

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Peart, Daniel (2017) Quantifying the Effect of Carbohydrate Mouth Rinsing on Exercise Performance. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research. ISSN 1064-8011

Published by: UNSPECIFIED

URL:

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link: <http://northumbria-test.eprints-hosting.org/id/eprint/47802/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)



Northumbria
University
NEWCASTLE



Customer
Excellence
UniversityLibrary

Northumbria Research Link

Citation: Peart, Daniel (2016) Quantifying the Effect of Carbohydrate Mouth Rinsing on Exercise Performance. Journal of Strength and Conditioning Research. ISSN 1064-8011 (In Press)

Published by: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins

URL:

This version was downloaded from Northumbria Research Link:
<http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/28948/>

Northumbria University has developed Northumbria Research Link (NRL) to enable users to access the University's research output. Copyright © and moral rights for items on NRL are retained by the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. Single copies of full items can be reproduced, displayed or performed, and given to third parties in any format or medium for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, provided the authors, title and full bibliographic details are given, as well as a hyperlink and/or URL to the original metadata page. The content must not be changed in any way. Full items must not be sold commercially in any format or medium without formal permission of the copyright holder. The full policy is available online: <http://nrl.northumbria.ac.uk/policies.html>

This document may differ from the final, published version of the research and has been made available online in accordance with publisher policies. To read and/or cite from the published version of the research, please visit the publisher's website (a subscription may be required.)

www.northumbria.ac.uk/nrl



1 **Title:** Quantifying the Effect of Carbohydrate Mouth Rinsing on Exercise Performance

2 **Running head:** Carbohydrate mouth rinse review

3 **Authors:** Daniel J. Peart

4

5 Department of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation, Faculty of Health and Life Sciences,

6 Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK

7

8 *Correspondence:

9 Dr Daniel J. Peart

10 Department of Sport, Exercise and Rehabilitation

11 Faculty of Health and Life Sciences

12 Northumbria University

13 Newcastle upon Tyne

14 UK

15 Email: Daniel.peart@northumbria.ac.uk

16

17

18 **ABSTRACT**

19 The purpose of this study was to review the existing literature investigating carbohydrate mouth
20 rinsing (CMR) as an ergogenic aid by using the effect sizes and percentage change in
21 performance of the respective studies as outcome measures. A trivial-small average overall
22 effect size was present for the 25 studies included in the review (0.18, 95% CI = 0.10 to 0.27).
23 Effect sizes for the sub-groups were; ≥ 25 -min (0.25, 95% CI = 0.14 to 0.36), ≤ 180 seconds
24 (0.06, 95% CI = -0.03 to 0.15), resistance exercise (-0.09, 95% CI -0.20 to 0.03) but the effect
25 size is still small. A sub-analysis of ~1-h cycling time trial performance resulted in an overall
26 effect size of 0.20 (95% CI = 0.02 to 0.38), and effect sizes for performance time and power
27 output of 0.31 (95% CI = -0.02 to 0.64) and 0.19 (95% CI = -0.09 to 0.46) respectively. Whilst
28 effect sizes were small the average percentage change in performance in ~1-h trials was 2.48%,
29 which may have implications for elite performers as this is greater than the 1.30% smallest
30 worthwhile change recommended in past research.

31

32 **KEY WORDS**

33 Carbohydrate, mouth rinse, nutrition, performance

34

35 INTRODUCTION

36 Amidst the research of nutritional practices to enhance exercise performance the ingestion of
37 carbohydrates (CHO) has arguably the most support. There is a wealth of research investigating
38 the effects of consuming CHO before, during and after exercise to support both performance
39 and recovery, with a number narrative reviews available (6, 8, 23, 25, 38). Typically, the
40 ergogenic benefit afforded by CHO is stronger when exercise protocols are ≥ 2 -h in length,
41 supposedly due to the metabolic demand of exercising for this duration. It has also been shown
42 to help performance of shorter protocols of approximately 1-h when intensity is sufficiently
43 high (26, 41). However, some have demonstrated that it can enhance performance in protocols
44 of much shorter durations when metabolic demand is likely to be met by endogenous CHO
45 stores, and therefore may not necessarily warrant exogenous feeding of CHO. In response to
46 this several authors, Carter et al. (7) being the first, have provided evidence that simply rinsing
47 the mouth with CHO (CMR) without ingesting it can influence performance. As the CHO is
48 not ingested it is not possible that it supports the endogenous stores of CHO, and it has been
49 proposed that oral receptors in the mouth may modulate central nervous system responses.
50 Findings from Chambers et al. (9) support this theory as they reported rinsing the mouth with
51 glucose and maltodextrin separately stimulated areas of the brain associated with motor output.

52

53 Although this nutritional strategy appears promising, and may be of interest to those who
54 struggle with the possible GI discomfort associated with the ingestion of CHO (8), the literature
55 to support it is still in its relative infancy. De Ataide e Silva et al. (13) performed a systematic
56 review of research available up to May 2013 and concluded that mouth rinsing with CHO
57 'seems to improve performance', reporting an average improvement of 5.05 W (95% CI = 0.90
58 to 9.20). However, whilst such reviews are useful as they combine and synthesise findings from

59 a number of different papers, and it is very difficult to consider all factors in the analysis, this
60 particular review suffers from some limitations. De Ataide e Silva et al. (13) only quantified
61 the findings from studies where power output was the main performance outcome despite the
62 fact that studies report a number of variables including time to completion, time to exhaustion,
63 peak power and average power. Furthermore De Ataide e Silva et al. (13) report mean
64 difference in power output between conditions and not effect size. The reporting of average
65 change in power is useful in a practical sense to help practitioners understand the extent of
66 change, but the use of this statistic alone is vague and may not provide a sufficient
67 understanding of the efficacy of CMR on performance. The aim of this study was to review the
68 existing literature in order to quantify the effect of CHO mouth rinse on exercise performance.

69

70 **METHODS**

71 A database (SPORTDiscus, Pubmed) search for relevant peer-reviewed articles (excluding
72 abstracts and unpublished theses/dissertations) was performed in September 2016. An original
73 search term of '*carbohydrate OR glucose OR maltodextrin OR dextrose AND mouth rinse AND*
74 *mouth wash OR exercise OR sport OR performance OR run* OR cyc**' returned 1,075,933 and
75 1,492,935 entries in SPORTDiscus and Pubmed respectively. A shorter search term of 'mouth
76 rinse OR mouth wash AND exercise' returned a more manageable 57 and 80 entries in
77 SPORTDiscus and Pubmed respectively. Further searches consisted of entering various
78 combinations of the following key words into Google Scholar; 'carbohydrate', 'mouth rinse',
79 'mouth wash', 'sport performance', 'sport', 'exercise', 'running' and 'cycling'. A manual
80 cross-reference of relevant articles and review articles was also performed. Identified studies
81 were included on the basis that they were performed on humans under normothermic
82 conditions, clearly stated the type of CHO in the mouth rinse, used a placebo controlled

83 repeated measures design, the mouth rinse was tested using a single exercise, and the relevant
84 raw data was available to calculate effect sizes (i.e. mean and standard deviation or standard
85 error). The following studies were excluded from the analysis; Beaven et al. (3) because raw
86 data was not available for the placebo condition (an attempt was made to contact the author),
87 Rollo et al. (39) because the performance outcome was self-selected running speed which is
88 not in itself a performance measure per se that could be compared to the outcomes of other
89 studies in the same sub-analysis, Rollo et al. (40) because CMR was not compared to a placebo
90 mouth rinse, Rollo et al (review) because it was a review article, and three studies were
91 excluded because the mouth rinse efficacy could have been influenced by a prior exercise (1,
92 30, 36). An overview of the search strategy is outlined in Fig 1.

93

94 The effectiveness of the mouth rinsing was quantified by determining the effect size for each
95 variable, which can be categorised as small (0.2), moderate (0.5) or high (0.8). This was
96 calculated using the following equation (this equation was reversed in the case of those studies
97 employing performance time as the performance measure, as a lower number is beneficial):

$$98 \text{ ES} = (\text{Mean of CHO} - \text{Mean of placebo}) \div \text{SD of placebo}$$

99

100 Some studies reported the standard error of the mean rather than the standard deviation.

101 Standard deviation was calculated from these studies using the following equation:

$$102 \text{ SD} = s_{\bar{x}} \times \sqrt{n}$$

103

104 A weighted effect size was then calculated to account for changes in individual sample sizes
105 as used by Matson and Tran (31) and Peart et al. (33) :

106 $Weighted\ ES = \sum[(ES)(n)] \div \sum n$

107

108 The most common exercise protocol of a ~1-h cycling time trial with ~6% CHO was used by
109 8/25 studies, therefore a sub-analysis on these studies was conducted to allow a comparison of
110 findings from a similar exercise. As both power and time to completion were used as
111 performance measures for the ~1-h cycling time trials a further sub-analysis on these was
112 performed. Percentage changes in performance were analysed in this further sub-analysis and
113 interpreted as recommended by Hopkins (20).

114

115 **RESULTS**

116 Table 1 describes the 25 included articles that allowed the analysis of 56 effect sizes (Table 2).
117 The overall effect size for the influence of CMR on performance exclusive of other factors was
118 0.18 (weighted = 0.18) and the small effect size for exercises that lasted longer than 25-min
119 (0.25) was on average higher than the trivial effect size for shorter exercises lasting under 3-
120 min (0.06). No statistical comparison was made between the groups due to the differing sample
121 sizes, but of note is that the upper 95% CI for shorter exercise was almost identical to the lower
122 95% CI for longer exercises, suggesting a possible difference. There was an average negative
123 effect size for resistance exercises, with the majority of the 95% CI lower than null. The most
124 common exercise protocol of a 1-h cycling time trial with ~6% CHO was used by 8/25 studies,
125 therefore a sub-analysis of these studies was conducted to allow a comparison of findings from
126 a similar exercise (Table 2). The overall effect size of these studies was 0.20, and the upper
127 95% CI approached moderate and reached moderate-large effect sizes for power output and
128 time to completion respectively.

130 DISCUSSION

131 The average effect sizes reported in this study can be classified as trivial-small, and some of
132 the lower 95% CI marginally cross 0, suggesting a trivial chance of a negative impact upon
133 performance. However, it must also be noted that some of the upper 95% CI reach 0.64
134 suggesting that there may be a moderate benefit for some individuals. Table 2 identifies that
135 the higher effect sizes are typically in exercises lasting 25-min or greater, and there has been a
136 particular focus on cycling time trials of approximately 1-h administering ~6% CHO. A number
137 of studies implementing this protocol have reported small-moderate effect sizes of 0.3 to 0.5
138 (7, 9, 19, 29, 35), however the average effect size is only small (Table 2). This may be
139 influenced by the small effect size reported by Beelen et al. (4), but is more than likely due to
140 the small negative effect size shown by Ispoglou et al. (21). In fact, if Ispoglou et al. (21) are
141 removed from the analysis the mean effect size for time trial performance increases from 0.31
142 to 0.41, demonstrating the impact that this study has on the final effect size. There are some
143 methodological differences between these studies such as pre-participation fasting times. The
144 low effect size reported by Beelen et al. (4) was attributed to participants being in a fed state,
145 and other authors have shown that effect sizes are higher when CMR is used in a fasted state
146 (17, 29). However this cannot explain the negative effect size from Ispoglou et al. (21) as
147 participants performed the trial following a 3-h fast, similar to the 2-4 h fast used in other
148 studies (7, 19, 29). Unfortunately, the number of differing fasting protocols and relatively small
149 number of studies in resulting sub-groups did not allow for a sub-analysis for the effect of
150 fasting on CMR efficacy. There is also some disparity between studies for duration of the rinse
151 (typically 5 or 10 seconds). However, this also cannot explain the much lower effect in the
152 Ispoglou et al. (21) study as the 5-s rinse used was comparable to Carter et al. (7) and Gam et
153 al. (19). Another consideration is that the true effect of the CMR in many of these studies is

154 unclear as very few compare CMR to a control condition. Gam et al. (19) argued that a control
155 condition is essential in future work as whilst they reported a significant difference between
156 CMR and a placebo, they found that a control was just as beneficial compared to the placebo
157 (their effect size reduces from 0.33 to 0.17 when CMR is compared to control rather than a
158 placebo). It could be the case that the action of rinsing the mouth may impact upon performance
159 by interrupting the participant, and this small decline in performance may be off-set by the
160 CHO content i.e. performance returned to control conditions as opposed to being improved.
161 Further work is needed to compare CMR to a control, perhaps in more ecological settings where
162 small interruptions may have a greater practical consequence.

163

164 Whilst effect sizes were on average trivial-small it should be considered that at the elite level
165 a small effect may be practically significant in competition. Although some studies observed
166 ‘physically active’ participants, a strength of the current body of research is that the majority
167 of studies observed participants specifically trained for the task (Table 1.). In fact, all of the
168 studies in the ~1-h cycling time trial sub-group analysis apart from Devenney et al. (15)
169 recruited cyclists or triathletes, and although the effect size was small the average improvement
170 in time to completion was 2.48% (Table 2). To put this into context Hopkins (20) suggests that
171 the smallest worthwhile change for cycling time trial time to completion is 1.3%, and other
172 authors have reported less substantial improvements in performance of 0.16% (14) and 2.34%
173 (24) for the same task when CHO was ingested. Moreover, Pottier et al. (35) actually observed
174 significant improvements in 1-h cycling time trial performance when using a mouth rinse, but
175 not when ingesting the CHO.

176

177 Resistance exercises had on average a negative effect size with most of the 95% CI range being
178 below 0, suggesting a potentially adverse effect upon performance. However, it should be
179 considered that this has been based on only two studies (11, 32), and the performances between
180 conditions in these studies were almost identical (Table 1). The average negative effect size is
181 likely due to participants performing one less repetition in a repetition to fatigue exercise in
182 Clarke et al. (11), which was within the reported normal variation for the outcome. Therefore,
183 whilst there is no evidence to support CMR for resistance exercise, there is also not enough
184 evidence to portray it as being detrimental.

185

186 It is evident that more work is needed in the area to standardise testing procedures to facilitate
187 practitioner and athlete interpretation of findings. In particular, it would be of benefit to see
188 more comparisons to a control condition. The current evidence suggests that CMR is not
189 ergogenic for very short duration exercises lasting less than 3-min, and that CMR may be more
190 beneficial for exercises of approximately 1-h but the effect sizes are variable (see CIs in Table
191 2). It is worth noting that whilst the effect sizes are on average trivial-small they may be higher
192 than the smallest worthwhile change for elite performers.

193

194 **PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS**

195 The evidence reviewed in this paper suggests that the average performance enhancement
196 afforded by CMR is trivial-small, but may be greater than the smallest worthwhile effects for
197 elite athletes. It is unclear if the small effects would provide any meaningful benefit to sub-
198 elite performers, however it should be considered that the average effect is not necessarily true
199 for every athlete and the broad confidence intervals suggest that CMR may be worth

200 experimenting with on an individual basis. Athletes whose events last 25-60 min may be more
201 likely to observe an ergogenic effect than those taking part in shorter more anaerobic events
202 and/or resistance exercises. For events and activities lasting more than 60 min the cost-benefit
203 relationship to withholding the ingestion of CHO should be considered. Finally, although not
204 included as a sub-analysis in this review some authors have suggested that CMR is more
205 effective when in a fasted state. Once again the cost-benefit relationship should be considered
206 for competing in a fasted state, but practitioners may wish to consider CMR if training in a low
207 glycogen state.

208

209 **REFERENCES**

210

- 211 1. Ali A, Yoo MJY, Moss C, and Breier BH. Carbohydrate mouth rinsing has no effect on
212 power output during cycling in a glycogen-reduced state. *J Int Soc Sport Nut* 13: 1,
213 2016.
- 214 2. Bastos-Silva VJ, Melo AdA, Lima-Silva AE, Moura FA, Bertuzzi R, and de Araujo
215 GG. Carbohydrate Mouth Rinse Maintains Muscle Electromyographic Activity and
216 Increases Time to Exhaustion during Moderate but not High-Intensity Cycling
217 Exercise. *Nutrients* 8: 49, 2016.
- 218 3. Beaven CM, Maulder P, Pooley A, Kilduff L, and Cook C. Effects of caffeine and
219 carbohydrate mouth rinses on repeated sprint performance. *Appl Physiol Nutr Met* 38:
220 633-637, 2013.
- 221 4. Beelen M, Berghuis J, Bonaparte B, Ballak SB, Jeukendrup AE, and van Loon LJ.
222 Carbohydrate mouth rinsing in the fed state: lack of enhancement of time-trial
223 performance. *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab* 19: 400, 2009.

- 224 5. Bortolotti H, Pereira LA, Oliveira RS, Cyrino ES, and Altimari LR. Carbohydrate
225 mouth rinse does not improve repeated sprint performance. *Revista Brasileira de*
226 *Cineantropometria & Desempenho Humano* 15: 639-645, 2013.
- 227 6. Burke LM, Hawley JA, Wong SH, and Jeukendrup AE. Carbohydrates for training and
228 competition. *J Sports Sci* 29: S17-S27, 2011.
- 229 7. Carter JM, Jeukendrup AE, and Jones DA. The effect of carbohydrate mouth rinse on
230 1-h cycle time trial performance. *Med Sci Sport Exer* 36: 2107-2111, 2004.
- 231 8. Cermak NM and van Loon LJ. The use of carbohydrates during exercise as an ergogenic
232 aid. *Sports Med* 43: 1139-1155, 2013.
- 233 9. Chambers ES, Bridge MW, and Jones DA. Carbohydrate sensing in the human mouth:
234 effects on exercise performance and brain activity. *J Physiol* 587: 1779-1794, 2009.
- 235 10. Chong E, Guelfi K, and Fournier P. Effect of a carbohydrate mouth rinse on maximal
236 sprint performance in competitive male cyclists. *J Sci Med Sport* 14: 162-167, 2011.
- 237 11. Clarke ND, Kornilios E, and Richardson DL. Carbohydrate and caffeine mouth rinses
238 do not affect maximum strength and muscular endurance performance. *J Strength Cond*
239 *Res* 29: 2926-2931, 2015.
- 240 12. Clarke ND, Thomas JR, Kagka M, Ramsbottom R, and Delextrat A. No dose-response
241 Effect Of Carbohydrate Mouth Rinse Concentration On 5 Km Running Performance In
242 Recreational Athletes. *J Strength Cond Res* in press, 2016.
- 243 13. de Ataide e Silva T, Di Cavalcanti Alves de Souza M, de Amorim J, Stathis C, Leandro
244 C, and Lima-Silva A. Can carbohydrate mouth rinse improve performance during
245 exercise? A systematic review. *Nutrients* 6: 1, 2014.
- 246 14. Desbrow B, Anderson S, Barrett J, Rao E, and Hargreave M. Carbohydrate-electrolyte
247 feedings and 1h time trial cycling performance. *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab* 14: 541-
248 549, 2004.

- 249 15. Devenney S, Collins K, and Shortall M. Effects of various concentrations of
250 carbohydrate mouth rinse on cycling performance in a fed state. *Eur J Sport Sci* 16:
251 1073-1078, 2016.
- 252 16. Dorling JL and Earnest CP. Effect of carbohydrate mouth rinsing on multiple sprint
253 performance. *J Int Soc Sport Nut* 10: 41, 2013.
- 254 17. Fares E-J and Kayser B. Carbohydrate mouth rinse effects on exercise capacity in pre-
255 and postprandial states. *J Nutr Metab* Article ID 385962: 1-6, 2011.
- 256 18. Fraga C, Velasques B, Koch AJ, Machado M, Paulucio D, Ribeiro P, and Pompeu
257 FAMS. Carbohydrate mouth rinse enhances time to exhaustion during treadmill
258 exercise. *Clin Physiol Funct Imaging*, 2015.
- 259 19. Gam S, Guelfi KJ, and Fournier PA. Opposition of carbohydrate in a mouth-rinse
260 solution to the detrimental effect of mouth rinsing during cycling time trials. *Int J Sport*
261 *Nutr Exerc Metab* 23: 48-56, 2013.
- 262 20. Hopkins WG. How to interpret changes in an athletic performance test. *Sportscience* 8:
263 1-7, 2004.
- 264 21. Ispoglou T, O'Kelly D, Angelopoulou A, Bargh M, O'Hara JP, and Duckworth LC.
265 Mouth Rinsing With Carbohydrate Solutions at the Postprandial State Fail to Improve
266 Performance During Simulated Cycling Time Trials. *J Strength Cond Res* 29: 2316-
267 2325, 2015.
- 268 22. Jeffers R, Shave R, Ross E, Stevenson EJ, and Goodall S. The effect of a carbohydrate
269 mouth-rinse on neuromuscular fatigue following cycling exercise. *Appl Physiol Nutr*
270 *Met* 40: 557-564, 2015.
- 271 23. Jeukendrup A. A step towards personalized sports nutrition: carbohydrate intake during
272 exercise. *Sports Med* 44: 25-33, 2014.

- 273 24. Jeukendrup A, Brouns F, Wagenmakers A, and Saris W. Carbohydrate-electrolyte
274 feedings improve 1 h time trial cycling performance. *Int J Sports Med* 18: 125-129,
275 1997.
- 276 25. Jeukendrup AE. Carbohydrate feeding during exercise. *Eur J Sport Sci* 8: 77-86, 2008.
- 277 26. Jeukendrup AE. Nutrition for endurance sports: marathon, triathlon, and road cycling.
278 *J Sports Sci* 29: S91-S99, 2011.
- 279 27. Kasper AM, Cocking S, Cockayne M, Barnard M, Tench J, Parker L, McAndrew J,
280 Langan-Evans C, Close GL, and Morton JP. Carbohydrate mouth rinse and caffeine
281 improves high-intensity interval running capacity when carbohydrate restricted. *Eur J*
282 *Sport Sci* 16: 560-568, 2016.
- 283 28. Kulaksız TN, Koşar ŞN, Bulut S, Güzel Y, Willems MET, Hazir T, and Turnagöl HH.
284 Mouth Rinsing with Maltodextrin Solutions Fails to Improve Time Trial Endurance
285 Cycling Performance in Recreational Athletes. *Nutrients* 8: 269, 2016.
- 286 29. Lane SC, Bird SR, Burke LM, and Hawley JA. Effect of a carbohydrate mouth rinse on
287 simulated cycling time-trial performance commenced in a fed or fasted state. *Appl*
288 *Physiol Nutr Met* 38: 134-139, 2012.
- 289 30. Luden ND, Saunders MJ, D'Lugos AC, Pataky MW, Baur DA, Vining CB, and Schroer
290 AB. Carbohydrate Mouth Rinsing Enhances High Intensity Time Trial Performance
291 Following Prolonged Cycling. *Nutrients* 8: 576, 2016.
- 292 31. Matson LG and Tran ZV. Effects of Sodium Bicarbonate Ingestion on Anaerobic
293 Performance: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Int J Sport Nutr* 3: 2-28, 1993.
- 294 32. Painelli VS, Roschel H, Gualano B, Del-Favero S, Benatti FB, Ugrinowitsch C, Tricoli
295 V, and Lancha Jr AH. The effect of carbohydrate mouth rinse on maximal strength and
296 strength endurance. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 111: 2381-2386, 2011.

- 297 33. Peart DJ, Siegler JC, and Vince RV. Practical recommendations for coaches and
298 athletes: a meta-analysis of sodium bicarbonate use for athletic performance. *J Strength*
299 *Cond Res* 26: 1975-1983, 2012.
- 300 34. Phillips SM, Findlay S, Kavaliauskas M, and Grant MC. The influence of serial
301 carbohydrate mouth rinsing on power output during a cycle sprint. *J Sport Sci Med* 13,
302 2014.
- 303 35. Pottier A, Bouckaert J, Gilis W, Roels T, and Derave W. Mouth rinse but not ingestion
304 of a carbohydrate solution improves 1-h cycle time trial performance. *Scand J Med Sci*
305 *Sports* 20: 105-111, 2010.
- 306 36. Přibyslavská V, Scudamore EM, Johnson SL, Green JM, Stevenson Wilcoxson MC,
307 Lowe JB, and O'Neal EK. Influence of carbohydrate mouth rinsing on running and
308 jumping performance during early morning soccer scrimmaging. *Eur J Sport Sci* 16:
309 441-447, 2016.
- 310 37. Rollo I, Cole M, Miller R, and Williams C. Influence of mouth rinsing a carbohydrate
311 solution on 1-h running performance. *Med Sci Sport Exer* 42: 798-804, 2010.
- 312 38. Rollo I and Williams C. Effect of mouth-rinsing carbohydrate solutions on endurance
313 performance. *Sports Med* 41: 449-461, 2011.
- 314 39. Rollo I, Williams C, Gant N, and Nute M. The influence of carbohydrate mouth rinse
315 on self-selected speeds during a 30-min treadmill run. *Int J Sport Nutr Exerc Metab* 18:
316 585, 2008.
- 317 40. Rollo I, Williams C, and Nevill M. Influence of ingesting versus mouth rinsing a
318 carbohydrate solution during a 1-h run. *Med Sci Sport Exer* 43: 468-475, 2011.
- 319 41. Siegler J, Howell K, Vince R, Bray J, Towlson C, Peart D, Mellor D, and Atkin S.
320 Aspartame in conjunction with carbohydrate reduces insulin levels during endurance
321 exercise. *J Int Soc Sport Nut* 9: 1-4, 2012.

- 322 42. Sinclair J, Bottoms L, Flynn C, Bradley E, Alexander G, McCullagh S, Finn T, and
323 Hurst HT. The effect of different durations of carbohydrate mouth rinse on cycling
324 performance. *Eur J Sport Sci* 14: 259-264, 2014.
- 325 43. Whitham M and McKinney J. Effect of a carbohydrate mouthwash on running time-
326 trial performance. *J Sports Sci* 25: 1385-1392, 2007.
- 327 44. Wright BF and Davison G. Carbohydrate Mouth Rinse Improves 1.5 h Run
328 Performance: Is There A Dose-Effect? *Int J Exer Sci* 6: 8, 2013.
- 329

Table 1. Summary of research articles used for analysis (chronological order)

Study	Subjects	Exercise (CHO rinse)	Effect Size	% change	P ≤ 0.05
Carter et al. (7)	7 male and 2 female cyclists	~ 1-h cycling TT (914 kJ) (6.4% maltodextrin)	Time = 0.40 AP = 0.15	2.93% 2.70%	Y Y
Whitham and McKinney (43)	7 recreationally active males	15-min (65% $\dot{V}O_2$ max) followed by 45-min running TT (6.4% maltodextrin)	Distance = 0.02	0.26%	N
Beelen et al. (4)	14 male endurance athletes	~ 1-h cycling TT (1053 kJ) (6.4% maltodextrin)	Time = -0.08 AP = -0.06	-0.54% -0.38%	N N
Chambers et al (9)	8 male cyclists 6 male and 2 female participants (activity level not specified)	~ 1-h cycling TT (914 kJ) (6.4% glucose) ~ 1-h cycling TT (837 kJ) (6.4% maltodextrin)	Time = 0.32 Time = 0.42	1.95% 3.10%	Y Y
Pottier et al. (35)	12 triathletes (sex not specified)	~ 1-h cycling TT (975 kJ) (6% isotonic carbohydrate-electrolyte solution)	Time = 0.47	3.74%	Y
Rollo et al. (37)	10 male runners	1-h running TT (6.4% isotonic carbohydrate-electrolyte solution)	Distance = 0.29	1.48%	Y
Chong et al. (10)	14 male cyclists	30-s maximal cycle sprint (6.4% isotonic carbohydrate-electrolyte solution) 30-s maximal cycle sprint (7.1% glucose)	PP = -0.10 AP = 0.06 PP = -0.13 AP = 0.00	-1.01% 0.47% -1.18% -	N N N N
Fares and Kayser (17)	13 non-athletic males	60% Wmax cycle to exhaustion following a controlled breakfast (6.4% maltodextrin) 60% Wmax cycle to exhaustion following an overnight fast (6.4% maltodextrin)	TEX = 0.17 TEX = 0.37	3.36% 10.39%	Y Y
Painelli et al. (32)	12 recreationally strength trained males	1-RM bench press (6.4% dextrose)	KG = 0.00	-	N
Bortolotti et al. (5)	9 under-15 soccer players	Repeated sprint ability test (6% maltodextrin)	Mean = 0.02 Best = -0.02	0.08% -0.08%	N N
Dorling and Earnest (16)	8 active males	Repeated sprint ability test (6.4% maltodextrin) Loughborough Intermittent Shuttle Test (6.4% maltodextrin)	Mean = 0.12 Mean = -0.10	0.58% -0.57%	N N
Gam et al. (19)	10 male cyclists	~ 1-h cycling TT (1000 kJ) (6.4% maltodextrin)	Mean = 0.33	5.33%	Y
Lane et al. (29)	12 male cyclists	1-h cycling TT following a controlled breakfast (10% maltodextrin) 1-h cycling TT following an overnight fast (10% maltodextrin)	AP = 0.29 AP = 0.43	1.75% 3.19%	Y Y
Wright and Davison (44)	7 physically active males	90-min treadmill TT (6% carbohydrate-electrolyte solution) 90-min treadmill TT (12% carbohydrate-electrolyte solution)	Distance = 0.41 Distance = 0.59	4.79% 6.71%	Y Y
Phillips et al. (34)	12 physically active males	30-s maximal cycle sprint (6.4% maltodextrin)	PP = 0.14	2.29%	Y

Sinclair et al. (42)*	11 male recreational cyclists	30-min cycling TT (6.4% maltodextrin)	Distance = 0.55 AP = 0.73	5.88% 6.36%	Y Y
Clarke et al. (11)	15 recreationally resistance-trained males	1-RM bench press (6% maltodextrin) Reps to fatigue at 60% 1-RM (6% maltodextrin) Total weight lifted (6% maltodextrin)	KG = 0.24 Total = -0.2 KG = -0.01	4.44% -4.76% -0.18%	N N N
Fraga et al. (18)	6 endurance trained men	Run to exhaustion at 85% $\dot{V}O_2$ max (8% dextrose)	TEX = 0.80 Distance = 0.64	25.09% 24.68%	Y Y
Ispoglou et al. (21)	9 male cyclists	~ 1-h cycling TT (4% carbohydrate-electrolyte solution) ~ 1-h cycling TT (6% carbohydrate-electrolyte solution) ~ 1-h cycling TT (8% carbohydrate-electrolyte solution)	Time = -0.20 AP = -0.11 Time = -0.41 AP = -0.18 Time = -0.25 AP = -0.14	-1.29% -1.21% -2.26% -2.03% -1.61% -1.62%	N N N N N N
Jeffers et al. (22)	9 male cyclists/triathletes	45-min cycle at 70% Wmax followed by a 15-min TT (6.4% maltodextrin)	AP = 0.00	-	N
Bastos-Silva et al. (2)	13 physically active males	Cycle to exhaustion 110% PPO (6.4% maltodextrin) Cycle to exhaustion 80% respiratory compensation point (6.4% maltodextrin)	TEX = 0.54 TEX = 0.74	8.07% 14.62%	Y Y
Clarke et al. (12)	15 healthy men	5-km running TT (3% maltodextrin) 5-km running TT (6% maltodextrin) 5-km running TT (12% maltodextrin)	Time = -0.16 Time = -0.13 Time = -0.05	-2.70% -1.94% -0.82%	N N N
Devenney et al. (15)	12 recreationally active males	~ 1-h cycling TT (6% maltodextrin) ~ 1-h cycling TT (16% maltodextrin)	Time = 0.50 AP = 0.48 Time = 0.58 AP = 0.61	5.62% 7.06% 6.32% 7.91%	Y Y Y Y
Kasper et al. (27)	8 recreationally active males	High-intensity running protocol (10% maltodextrin)	TEX = 0.73	30.77%	Y
Kulaksiz et al. (28)	9 recreational cyclists	20-km cycling TT (3% maltodextrin) 20-km cycling TT (6% maltodextrin) 20-km cycling TT (12% maltodextrin)	Time = 0.03 AP = 0.05 Time = 0.02 AP = 0.23 Time = 0.21 AP = 0.00	0.25% 0.49% 0.25% 2.38% 2.24% -	N N N N N N

*Analysis only includes the 10-s rinse trial as raw data was not available for the 5-s rinse trial; AP = average power; PP = peak power; TEX = time to exhaustion; Wmax = watt max; PPO = peak power output; TT = time trial; KG = kilograms; reps = repetitions; 1-RM = one rep max; Y = yes; N = no.

Table 2. Summary of Effect Sizes

Measure	No. of ES	Effect size				% change
		Mean	SD	95% CI	Weighted ES	
Overall	56	0.18	0.30	0.10, 0.27	0.18	-
Resistance exercise	4	-0.09	0.07	-0.20, 0.03	-0.09	-
≤180 seconds	15	0.06	0.17	-0.03, 0.15	0.06	-
≥25-min	37	0.25	0.34	0.14, 0.36	0.25	-
1-h cycling TT with ~6% CHO (overall)	14	0.20	0.31	0.02, 0.38	0.21	-
1-h cycling TT time with ~6% CHO (time to completion)	8	0.31	0.25	-0.02, 0.64	0.31	2.48%
1-h cycling TT power with ~6% CHO (power output)	6	0.19	0.27	-0.09, 0.46	0.21	1.93%

≥25-min most of these studies were over 30-min but the threshold was set at 25-min to allow the inclusion of Clarke et al.

(12). 1-h cycling TT includes Beelen et al. (4), Carter et al. (7), Chambers et al. (4), Gam et al. (19), Ispoglou et al. (21),

Lane et al. (29), Pottier et al. (35). ES = effect size, TT = time trial, CHO = carbohydrate, CI = confidence intervals.




Fig 1. Study selection process