was the length of the shortest prevalence period for the parameter of interest appropriate?	Yes	No
10. Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the parameter of interest appropriate?	Yes	No
11. Summary item on the overall risk of study bias.	Yes	No

*This is a comparison of the original Risk of Bias Tool with the modified Risk of Bias Tool. Question one has been substituted with a different question that was deemed more relevant to assess the risk of bias within the proposed studies.