

1 **Motivators and Barriers to Mouthguard Compliance by Adult Gaelic Football Athletes**

2

3 Investigation performed at Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland

4

5 Aoife Burke<sup>1,2</sup> & (<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1234-8840>), Niall O'Connor<sup>2</sup> & Niall Duffy<sup>2</sup> & Katie

6 Holohan<sup>2</sup> & Enda F Whyte<sup>1,2</sup> & (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9458-9498>) and Siobhán O'Connor<sup>1,2</sup> &

7 (<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2001-0746>).

8

9 <sup>1</sup> Centre for Injury Prevention and Performance, Athletic Therapy and Training, Dublin City

10 University, Dublin, Ireland

11 <sup>2</sup> School of Health and Human Performance, Dublin City University, Dublin, Ireland

12

13 Corresponding Author:

14 Aoife Burke

15 Address: XG08, Lonsdale Building, Dublin City University, Glasnevin Campus, Dublin 9, Ireland.

16 Telephone: +353 1 7006370

17 Email : [aoife.burke@dcu.ie](mailto:aoife.burke@dcu.ie)

18

19

20 & These authors contributed equally to the work.

21 **Abstract**

22

23 **Introduction**

24

25 Dental injuries contribute to 57% of reported maxillofacial injuries in Gaelic Football, with associated  
26 psychological and economic impacts on the affected athletes. Mouthguards have been developed in  
27 efforts to mitigate the incidence and severity of dental injuries, and use is mandatory in Gaelic  
28 Football. Dental claims have reduced by over 50% since mouthguards became mandatory, but costs  
29 of dental injuries are still prevalent. The aim of this study was to determine the mouthguard  
30 compliance rates in adult Gaelic Football players, as well as the motivations and barriers to  
31 compliance.

32

33 **Methods**

34

35 This cross-sectional study utilised an online survey to determine the self-reported compliance of  
36 adult Gaelic Footballers with mouthguard use, the perceived peer compliance, and the motivations  
37 and barriers to compliance. Chi-square tests were used to examine differences between sex and  
38 between elite and sub-elite players.

39

40 **Results**

41

42 A total of 545 Gaelic Footballers completed the survey. During training, 22% of players reported to  
43 always wear a mouthguard, with 48% never wearing it, and 30% occasionally wearing it. For games,  
44 48% of players reported to wear a mouthguard, with 11% never wearing it and 41% occasionally  
45 wearing it. Motivating factors included teeth protection, gum protection and the rules of the game.  
46 The main barriers were discomfort, difficulty breathing and difficulty speaking. Females had  
47 significantly poorer compliance in training, but had significantly better compliance in games when  
48 compared to males.

49

50 **Conclusion**

51

52 Mouthguard compliance is relatively poor amongst adult Gaelic Football players. Although  
53 compliance improves for games compared to training, there are still 1 in 2 players not wearing a  
54 mouthguard for games. Discomfort and challenges with breathing and speaking suggest that players  
55 may benefit from having a custom-fit mouthguard. Coaches, refereeing officials and governing  
56 bodies should strive to implement the rules more often and improve education around the benefits  
57 of mouthguard use within the sport.

58

59 **Keywords**

60 Mouthguard; Dental injury; Gaelic Games, Gumshield

61

## 62 Introduction

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

Gaelic Football is a high-intensity, high-velocity, multidirectional field sport that requires strength, speed and endurance [1]. Although Gaelic Football is an amateur sport, the physical demands exerted by the athletes are similar to those of professional soccer players [2], especially those who compete at an elite inter-county level [3]. Rules of the ladies game do not permit deliberate bodily contact between players, but males are permitted to use their bodies to confront opponents, when efforts are being made to dispossess the ball [4,5]. Due to the physical nature of the game, there is a high incidence of injury within the sport, with rates of 5.8 injuries per 1000 hours observed in males [6], and 7.9 injuries per 1000 hours in ladies Gaelic Footballers [1]. In 2021, maxillofacial injuries accounted for 5% of all adult male Gaelic Football injuries, with injuries to the teeth specifically contributing to 57% of these maxillofacial injuries [7]. While dental injury claims are lower in ladies Gaelic Football compared with males [7,8], exact figures on incidence rates in ladies Gaelic Football have not yet been published. Injuries to the teeth can be distressing with associated social, psychological and economic impacts on the affected athletes [9,10]. The management of these injuries can extend across an athlete's lifetime, with functional and aesthetic impairments associated with poor oral health-related quality of life outcomes in those affected by traumatic dental injuries [11].

Mouthguards have been introduced to sports in efforts to mitigate the incidence and severity of dental injuries [12]. Mouthguards increase the surface area over which the impact to the mouth is applied, acting to distribute the forces more widely and reducing the stress acting on one tooth alone [13]. A meta-analysis confirmed the protective effect of mouthguards, where the risk of traumatic dental injuries was 1.6 to 1.9 times greater when a mouthguard was not worn [14]. Not surprisingly, the Gaelic Games Association (GAA) introduced a rule in 2014, making mouthguard use mandatory for players of all grades in all male Gaelic Football games and training sessions. The Ladies Gaelic Football Association (LGFA) introduced the same rule into the ladies game in 2017. The introduction of this rule has observed a drop of 52% in the cost of dental injury claims in ladies Gaelic Footballers made via the LGFA injury fund, when compared to the three years prior to mandatory ruling of mouthguards in the game [15]. However, if dental claims are to be further reduced, it is important to determine the compliance rates of Gaelic Football participants in mouthguard use. With a mean cost of €968.54 per dental injury claim observed in a recent ladies Gaelic Football study [15], it is in the best interests of the GAA and LGFA to determine how compliance can be improved through the sport. A study looking at the compliance of children across a range of community sports, found 34% of participants wear a mouthguard voluntarily, but that compliance increased to 66% where a policy for mouthguard use existed [9]. This highlights the influence of protective equipment rules in sport. Nevertheless, the current compliance of mouthguard use in adult Gaelic Footballers has not yet been studied.

Across other team sports where mouthguard use is mandatory, compliance amongst adults has been found to be greatest in field hockey players (88-91%) [16,17], with lower rates observed in rugby players (54-68%) [18,19], and in ice hockey players (13-63%) [20,21]. Upon observation, compliance in elite sports has appeared greater within elite athletes (69%) [18] compared to sub-elite athletes (54%) [22], but no studies to our knowledge have assessed differences between elite and sub-elite athletes. In order to improve compliance, it is pertinent to understand the motivations and barriers to mouthguard use. Although research has demonstrated a good understanding for mouthguard efficacy amongst athletes, this does not necessarily translate into sound compliance, with athlete behaviour often being influenced by peers [12]. Furthermore, the existing studies looking at mouthguard compliance in sport have often been self-reported, with little focus given to how peers perceive compliance amongst team-mates. This is important to consider as it may help to inform whether compliance may be affected by a greater peer culture within the game. Known barriers to mouthguard use across sports include discomfort [18], impedance with communication,

113 challenges with breathing, and cost [23]. Therefore, the primary aim of this study is to determine the  
114 current compliance rates of, motivations and barriers to, mouthguard use in adult male and ladies  
115 Gaelic footballers. It is hypothesized that Gaelic Footballers will have poor compliance of  
116 mouthguard use in training, with greater compliance in games where rules are enforced. A  
117 secondary aim is to examine whether compliance rates, motivations and barriers differ between  
118 male and female players, and between elite and sub-elite players. It is hypothesized that females  
119 may demonstrate better compliance than males, and elite athletes will demonstrate better  
120 compliance than sub-elite athletes.

121

## 122 **Methods**

### 123 *Study Design and Participants*

124

125 This cross-sectional study was designed in line with the Strengthening the Reporting of  
126 Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidelines (Supplementary Material 1). The School  
127 of Health and Human Performance Research Ethics Committee of Dublin City University, Dublin,  
128 Ireland gave ethical approval for this work (2021\_13\_AB\_PE). Written informed consent obtained  
129 from all participants prior to the commencement of the study. Current male and ladies adult Gaelic  
130 Footballers were recruited via emails sent to 160 local GAA club secretaries across the country  
131 (whose contact details could be sourced online), and via social media posts. Five clubs from each  
132 county (32 counties in total) were chosen at random to be contacted, so that geographic  
133 representation would be accounted for. Participants who no longer played Gaelic Football and those  
134 under the age of 18 were excluded from the study. Data was collected from the 29<sup>th</sup> of October 2021  
135 to the 17<sup>th</sup> of December 2021. An a priori sample size calculation for a medium effect in a chi-square  
136 test was conducted using G\*Power (Version 3.1). A minimum sample of 172 responses would be  
137 required to find a significant effect. A total of 568 athletes completed the survey. Responses were  
138 screened for completeness, and any responses with less than 100% of completion were removed  
139 from the analysis. Following removal of incomplete responses, the final sample consisted of 545  
140 athletes. Elite Gaelic Footballers consisted of those competing at inter-county level, while sub-elite  
141 consisted of those competing at club or collegiate level [24].

142

143 An online survey (Google Forms, Google, California, USA) (Supplementary Material 2) was  
144 adapted to a Gaelic Football audience based on previously published literature [25]. The survey  
145 consisted of three sections. The first section captured details on the athlete demographics (age, sex,  
146 level of competition they are currently playing at, and the number of years playing Gaelic Football).  
147 The second section focused on self-reported mouthguard compliance, and perceived compliance of  
148 peers or teammates. The final section gathered information on the motivations and barriers for  
149 mouthguard compliance, and the perceived function of a mouthguard. A pilot of the survey was  
150 conducted with 6 research experts in the field of qualitative data for feedback, before being trialled  
151 on a group of recreational athletes (n = 10).

152

### 153 *Statistical Analysis*

154

155 Data analysis was performed in Excel Version 2202 (Microsoft Corporation Washington,  
156 USA) and SPSS Version 27 (IBM, Chicago, Illinois, USA). Frequency statistics were employed for  
157 assessing the compliance of mouthguard use in male and female Gaelic Footballers (during training  
158 and matches), and for exploring the motivations and barriers to mouthguard use.

159

160 Pearson Chi square ( $\chi^2$ ) tests were used to examine the differences between male and  
161 female athletes, as well as examining the differences between elite and sub-elite athletes in  
162 mouthguard compliance, and the motivations and barriers to mouthguard use. A p-value of <0.05

163 indicated statistical significance and effect sizes were defined using the Phi ( $\Phi$ ) coefficient (small =  
164 0.1, moderate = 0.3, large = 0.5) [26].

165

166

## 167 **Results**

168

169 Five hundred and forty-five athletes completed the survey (367 males, 178 females).  
170 Participant demographics such as level of play, age and number of years playing Gaelic Football are  
171 presented in Table 1. No significant differences were observed for age or years playing between  
172 sexes.

173

174 With regards to self-reported mouthguard compliance, 26% of athletes reported to always  
175 wear a mouthguard during training, and compliance increased to 48% if athletes were playing a  
176 game. Over one third of athletes (36%) rarely or never wear a mouthguard during games, reporting  
177 to keep it in their sock until they are instructed to put it in by management staff or refereeing  
178 officials. A chi-square analysis revealed significant differences between male and female athlete  
179 compliance in training ( $\chi^2$ : 9.56,  $p$ : 0.048;  $\Phi$  : 0.13 small effect size), whereby a greater proportion of  
180 females never wearing a mouthguard during training compared to males (Table 2; Figure 1). There  
181 was also a significant difference between sexes in games ( $\chi^2$ : 15.13,  $p$ : 0.001;  $\Phi$  : 0.17 small effect  
182 size), with a greater proportion of females always wearing a mouthguard in games compared to  
183 males (Table 2; Figure 1). No significant differences were found between elite and sub-elite athletes  
184 in self-reported mouthguard compliance (Table 2; Figure 2).

185

186 When asked to rate peer compliance, 73% of athletes perceived their peers to have very  
187 poor or poor compliance during training, and 7% perceived their peers to have good to excellent  
188 compliance. In games, 26% perceived their peers to have very poor or poor compliance, and 38%  
189 perceived peer compliance to be good or excellent.

190

191 Motivations and barriers to compliance are presented in Table 3. Popular motivators include  
192 “it’s the rules of the game” (84% agreed), “injury insurance scheme” (80% agreed) and “dental care”  
193 (94% agreed). A chi-square analysis revealed “injury insurance” to be significantly more motivating  
194 to females compared to males ( $\chi^2$ : 8.99,  $p$ : 0.01;  $\Phi$  : 0.17 small effect size) (Supplementary Material  
195 3). The main barriers to compliance are “discomfort”, “difficulty breathing” and “difficulty speaking”.  
196 No significant differences were observed in motivations or barriers between elite and sub-elite  
197 athletes (Supplementary Material 4).

198

199 Lastly, when asked about their perceived function of a mouthguard, 100% of athletes agreed  
200 that it protected teeth, 66% agreed that it protected the jaw, 35% agreed that it may assist in  
201 reducing the effects of a concussion, and 67% agreed that it would protect the gums. No significant  
202 differences in perceived mouthguard function were observed between male and female athletes  
203 (Supplementary Material 3). A significantly greater proportion of elite athletes perceived the  
204 mouthguard to protect the jaw compared to sub-elite athletes ( $\chi^2$ : 6.53,  $p$ : 0.04;  $\Phi$  : 0.11 small effect  
205 size) (Supplementary Material 4).

206

207 **Table 1. Group Demographics and Baseline Differences between Male and Female Athletes**

Competition	Level	Sex	% (n)	Age Mean ± SD (Years)	P Value <sup>^</sup>	Years Playing Mean ± SD (Years)	P Value <sup>~</sup>
Elite (n: 58)	Inter-County	Male	60% (35)	23.9 ± 4.6	0.06	17.9 ± 4.1	0.54
		Female	40% (23)	20.2 ± 1.9		13.8 ± 3.3	
		Total	100% (58)	22.4 ± 4.2		16.2 ± 4.3	
Sub-Elite (n: 487)	Senior Club	Male	46% (169)	24.3 ± 5.7	0.14	17.2 ± 4.2	0.11
		Female	30% (53)	23.3 ± 3.6		14.8 ± 4.9	
		Total	100% (222)	24.1 ± 5.3		16.6 ± 4.5	
	Intermediate Club	Male	18% (66)	24.7 ± 6.3	0.07	17.7 ± 3.9	0.12
		Female	28% (50)	23.3 ± 5.0		15.0 ± 4.7	
		Total	100% (116)	24.1 ± 5.8		16.5 ± 4.2	
	Junior Club	Male	22% (79)	26.2 ± 7.1	0.97	17.4 ± 4.5	0.82
		Female	22% (39)	25.6 ± 7.0		15.2 ± 4.9	
		Total	100% (118)	26.0 ± 7.0		16.7 ± 4.7	
	Collegiate	Male	5% (18)	21.2 ± 6.0	0.26	15.6 ± 3.2	0.32
		Female	7% (13)	19.7 ± 1.4		15.2 ± 4.9	
		Total	100% (31)	20.6 ± 4.7		14.3 ± 3.8	


208 N: Number of participants; SD: standard deviation; <: less than; ^: P Value indicating differences in age between sexes; ~: P Value  
 209 indicating differences in number of years playing between sexes.

210  
 211 **Table 2. Self-reported Compliance of Mouthguard Use for Training and Games in Males and Female,**  
 212 **and in Elite and Sub-Elite Athletes**


	Always, 100% of the time		More often than not, 75% of the time		Sometimes, 50% - 75% of the time		Rarely, I keep it in my sock		Never wear it		Chi-Square (Φ)	P value
	Male % (n)	Female % (n)	Male % (n)	Female % (n)	Male % (n)	Female % (n)	Male % (n)	Female % (n)	Male % (n)	Female % (n)		
<b>Training</b>												
	25% (90)	16% (29)	14% (53)	11% (20)	9% (31)	8% (15)	14% (51)	12% (22)	39% (142)	52% (92)	9.56 (0.13)	<0.05*
<b>Games</b>												
	44% (162)	56% (100)	9% (33)	11% (19)	5% (19)	7% (13)	28% (101)	20% (36)	14% (52)	6% (10)	15.13 (0.17)	0.00*
	Elite % (n)	Sub-Elite % (n)	Elite % (n)	Sub-Elite % (n)	Elite % (n)	Sub-Elite % (n)	Elite % (n)	Sub-Elite % (n)	Elite % (n)	Sub-Elite % (n)	Chi-Square (Φ)	P value
<b>Training</b>												
	21% (12)	22% (107)	26% (15)	12% (58)	9% (5)	8% (41)	7% (4)	14% (69)	38% (22)	44% (212)	9.99 (0.14)	0.05
<b>Games</b>												
	60% (35)	47% (227)	9% (5)	10% (47)	0% (0)	7% (32)	17% (10)	26% (127)	14% (8)	11% (54)	7.85 (0.12)	0.10

213 N: Number of participant; Φ: Phi coefficient effect size; \*: significant p value < 0.05.

214




215




216  
217  
218

Figure 1. Male and Female Self-reported Compliance of Mouthguard Use (n = 545).  
\*: Significant difference between males and females at  $p < 0.05$ .



219



220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

Figure 2. Elite and Sub-elite Self-reported Compliance of Mouthguard Use (n = 545).



232 *Table 3. Motivations, Barriers and Perceived Function of Mouthguards (n: 545)*  
 233

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
	% (n)	% (n)	% (n)
<b>Motivations (n: 315)</b>			
<i>Dental Care</i>	94% (295)	5% (16)	1% (4)
<i>Rules of the Game</i>	84% (263)	12% (39)	4% (13)
<i>Injury Insurance</i>	80% (251)	13% (40)	8% (24)
<i>Reduce Concussion Effects</i>	32% (100)	42% (132)	26% (83)
<b>Barriers (n: 230)</b>			
<i>Difficulty Speaking</i>	88% (202)	8% (19)	4% (9)
<i>Discomfort</i>	80% (185)	10% (24)	9% (21)
<i>Difficulty Breathing</i>	79% (182)	14% (32)	7% (16)
<i>Excess Saliva</i>	46% (105)	22% (50)	33% (75)
<i>Dry Mouth</i>	43% (99)	24% (55)	33% (76)
<i>Bad Taste/Odour</i>	26% (59)	28% (65)	46% (106)
<i>Nausea</i>	15% (35)	20% (47)	64% (148)
<i>Feel it is Unnecessary</i>	12% (28)	22% (51)	66% (151)
<i>Aesthetics</i>	10% (23)	17% (40)	73% (167)
<i>Cost</i>	7% (15)	20% (46)	74% (169)
<b>Function (n: 545)</b>			
<i>Teeth Protection</i>	100% (543)	0% (2)	0% (0)
<i>Gum Protection</i>	66% (362)	23% (126)	11% (57)
<i>Jaw Protection</i>	66% (361)	22% (120)	12% (64)
<i>Reduce Concussion Effects</i>	36% (194)	39% (214)	25% (137)

N: Number of participants.

234  
 235  
 236  
 237  
 238  
 239  
 240  
 241  
 242  
 243  
 244  
 245  
 246  
 247  
 248  
 249  
 250  
 251  
 252  
 253  
 254  
 255  
 256  
 257  
 258  
 259  
 260

## 261 Discussion

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

294

295

296

297

298

299

300

301

302

303

304

305

306

307

308

The primary aim of this study was to determine the compliance rate for mouthguard use amongst adult Gaelic Footballers. The primary hypothesis can be accepted as overall compliance rates were relatively poor, with the majority of athletes (56%) reporting to rarely or never wear their mouthguard during training. Self-reported compliance rates did increase for games as expected, with almost two-thirds of athletes reporting to wear it most of the time or always. These compliance rates align well with previous research [27], which found compliance rates of 54% and 43% in rugby [22] and field hockey [28] respectively. There are numerous reasons why compliance rates may be poorer in training than in games. Firstly, the intensity of training is typically lower than in games, with training sessions dedicating time to non-contact skills and low intensity player contact [29]. Consequently, injury rates are often lower in training than in games [30], and perhaps the majority of Gaelic Footballers perceive this lower intensity of play and lower injury risk as a reason for rarely or never wearing a mouthguard in training. Players appeared to recognise the poor compliance practices amongst their teammates, as observed in the findings of perceived peer compliance. This suggests a culture where not wearing a mouthguard is somewhat acceptable amongst peers, which may itself be an additional barrier to overcome. Secondly, there are no refereeing officials present at training sessions to enforce the mandatory mouthguard use rule, and therefore, Gaelic Footballers do not serve any punishment for their lack of compliance. Although management staff of sporting teams are aware of the rule and the benefits to mouthguard use, previous research has found that staff are not inclined to enforce mouthguard practices among athletes [31,32], highlighting the need for the GAA and LGFA to encourage coaches to ensure players wear mouthguards during all GAA and LGFA activities.

Another aspect relating to the primary aim of this study was to determine the motivations and barriers to mouthguard compliance in adult Gaelic Footballers. The majority of athletes with good compliance reported dental protection, rules of the game and injury insurance cover as the reasons for wearing a mouthguard most of the time or always. This is in line with previous research whereby player perception of efficacy in injury prevention largely dictates implementation practices [18]. The most common barriers to mouthguard use for those who rarely or never wear a mouthguard were difficulty speaking, discomfort and challenges with breathing. A recently published review on sports mouthguards has identified similar barriers to compliance [32]. Although the mouthguard fit (e.g. custom-made vacuum fit mouthguards) can influence comfort and perceived ease of breathing and communication [33], this alone does not seem enough to command good compliance [12]. A controlled randomised trial found that strength and performance were unaffected by custom-fit mouthguards, with athletes reporting the mouthguards to be comfortable and not causing difficulty breathing [34]. In contrast, strength and performance testing was negatively affected by the boil-and-bite mouthguard, with associated reports of discomfort and breathing challenges [34], highlighting the importance of mouthguard selection from athletes. Ultimately, education around mouthguard use appears to be the most advocated means of improving compliance [32,35], with lower compliance rates observed when education has not been provided [35]. The results of this study demonstrate a good understanding of mouthguard function amongst participants, especially with relation to dental, jaw and gum protection. Athletes seemed less sure of the potential benefits relating to concussion, and perhaps this is an avenue that should be explored more in player and coach education, especially if custom-fit mouthguards are implemented. Concussion injuries in sport not only result in time-loss from sport, but may also result in cognitive and emotional symptoms that can impair ability to work and study [36,37]. If custom-fit mouthguards have the potential to reduce the effects of concussion, in addition to providing more

309 comfort for the athlete, perhaps the GAA and LGFA could consider advocating or subsidising this  
310 type of mouthguard for its players.

311

312 A secondary aim of this study was to examine whether compliance rates, motivations and  
313 barriers differed between male and female players, and between elite and sub-elite players. The  
314 hypothesis that females may demonstrate better compliance than males can partly be accepted.  
315 Although a significantly larger proportion of females never wore a mouthguard in training, a  
316 significantly greater proportion of females always wore a mouthguard in games. Previous research  
317 has found females to be more compliant [38–40], but the majority of studies comparing sexes are  
318 based on teenagers or children [38,39]. A potential reason for greater compliance of females in  
319 games may be that females have been observed to have a higher sport morality than males [41]. In  
320 support of this, it is not surprising that “it’s the rules of the game” and “dental care” were similarly  
321 ranked as top motivators for wearing a mouthguard in this study. With regards to elite vs sub-elite  
322 compliance, no significant differences were noted, and so the secondary hypothesis that speculated  
323 elite athletes to have better compliance than sub-elite athletes can be rejected.

324

### 325 **Practical Recommendations**

326

327 As demonstrated in this study, mouthguard compliance is relatively poor in both training  
328 and in games in adult Gaelic Football. Athletes are very much aware of the poor compliance, despite  
329 recognising the benefits to wearing a mouthguard. Based on the perceived barriers to compliance,  
330 discomfort and challenges with breathing and speaking appear to be the most prominent deterrents  
331 for use. Although it is difficult to balance the needs of the athlete without compromising the  
332 function of dental protection in the mouthguard, athletes should be encouraged to wear custom-fit  
333 mouthguards that are moulded by orthodontic specialists. Research has demonstrated these  
334 mouthguards to be less invasive on athlete comfort, breathing and communication. Perhaps custom-  
335 fit mouthguards should be subsidised so that they are more affordable and accessible to Gaelic  
336 Footballers. Secondly, further education could be provided to athletes on the costs of dental trauma  
337 and how quality of life can be affected after traumatic dental injuries. Within Gaelic Football,  
338 athletes are not covered by the Injury Insurance Scheme if they are not wearing a mouthguard at the  
339 time of injury. As a result, the athlete would be forced to fund the dental repair costs independently.  
340 With a mean cost of €968.54 per dental injury claim observed in a recent ladies Gaelic Football study  
341 [15], this is a significant sum to pay from an athlete’s personal finances, and may act as an incentive  
342 to wear a mouthguard in the future. Coaches and management staff should check and promote  
343 mouthguard use amongst their teams. In addition, widespread education by the governing bodies  
344 (GAA and LGFA) is needed, to highlight the importance of mouthguard compliance and how a lack of  
345 compliance may prove costly if a dental injury occurs at a time when a mouthguard is not worn.

346

### 347 **Limitations**

348

349 There are three main limitations to this study. Firstly, the survey did not capture details on  
350 the type of mouthguard that participants were using at the time. Standard-fit and boil-and-bite  
351 mouthguards have been noted to be uncomfortable and typically require the athlete to bite on the  
352 mouthguard in order to keep it in place, resulting in challenges with breathing and talking. Knowing  
353 the type of mouthguard used may have provided further insight into why compliance was relatively  
354 poor in this study. Secondly, the survey did not establish if athletes had sustained a traumatic dental  
355 injury in the past. It has been reported that mouthguard compliance improves in those with a history  
356 of injury, but this was not captured in this study. Lastly, the main focus of this study was on adult

357 Gaelic Football athletes, and did not capture the compliance of teenagers or children who make up a  
358 significant proportion of Gaelic Football athletes. Of note, mouthguard use only became compulsory  
359 in 2014 in the male game, and 2017 in the ladies game. At this time, the current participants of this  
360 study would have been teenagers and may not have been open to adapting their practices,  
361 especially if mouthguards were ill-fitting due to changes in maturation and growth occurring at a  
362 similar time. Perhaps compliance will improve as the years progress, especially where children who  
363 are currently participating will be encouraged to wear a mouthguard upon their first encounter with  
364 the sport.

365

## 366 **Conclusion**

367

368 Mouthguard compliance rates were relatively poor in training, with improved compliance  
369 observed in games. Males demonstrated greater compliance than females in training, but females  
370 had greater compliance in games. No differences in compliance rates were found between elite and  
371 non-elite athletes. Popular motivators for compliance included the rules of the game, dental  
372 protection and jaw protection. Discomfort, and challenges with breathing and communication were  
373 found to be the major barriers to compliance, suggesting a move towards custom-fit mouthguard  
374 advocacy. Coaches, referees and governing bodies should strive to encourage compliance across  
375 all GAA and LGFA activities, in order to further reduce the incidence and cost of dental injuries within  
376 the sport.

## 377 References

378

- 379 [1] O'Connor S, Bruce C, Teahan C, McDermott E, Whyte E. Injuries in collegiate ladies gaelic  
380 footballers: A 2-season prospective cohort study. *J Sport Rehabil* 2021;30:261–6.  
381 <https://doi.org/10.1123/JSR.2019-0468>.
- 382 [2] Dekkers T, O'Sullivan K, Collins K, McVeigh JG, Roe M, Murphy JC, et al. The epidemiology of  
383 back injuries in elite Gaelic football athletes: An 8-year prospective study. *Phys Ther Sport*  
384 2022;57:105–11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ptsp.2022.07.009>.
- 385 [3] Malone S, Solan B, Collins KD, Doran DA. Positional Match Running Performance in Elite  
386 Gaelic Football. *J Strength Cond Res* 2016;30:2292–8.  
387 <https://doi.org/10.1519/JSC.0000000000001309>.
- 388 [4] Ladies Gaelic Football Association. Playing Rules 2021. Ladies Gaelic Football Association,  
389 Croke Park; 2021.
- 390 [5] Gaelic Athletic Association. Gaelic Athletic Association OFFICIAL GUIDE-PART 2 Part 2  
391 Contents. Central Council of the Association, Croke Park; 2022.
- 392 [6] Wilson F, Caffrey S, King E, Casey K, Gissane C. A 6-month prospective study of injury in Gaelic  
393 football. *Br J Sports Med* 2007;41:317–21. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2006.033167>.
- 394 [7] Sexton PF, Courtney R, Dhaidheid C Mac, Barry T, McCann PJ. Dental injuries in Gaelic Games:  
395 A review of insurance injury claims of 2007–2015. *Br J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 2017;55:e142.  
396 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bjoms.2017.08.165>.
- 397 [8] O'Connor S, Whyte E, Fortington L, Corrigan J. The cost of injury in Ladies Gaelic football: A  
398 nine-year analysis (2012–2020) of the LGFA's Injury Fund. *J Sci Med Sport* 2023;26:31–6.  
399 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2022.10.007>.
- 400 [9] O'Malley M, Evans DS, Hewson A, Owens J. Mouthguard use and dental injury in sport: a  
401 questionnaire study of national school children in the west of Ireland. *J Ir Dent Assoc*  
402 2012;58:205–11.
- 403 [10] De Souza Cortes MI, Marcenes W, Sheiham A. Impact of traumatic injuries to the permanent  
404 teeth on the oral health-related quality of life in 12-14-year-old children. *Community Dent*  
405 *Oral Epidemiol* 2002;30:193–8. <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0528.2002.300305.x>.
- 406 [11] Zaror C, Martínez-Zapata MJ, Abarca J, Díaz J, Pardo Y, Pont À, et al. Impact of traumatic  
407 dental injuries on quality of life in preschoolers and schoolchildren: A systematic review and  
408 meta-analysis. *Community Dent Oral Epidemiol* 2018;46:88–101.  
409 <https://doi.org/10.1111/cdoe.12333>.
- 410 [12] Newsome PRH, Tran DC, Cooke MS. The role of the mouthguard in the prevention of sports-  
411 related dental injuries: A review. *Int J Paediatr Dent* 2001;11:396–404.  
412 <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0960-7439.2001.00304.x>.
- 413 [13] Hoffmann J, Alfter G, Rudolph NK, Göz G. Experimental comparative study of various  
414 mouthguards. *Dent Traumatol* 1999;15:157–63. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-9657.1999.tb00794.x>.
- 415
- 416 [14] Knapik JJ, Marshall SW, Lee RB, Darakjy SS, Jones SB, Mitchener TA, et al. Mouthguards in  
417 Sport Activities. *Sport Med* 2007;37:117–44. <https://doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200737020-00003>.
- 418
- 419 [15] Greene J, Corrigan J, O'Connor S. Mouthguards reduce dental injuries and associated costs in  
420 Ladies Gaelic football – Irish Medical Journal. *Ir Med J* 2023;116:836.
- 421 [16] Cicek T, Dhamo B, Wolvius EB, Wesselink PR, Kragt L. Effectiveness of the new mandatory  
422 mouthguard use and orodental injuries in Dutch field hockey. *Phys Sportsmed* 2021;49:455–  
423 62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00913847.2020.1853487>.
- 424 [17] Gorks S, Henke T, Platen P. 279 Field hockey injuries and personal protective equipment: a  
425 status survey of German national teams. *Br. J. Sports Med.*, vol. 55, BMJ Publishing Group Ltd  
426 and British Association of Sport and Exercise Medicine; 2021, p. A108.2-A109.  
427 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2021-ioc.257>.

- 428 [18] Kroon J, Cox JA, Knight JE, Nevins PN, Kong WW. Mouthguard use and awareness of junior  
429 rugby league players in the gold coast, Australia: A need for more education. *Clin J Sport Med*  
430 2016;26:128–32. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JSM.000000000000206>.
- 431 [19] Boffano P, Boffano M, Gallesio C, Roccia F, Cignetti R, Piana R. Rugby athletes' awareness and  
432 compliance in the use of mouthguards in the North West of Italy. *Dent Traumatol*  
433 2012;28:210–3. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-9657.2011.01067.x>.
- 434 [20] Hawn KL, Visser MF, Sexton PJ. Enforcement of mouthguard use and athlete compliance in  
435 National Collegiate Athletic Association men's collegiate ice hockey competition. *J Athl Train*  
436 2002;37:204–8.
- 437 [21] Berry DC, Miller MG, Leow W. Attitudes of Central Collegiate Hockey Association ice hockey  
438 players toward athletic mouthguard usage. *J Public Health Dent* 2005;65:71–5.  
439 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-7325.2005.tb02789.x>.
- 440 [22] Boffano P, Boffano M, Gallesio C, Roccia F, Cignetti R, Piana R. Rugby athletes' awareness and  
441 compliance in the use of mouthguards in the North West of Italy. *Dent Traumatol*  
442 2012;28:210–3. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-9657.2011.01067.x>.
- 443 [23] Karaganeva R, Pinner S, Tomlinson D, Burden A, Taylor R, Yates J, et al. Effect of mouthguard  
444 design on retention and potential issues arising with usability in sport. *Dent Traumatol*  
445 2019;35:73–9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/edt.12446>.
- 446 [24] Renard M, Anton-Solanas A, Kelly DT, Ó Catháin C. Evaluation of nutrition knowledge in elite  
447 and sub-elite Gaelic football players. *Sci Med Footb* 2022;6:82–8.  
448 <https://doi.org/10.1080/24733938.2021.1883195>.
- 449 [25] Tinoco JMM, Sassone LM, Stevens RH, Martins DD, Grangeiro Neto JA, Tinoco EMB.  
450 Mouthguard use and attitudes regarding dental trauma among elite cross-country mountain  
451 biking and field hockey athletes. *Dent Traumatol* 2021;37:307–13.  
452 <https://doi.org/10.1111/edt.12636>.
- 453 [26] Cohen J. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioural Sciences*. Second Edi. New Jersey:  
454 Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.; 1988.
- 455 [27] Quarrie KL, Gianotti SM, Chalmers DJ, Hopkins WG. An evaluation of mouthguard  
456 requirements and dental injuries in New Zealand rugby union. *Br J Sports Med* 2005;39:650–  
457 4. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjism.2004.016022>.
- 458 [28] Bolhuis JH, Leurs JM, Flögel GE. Dental and facial injuries in international field hockey. *Br J*  
459 *Sports Med* 1987;21:174–7. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjism.21.4.174>.
- 460 [29] Murphy JC, O'Malley E, Gissane C, Blake C. Incidence of injury in gaelic football: A 4-year  
461 prospective study. *Am J Sports Med* 2012;40:2113–20.  
462 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546512455315>.
- 463 [30] O' Connor S, McCaffrey N, Whyte EF, Moran KA. Epidemiology of injury in male adolescent  
464 Gaelic games. *J Sci Med Sport* 2016;19:384–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2015.06.002>.
- 465 [31] Hawn KL, Visser MF, Sexton PJ. Enforcement of mouthguard use and athlete compliance in  
466 National Collegiate Athletic Association men's collegiate ice hockey competition. *J Athl Train*  
467 2002;37:204–8.
- 468 [32] Roberts HW. Sports mouthguard overview: Materials, fabrication techniques, existing  
469 standards, and future research needs. *Dent Traumatol* 2023;39:101–8.  
470 <https://doi.org/10.1111/edt.12809>.
- 471 [33] Queiróz AFVR, de Brito RB, Ramacciato JC, Motta RHL, Flório FM. Influence of mouthguards  
472 on the physical performance of soccer players. *Dent Traumatol* 2013;29:450–4.  
473 <https://doi.org/10.1111/edt.12026>.
- 474 [34] Duddy FA, Weissman J, Lee RA, Paranjpe A, Johnson JD, Cohenca N. Influence of different  
475 types of mouthguards on strength and performance of collegiate athletes: A controlled-  
476 randomized trial. *Dent Traumatol* 2012;28:263–7. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-9657.2011.01106.x>.
- 477  
478 [35] Parker K, Marlow B, Patel N, D G. An audit on the use of mouthguards in orthodontic patients

- 479 before treatment. *BOS Clin Eff Bull* 2016;36:14–6.
- 480 [36] Fallesen P, Campos B. Effect of concussion on salary and employment: A population-based  
481 event time study using a quasi-experimental design. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e038161.  
482 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-038161>.
- 483 [37] Røe C, Sveen U, Alvsker K, Bautz-Holter E. Post-concussion symptoms after mild traumatic  
484 brain injury: Influence of demographic factors and injury severity in a 1-year cohort study.  
485 *Disabil Rehabil* 2009;31:1235–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638280802532720>.
- 486 [38] Shore E, O’Connell AC. Cross-sectional cohort study on the use of mouthguards by children  
487 playing Gaelic football in Ireland. *Dent Traumatol* 2021;37:795–802.  
488 <https://doi.org/10.1111/edt.12714>.
- 489 [39] Spinass E, Aresu M, Giannetti L. Use of mouth guard in basketball: observational study of a  
490 group of teenagers with and without motivational reinforcement. *Eur J Paediatr Dent*  
491 2014;15:392–6.
- 492 [40] Vucic S, Drost RW, Ongkosuwito EM, Wolvius EB. Dentofacial trauma and players’ attitude  
493 towards mouthguard use in field hockey: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports*  
494 *Med* 2016;50:298–304. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-094896>.
- 495 [41] Miller BW, Roberts GC, Ommundsen Y. Effect of perceived motivational climate on moral  
496 functioning, team moral atmosphere perceptions, and the legitimacy of intentionally  
497 injurious acts among competitive youth football players. *Psychol Sport Exerc* 2005;6:461–77.  
498 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2004.04.003>.
- 499  
500