



NICOLAUS COPERNICUS  
UNIVERSITY  
IN TORUŃ



**Quality in Sport. eISSN 2450-3118.**

**Journal Home Page**

**<https://apcz.umk.pl/QS/index>**

**KĄDZIOLKA, Witold, BORÓWKA, Karolina, GÓRKA, Piotr, DOMAGAŁA, Szymon, TYMIŃSKA, Paulina, FRĄCZEK, Julia, WIATER, Zuzanna, BRANKOWSKA, Karolina, JAKUBOWSKA, Marta and OLEJNIK, Michał. Beyond “Epicondylitis”: Integrating Mechanotransduction and Health Literacy into the Management of Lateral Elbow Tendinopathy. Quality in Sport. 2026;52:69540. eISSN 2450-3118. <https://doi.org/10.12775/QS.2026.52.69540>**

The journal has been awarded 20 points in the parametric evaluation by the Ministry of Higher Education and Science of Poland. This is according to the Annex to the announcement of the Minister of Higher Education and Science dated 05.01.2024, No. 32553. The journal has a Unique Identifier: 201398. Scientific disciplines assigned: Economics and Finance (Field of Social Sciences); Management and Quality Sciences (Field of Social Sciences).

Punkty Ministerialne z 2019 - aktualny rok 20 punktów. Załącznik do komunikatu Ministra Szkolnictwa Wyższego i Nauki z dnia 05.01.2024 Lp. 32553. Posiada Unikatowy Identyfikator Czasopisma: 201398. Przypisane dyscypliny naukowe: Ekonomia i finanse (Dziedzina nauk społecznych); Nauki o zarządzaniu i jakości (Dziedzina nauk społecznych). © The Authors 2026.

This article is published with open access under the License Open Journal Systems of Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń, Poland. Open Access: This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Noncommercial License, which permits any noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited. This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial Share Alike License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Received: 04.03.2026. Revised: 14.03.2026. Accepted: 14.05.2026. Published: 18.03.2026.

---

## **Beyond “Epicondylitis”: Integrating Mechanotransduction and Health Literacy into the Management of Lateral Elbow Tendinopathy**

Witold Kądziołka, Medical University of Silesia, ul. Poniatowskiego 15, 40-055 Katowice, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6952-0054>

witold.kadziolka1@gmail.com

Karolina Borówka, Medical University of Silesia, ul. Poniatowskiego 15, 40-055 Katowice, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-5669-1491>

s85616@365.sum.edu.pl

Piotr Górka, Medical University of Silesia, ul. Poniatowskiego 15, 40-055 Katowice, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1044-8952>

s82797@365.sum.edu.pl

Szymon Domagała, Medical University of Silesia, ul. Poniatowskiego 15, 40-055 Katowice, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-7989-2942>

s82757@365.sum.edu.pl

Paulina Tymińska, Medical University of Silesia, ul. Poniatowskiego 15, 40-055 Katowice, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5624-1599>

s86287@365.sum.edu.pl

Julia Frączek, Medical University of Silesia, ul. Poniatowskiego 15, 40-055 Katowice, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0239-6824>

s82577@365.sum.edu.pl

Zuzanna Wiater, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-6637-1188>

[zuzia.wiater@gmail.com](mailto:zuzia.wiater@gmail.com)

Karolina Brankowska, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0000-2486-1583>

[karolinabrankowska@gmail.com](mailto:karolinabrankowska@gmail.com)

Marta Jakubowska, Medical University of Lodz, al. Tadeusza Kościuszki 4, 90-419, Łódź

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-4316-7664>

[jakubowska.marta01@gmail.com](mailto:jakubowska.marta01@gmail.com)

Michał Olejnik, Medical University of Warsaw, Żwirki i Wigury 61, 02-091 Warsaw, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0009-0007-7664-600X>

[molej2001@gmail.com](mailto:molej2001@gmail.com)

Corresponding author: Witold Kądziołka, Medical University of Silesia, ul. Poniatowskiego 15, 40-055 Katowice, Poland, e-mail: [witold.kadziolka1@gmail.com](mailto:witold.kadziolka1@gmail.com)

## **ABSTRACT**

**Background:** Lateral elbow tendinopathy (LET) is a prevalent musculoskeletal disorder characterized by pain and functional impairment at the common extensor origin. This narrative review explores the critical paradigm shift from the historical inflammatory "epicondylitis" model to a modern mechanobiological framework. **Objective:** To synthesize current evidence-based perspectives on the pathophysiology, diagnosis, and management of LET, emphasizing the optimization of quality of care through active loading protocols. **Evidence Synthesis:** Pathophysiological understanding has evolved from an inflammatory model to one of tendinosis, characterized by angiofibroblastic hyperplasia and a failed healing response. Clinical diagnosis relies on provocative maneuvers and objective measures, specifically Pain-Free Grip Strength (PFGS) and the Patient-Rated Tennis Elbow Evaluation (PRTEE), to ensure diagnostic quality and monitor therapeutic efficacy. A critical appraisal of passive interventions, such as corticosteroid injections and NSAIDs, highlights their limitations and potential for long-term clinical failure. In contrast, mechanotransduction-driven active protocols—including isometric loading for acute analgesia and Heavy Slow Resistance (HSR) training for structural remodeling—represent the modern gold standard. Furthermore, the integration of a biopsychosocial framework and the enhancement of patient health literacy are essential for addressing nociplastic pain and ensuring sustainable functional reintegration. **Conclusions:** Effective management of LET requires a structured, criterion-based transition to active management, prioritizing therapeutic loading over passive symptom masking to maximize long-term musculoskeletal health and minimize recurrence.

**Key words:** Lateral Elbow Tendinopathy, Mechanotransduction, Angiofibroblastic Hyperplasia, Heavy Slow Resistance, Biopsychosocial Model, Patient-Rated Tennis Elbow Evaluation (PRTEE)

## **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

LET – Lateral Elbow Tendinopathy

PFGS – Pain-Free Grip Strength

PRTEE – Patient-Rated Tennis Elbow Evaluation

HSR – Heavy Slow Resistance

MCID – Minimal Clinically Important Difference

NSAIDs – Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs

CSI – Corticosteroid Injections

US / MSK US – Ultrasound / Musculoskeletal Ultrasound

MRI – Magnetic Resonance Imaging

ESWT – Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy

MVC – Maximum Voluntary Contraction

QoL / QOL – Quality of Life

PLRI – Posterolateral Rotatory Instability

NPRS – Numeric Pain Rating Scale

TEFS – Tennis Elbow Function Scale

MeSH – Medical Subject Headings

## **1. Introduction: The Clinical Burden of Lateral Elbow Pain**

### **1.1. Epidemiology and Impact**

Lateral elbow tendinopathy (LET) remains a predominant cause of musculoskeletal morbidity in the upper extremity, characterized by chronic pain and functional impairment localized to the common extensor origin. Epidemiological investigations continue to indicate a stable annual prevalence of 1% to 3% within the general population, although this figure escalates significantly in occupational cohorts requiring repetitive forearm activities (1). The peak incidence is consistently observed between the fourth and fifth decades of life, suggesting a correlation between cumulative mechanical stress and age-related tissue vulnerability (2). Beyond the clinical presentation, the socioeconomic burden of LET is substantial, manifesting as a leading cause of prolonged workplace absenteeism and diminished productivity in manual and sedentary professional sectors alike (1, 2). The recalcitrant nature of the condition, with

symptoms often persisting beyond twelve months in a significant subset of patients, necessitates a standardized, high-quality diagnostic and therapeutic framework (3, 25, 26).

## **1.2. The Nomenclature Debate**

The academic transition from the misnomer "lateral epicondylitis" to "lateral elbow tendinopathy" reflects a profound evolution in the clinico-pathological understanding of the disease. For much of the twentieth century, the condition was conceptualized as an acute or chronic inflammatory process, justifying the widespread clinical reliance on anti-inflammatory modalities (4). However, contemporary histopathological analyses have definitively refuted the presence of a primary inflammatory cell infiltrate in chronic LET lesions, instead revealing a signature of "angiofibroblastic hyperplasia" (5). This degenerative state is characterized by the disordered arrangement of collagen fibers, an increase in non-functional ground substance, and pathological neovascularization (4, 5). Consequently, the adoption of the term tendinopathy signifies a paradigm shift toward a mechanobiological model, acknowledging the pathology as a failed healing response of the tendon matrix under repetitive strain (4, 5).

## **1.3. Study Objective**

Despite the emergence of high-level evidence supporting the degenerative nature of LET, clinical practice often remains anchored in antiquated, passive treatment modalities. This narrative review seeks to synthesize the current evidence-based landscape regarding the management of lateral elbow tendinopathy, with a rigorous focus on optimizing the quality of care through the implementation of active loading protocols. By analyzing recent meta-analyses and clinical practice guidelines, this article evaluates the efficacy of modern interventions such as mechanotransduction-based rehabilitation and regenerative medicine (3, 6, 25). The ultimate objective is to provide the clinician with a structured, evidence-driven pathway to enhance functional outcomes, minimize recurrence rates, and standardize the criteria for a safe return to athletic and occupational activities (6).

## **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### **2.1. Search Strategy and Data Sources**

This narrative review focuses on the clinico-pathological evolution and contemporary management of lateral elbow tendinopathy (LET). The analysis was based on a comprehensive

search of the PubMed, Scopus, and Cochrane Library databases to identify high-level evidence, including systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and clinical practice guidelines. Additionally, prestigious publishing platforms and journals such as The New England Journal of Medicine, The Lancet Rheumatology, Nature Reviews Disease Primers, British Journal of Sports Medicine (BJSM), and Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy (JOSPT) were explored to enhance the quality and academic rigor of this synthesis.

The following MeSH terms and keywords were used in the search: “Lateral elbow tendinopathy”, “Lateral epicondylitis”, “mechanotransduction”, “tendinosis”, “angiofibroblastic hyperplasia”, “Heavy Slow Resistance (HSR)”, “isometric loading”, “central sensitization”, and “nociplastic pain”.

## **2.2. Study Selection and Inclusion Criteria**

A total of 24 articles published between 2011 and 2025 were included. No strict time limit was set, but the selection prioritized the last decade to ensure the integration of the most current clinical standards. The aim was to provide a full and clear picture of the clinico-pathological evolution of LET by including foundational research on mechanotransduction as well as recent findings on nociplastic pain. Only studies conducted on humans and published in English were considered. Research focusing on non-peer-reviewed data or lacking validated clinimetric outcomes (e.g., PRTEE, PFGS) was excluded.

### **Study Selection and Screening Process**

- **Identification (n = 39):** Records identified via PubMed, Scopus, Cochrane Library, and high-impact publishing platforms (including NEJM, The Lancet Rheumatology, Nature Reviews Disease Primers, BJSM, and JOSPT).
- **Screening (n = 24):** Records after title/abstract screening and applying exclusion criteria.
- **Excluded (n = 15):**
  - 2 articles: Language barrier (publications in languages other than English).
  - 9 articles: Studies focusing on basic science or animal models with limited direct clinical applicability to human rehabilitation protocols.

- 4 articles: Absence of peer-review validation or standardized clinimetric assessment tools (e.g., PRTEE/PFGS), precluding objective evaluation of therapeutic efficacy.

- **Eligibility (n = 24):** Full-text articles assessed for eligibility.

- **Included (n = 24):** Final studies analyzed.

The studies were selected through a systematic, multi-step procedure in accordance with a structured framework based on PRISMA methodology.

### **3. PATHOPHYSIOLOGY: BEYOND INFLAMMATION**

#### **3.1. The Histopathological Landscape: Angiofibroblastic Hyperplasia**

The contemporary understanding of lateral elbow tendinopathy (LET) has undergone a fundamental transition, shifting from an antiquated inflammatory model toward a paradigm of failed homeostatic repair and tissue degeneration. Histological investigations consistently demonstrate that chronic LET is characterized by "angiofibroblastic hyperplasia," a pathological state involving the disorganized proliferation of fibroblasts and vascular elements within the common extensor origin (5). Microscopic examination reveals the replacement of highly organized, parallel Type I collagen fibers with immature Type III collagen and a significant increase in non-collagenous ground substance, particularly proteoglycans (5, 6). This structural disarray facilitates the loss of hierarchical tendon architecture, thereby reducing the mechanical load-bearing capacity and perpetuating a cycle of repetitive microtrauma and maladaptive repair (6).

#### **3.2. The Tendon Continuum Model**

The clinical progression of the disease is best elucidated through the "Tendon Continuum Model," which delineates the pathology into three distinct yet fluid stages: reactive tendinopathy, tendon disrepair, and degenerative tendinopathy (7). In the reactive phase, typically precipitated by an acute increase in mechanical load, the tendon exhibits a non-inflammatory proliferative response in the matrix and cells as a compensatory mechanism to distribute stress and increase its cross-sectional area (4, 7). If the pathological loading persists without adequate recovery, the tendon progresses to the stage of disrepair, marked by greater matrix breakdown and disordered fibroblast activity (4). The terminal stage, degenerative

tendinopathy, is characterized by extensive areas of cell death and matrix exhaustion, leaving the tendon structurally compromised and significantly increasing the risk of macroscopic failure or tearing (4, 7).

### **3.3. Neurobiology and Nociceptive Mechanisms**

The absence of a primary inflammatory cell infiltrate necessitates an alternative explanation for the profound clinical pain associated with lateral elbow tendinopathy. Recent evidence suggests a complex interplay between peripheral structural alterations and central neural adaptations. Peripheral nociception is partly mediated by neoinnervation, a process where unmyelinated sensory nerve fibers accompany pathological neovascularization within the degenerated tendon matrix (8). These fibers facilitate the local release of biochemical mediators, such as glutamate and substance P, which hypersensitize the local environment and lower the mechanical pain threshold (5, 8). However, persistent peripheral input often culminates in nociplastic pain, a state characterized by altered nociceptive processing in the central nervous system despite evidence of healing in the peripheral tissues (9). This phenomenon of central sensitization involves an increased responsiveness of central neurons to normal or sub-threshold afferent inputs, resulting in widespread mechanical hyperalgesia and a frequent discordance between structural tendon recovery and clinical symptom severity (9). Integrating this nociplastic perspective into clinical practice is essential for optimizing treatment quality, shifting the focus from isolated tendon repair to the comprehensive modulation of central pain pathways (5, 9).

## **4. DIAGNOSTIC QUALITY AND CLINICAL ASSESSMENT**

### **4.1. Differential Diagnosis**

The diagnostic quality in managing lateral elbow pain depends fundamentally on the clinician's ability to distinguish lateral elbow tendinopathy (LET) from a spectrum of masquerading pathologies (3, 10). Given that chronic LET is frequently associated with nociplastic changes and central sensitization, the clinical presentation may involve a significant clinico-pathological overlap with neurogenic or intra-articular disorders (9). A primary differential consideration is radial tunnel syndrome, characterized by compression of the posterior interosseous nerve, which is typically differentiated from LET by pain localized 3 to 4 cm distal to the lateral epicondyle and positive findings during resisted supination or middle

finger extension (10, 11). Additionally, cervical radiculopathy, specifically involving the C6 or C7 nerve roots, must be excluded through a comprehensive neurological screening and the Spurling test, as proximal neural irritation can manifest as referred pain in the lateral elbow region (11). Other intra-articular mimics, such as posterolateral rotatory instability (PLRI) and synovial plica syndrome, must be evaluated through specific provocative maneuvers to ensure the diagnostic yield and the high quality of subsequent orthopedic interventions (5, 11). The clinical features distinguishing LET from its diagnostic mimics are summarized in Table 1.

<b>Pathology</b>	<b>Key Clinical Features</b>	<b>Diagnostic Tests / Findings</b>
<b>Lateral Elbow Tendinopathy (LET)</b>	Pain localized strictly at the lateral epicondyle; aggravated by resisted wrist extension.	Positive Cozen's and Mill's tests; pain-free grip strength (PFGS) deficit.
<b>Radial Tunnel Syndrome</b>	Pain localized 3–4 cm distal to the epicondyle (mobile wad); deep aching sensation.	Pain during resisted supination or resisted middle finger extension.
<b>Cervical Radiculopathy (C6-C7)</b>	Referred pain in the lateral forearm; possible paresthesia in the thumb/index finger.	Positive Spurling's test; diminished brachioradialis reflex; neck pain.
<b>Posterolateral Rotatory Instability (PLRI)</b>	Sensation of "giving way" or snapping; vague lateral elbow pain.	Positive Lateral Pivot-Shift Test; pain during pushing up from a chair.

<b>Synovial Plica Syndrome</b>	Snapping or clicking during elbow extension; pain at the posterior aspect of the radiohumeral joint.	Focal tenderness over the radiohumeral joint line; positive flexion-pronation test.
--------------------------------	--	---

Table 1: Differential Diagnosis of Lateral Elbow Pain

#### 4.2. Objective Measures

To move beyond subjective symptom reporting and ensure measurable quality in clinical outcomes, the integration of validated objective measures is mandatory (3, 11). The Patient-Rated Tennis Elbow Evaluation (PRTEE) is currently regarded as the gold standard patient-reported outcome measure, offering superior reliability and sensitivity to clinical change in both pain and functional disability (3, 10). Furthermore, Pain-Free Grip Strength (PFGS) serves as a critical performance-based outcome measure for quantifying tendon load-bearing capacity (5, 11). Research indicates that PFGS provides a more accurate reflection of functional impairment than maximum voluntary contraction, as it directly identifies the mechanical threshold at which nociceptive input is triggered (5, 11). Establishing a baseline PFGS allows for the determination of the Minimal Clinically Important Difference (MCID), which for the PRTEE total score is reported to be approximately 11 to 15 points, serving as a vital metric in assessing therapeutic efficacy (11, 12).

#### 4.3. The Role of Imaging

While LET remains predominantly a clinical diagnosis based on history and provocative maneuvers such as Cozen’s and Mill’s tests, imaging serves as a vital adjunct for confirming structural pathology and refining the prognosis in recalcitrant cases (10, 11). Musculoskeletal ultrasound (US) is the primary imaging modality due to its capacity for dynamic assessment and its ability to identify the hallmarks of tendinosis, including focal hypoechoogenicity, tendon thickening, and neovascularization (4, 10). Recent advancements in imaging highlight that structural abnormalities identified via US or Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI), such as high T2 signal intensity within the common extensor origin, must be correlated strictly with clinical findings (11). This is necessitated by the fact that asymptomatic individuals frequently exhibit

similar radiological degenerations, meaning that imaging findings alone do not establish a diagnosis (5, 10). Within the framework of the tendon continuum model, imaging remains a supportive tool to identify the extent of matrix disrepair or degeneration, thereby optimizing the quality of the selected loading protocol (7, 11).

## **5. CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF PASSIVE INTERVENTIONS (THE "OLD" SCHOOL)**

### **5.1. Corticosteroid Injections: The Paradox of Symptomatic Relief**

Local corticosteroid injections (CSI) have been a clinical mainstay for decades, valued primarily for their ability to provide rapid, potent analgesia in the acute phase of lateral elbow tendinopathy (13, 14). However, current evidence from high-impact meta-analyses reveals a significant "rebound effect"; while CSI offers superior pain reduction at 4 to 8 weeks, long-term outcomes at 6 to 12 months are consistently inferior compared to "wait-and-see" approaches or physiotherapy (13, 16). The physiological rationale for this failure lies in the non-inflammatory nature of the disease; corticosteroids exert catabolic effects on tenocytes, inhibiting protein synthesis and potentially leading to permanent tendon atrophy or mechanical weakening of the common extensor origin (14, 17). Furthermore, comparative studies demonstrate that modern alternatives, such as extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT), provide more sustainable ultrasonographic and clinical improvements without the structural risks associated with steroid-induced tissue degradation (17).

### **5.2. Pharmacological Limitations: NSAIDs and the Non-Inflammatory Reality**

The routine prescription of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) remains highly prevalent in primary orthopaedic care, yet their role in the management of tendinopathy is increasingly marginalized (13, 19). Given that lateral elbow tendinopathy is histopathologically a tendinosis characterized by failed healing rather than an active inflammatory infiltrate, the anti-inflammatory properties of these agents do not address the primary pathology (14, 15). Systematic reviews indicate that oral and topical NSAIDs may provide small, transient benefits in pain scores for up to 4 weeks, but they demonstrate no disease-modifying capability and do not facilitate matrix remodeling (13, 16). From a quality-of-care standpoint, the prolonged use of NSAIDs is discouraged due to potential gastrointestinal and renal side effects, as well as their lack of efficacy in preventing the progression of chronic degenerative changes (14, 19).

### **5.3. The Risks of Immobilization and Bracing**

Historically, "rest and immobilization" were advocated to offload the common extensor origin; however, current musculoskeletal paradigms emphasize that prolonged unloading is detrimental to tendon health (13, 15). Tendons require specific mechanical stimuli through mechanotransduction to maintain homeostatic matrix synthesis and tensile strength (8). Over-reliance on passive bracing or complete cessation of activity leads to a rapid decline in the tendon's load-bearing capacity and a concomitant deconditioning of the forearm extensor musculature (15, 18). While orthotic devices may provide some symptomatic relief during high-demand activities, systematic overviews highlight that their long-term benefit is inconsistent and they should not be utilized as a substitute for active rehabilitative loading (13, 18). Modern orthopaedic practice prioritizes early activity modification over complete rest to ensure the preservation of tendon quality and functional integrity (14, 19).

## **6. THE MODERN GOLD STANDARD: MECHANOTRANSDUCTION AND LOAD MANAGEMENT**

### **6.1. The Science of Mechanotransduction**

The contemporary management of lateral elbow tendinopathy (LET) has undergone a fundamental shift toward load-driven interventions, predicated on the physiological principle of mechanotransduction (13, 21, 26). Mechanotransduction is the process by which tenocytes convert mechanical stimuli into biochemical signals, thereby promoting the synthesis of Type I collagen and essential proteoglycans within the extracellular matrix (8, 21). In the degenerative environment characteristic of chronic LET, appropriate mechanical strain is mandatory to reverse collagen disarray and matrix exhaustion (14, 21). Controlled loading not only stimulates structural remodeling but also enhances tendon stiffness and the capacity of the tissue to store and release elastic energy (8, 22). Consequently, clinical quality in sports medicine is now defined by the transition from passive "tissue offloading" to "tissue reloading," ensuring that the common extensor origin regains the load-bearing capacity required for athletic and occupational demands (13, 15, 21).

## **6.2. Active Protocols: The Hierarchy of Loading**

### **6.2.1. Isometric Loading: Management of the Acute Nociceptive Phase**

In the reactive or acute-on-chronic stages of LET, isometric loading serves as the primary clinical tool for immediate symptom modulation (14, 22). Unlike dynamic exercises, isometric contractions involving sustained holds allow for the application of high-magnitude loads without the potentially provocative shear forces associated with elbow joint movement (13, 15). The clinical utility of isometrics lies in their documented analgesic effect, which is mediated by the reduction of cortical inhibition and the modulation of the central nervous system's pain processing (9, 14). Utilizing isometric contractions at approximately 70% of maximum voluntary contraction for durations of 30 to 45 seconds facilitates rapid pain relief, providing a "therapeutic window" that allows for the initiation of more aggressive dynamic loading protocols (14, 22).

### **6.2.2. Heavy Slow Resistance (HSR): Building Tendon Load Tolerance**

As the clinical presentation progresses beyond the acute nociplastic phase, Heavy Slow Resistance (HSR) training is utilized to foster durable structural adaptation (15, 22). HSR involves performing isotonic contractions—both concentric and eccentric—under high mechanical loads and at a very slow velocity, typically lasting three to four seconds for each phase of the movement (15, 22). This approach maximizes the "time under tension" for the tenocytes, providing a more robust stimulus for matrix remodeling than traditional high-repetition strengthening (15, 22). HSR is particularly effective in addressing the mechanical deficits of a degenerative tendon, as it progressively restores the tensile strength of the common extensor origin while minimizing the risk of reactive flares through controlled velocity (15, 22).

## **6.3. Eccentric vs. Isotonic Exercise: Comparative Analysis of Training Strategies**

The debate regarding the superiority of eccentric training versus isotonic protocols remains a central focus of the orthopaedic literature (6, 20). Historically, eccentric strengthening, based on the isolated lengthening of the muscle-tendon unit, was considered the gold standard for all tendinopathies (20). Systematic reviews indicate that while eccentric exercise is significantly more effective than passive interventions, it may not be uniquely superior to isotonic loading which incorporates both concentric and eccentric phases (6, 20). Contemporary evidence suggests that isotonic protocols, particularly HSR, offer broader

functional benefits by addressing the entire range of muscle-tendon unit function and ensuring more comprehensive neuromuscular adaptation (20, 22). Furthermore, isotonic loading often results in higher patient compliance in athletic populations, as it more closely replicates the complex and varied loading patterns required in manual labor and racquet sports (18, 20).

#### 6.4. Return to Sport and Occupational Criteria

The hallmark of a high-quality rehabilitative program is the objective determination of a patient's readiness to resume high-demand activities through rigorous functional criteria (13, 14, 23). A safe return to sport or occupational tasks is indicated when specific thresholds are achieved: first, the restoration of Pain-Free Grip Strength (PFGS) to within 90% of the asymptomatic contralateral limb (11, 12, 23); second, the absence of reactive pain during task-specific provocative loading, such as high-velocity wrist extension (23); and third, a reduction in disability scores on validated measures such as the PRTEE that exceeds the Minimal Clinically Important Difference (MCID) (10, 12). High-quality management must also incorporate a graduated schedule that incrementally introduces the specific volume and intensity of the patient's prior activity to ensure long-term durability of the rehabilitative outcome (13, 23).

To facilitate clinical implementation, the synthesized approach integrating diagnostic thresholds and phase-specific loading protocols is summarized in Table 2.

Stage	Clinical Phase / Objective	Primary Interventions & Assessments	Key Clinical Considerations & Thresholds
<b>Stage 1: Diagnosis &amp; Phenotyping</b>	Confirm LET and identify pain mechanisms.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cozen's and Mill's clinical tests.</li> <li>• Baseline Pain-Free Grip Strength (PFGS).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rule out Radial Tunnel Syndrome and Cervical Radiculopathy (C6/C7).</li> <li>• Screen for central sensitization and kinesiophobia.</li> </ul>
<b>Stage 2a:</b>	Pain modulation and	• <b>Isometric loading:</b>	• <b>Avoid:</b> Aggressive

<b>Management (Reactive Phase)</b>	reduction of cortical inhibition (High Irritability).	30–45s holds, 5 repetitions at 70% MVC.	stretching and provocative eccentric-only protocols. • Focus on analgesia.
<b>Stage 2b: Management (Degenerative Phase)</b>	Matrix remodeling and increasing tissue load tolerance (Low Irritability).	• <b>Heavy Slow Resistance (HSR)</b> or Isotonic strengthening (3s concentric / 3s eccentric).	• Educate on "acceptable pain" during loading ( <b>VAS ≤ 3</b> ). • Emphasize mechanotransduction.
<b>Stage 3: Quality Control &amp; Progression</b>	Monitor recovery trajectory and enhance adherence.	• Weekly tracking of PRTEE scores. • Serial measurement of PFGS improvement.	• Focus on health literacy. • Ensure patient understands the transition from passive to active management.
<b>Stage 4: Return to Function</b>	Determine readiness for full sport or occupational reintegration.	• Final functional capacity evaluation. • Clinimetric verification of success.	• <b>PFGS:</b> > 90% of the contralateral side. • <b>PRTEE:</b> Improvement exceeding the MCID (> 11 points).

Table 2. Evidence-Based Clinical Management Algorithm for Lateral Elbow Tendinopathy (LET)

## **7. QUALITY OF CARE: PATIENT EDUCATION AND BIOPSYCHOSOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**

### **7.1. The Biopsychosocial Framework and Nociceptive Pain Management**

The optimization of quality in the management of lateral elbow tendinopathy (LET) necessitates a transition from a purely structural-biomechanical model to a comprehensive biopsychosocial approach (13, 14). Contemporary evidence indicates that chronic lateral elbow pain is a multidimensional phenomenon where non-structural factors, including psychological distress, kinesiophobia, and nociceptive pain mechanisms, play a critical role in symptom persistence (9). Research suggests that patients manifesting high levels of baseline anxiety and maladaptive coping strategies exhibit inferior functional prognoses, independent of the structural severity identified in diagnostic imaging (9, 19). Integrating a biopsychosocial risk assessment into the clinical workflow allows for a more personalized rehabilitative pathway, which is essential for reducing the incidence of chronic disability and enhancing the overall quality of the orthopaedic intervention (14, 18).

### **7.2. Enhancing Health Literacy and Clinical Education Quality**

Clinical education serves as the fundamental driver of patient adherence to active loading protocols, which is the primary determinant of long-term therapeutic success (13, 24). A significant challenge in modern musculoskeletal care is the low readability and accessibility of patient education materials; recent analyses indicate that resources provided by leading orthopaedic institutions are often drafted at a linguistic level that exceeds the average patient's health literacy, thereby limiting their effectiveness (24). High-quality care requires the implementation of transparent, evidence-based communication strategies that focus on debunking the "inflammation myth" and explaining the physiological process of mechanotransduction (21, 24). Ensuring that the patient understands that discomfort during therapeutic exercise does not signify further tissue damage, but rather a necessary stimulus for tendon remodeling, significantly increases compliance and improves clinical outcomes (19, 24).

### **7.3. Long-term Prevention and Quality of Life (QoL) Metrics**

The ultimate marker of quality in the treatment of LET is the sustainability of the clinical result and the objective improvement in the patient's quality of life (13, 19). Long-term success

is predicated on the integration of task-specific conditioning and ergonomic modifications, such as the optimization of racket grip dimensions or the adjustment of professional workstations to minimize repetitive mechanical strain on the common extensor origin (21, 22). Furthermore, clinical assessment should extend beyond pain scores to include validated Quality of Life (QoL) metrics, ensuring that the patient has achieved full reintegration into their social, professional, and recreational roles (12, 19). High-quality management concludes with the provision of a durable self-management strategy, empowering the patient to maintain tendon load-bearing capacity and recognize early indicators of reactive tendinopathy to prevent future recurrences (14, 22).

## **8. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES**

### **8.1. Evidence Synthesis and Evolution of the Therapeutic Paradigm**

The contemporary scientific understanding of lateral elbow tendinopathy (LET) has undergone a profound transformation, successfully redefining the condition from an acute inflammatory process to a complex mechanobiological state of failed homeostatic repair (4, 5). This review underscores that the highest quality of clinical care is achieved through a decisive transition from passive modalities to progressive tissue loading (6, 13, 14). High level evidence indicates that corticosteroid injections, despite their immediate analgesic efficacy, exert a deleterious catabolic effect on the structural integrity of the tendon matrix, thereby increasing the risk of chronic recalcitrance and recurrence (13, 16). Integrating the principles of mechanotransduction and the tendon continuum model allows the orthopaedic specialist to precisely calibrate mechanical strain according to the specific histopathological stage of the tissue, which constitutes the foundation of modern musculoskeletal medicine (7, 8, 21, 22).

### **8.2. Implications for Quality of Care in Sports and Occupational Medicine**

The optimization of functional outcomes in the athletic and professional populations necessitates the implementation of objective, validated metrics, including Pain Free Grip Strength (PFGS) and patient reported outcome measures such as the PRTEE (3, 11, 12). From the perspective of sports medicine and occupational health, the quality of a therapeutic intervention is measured not merely by temporary symptom relief but by the durability and safety of the Return to Play or Work (13, 23). The adoption of the biopsychosocial framework and the early identification of central sensitization are essential for avoiding therapeutic failure

in patients manifesting nociplastic pain (9, 14, 18). Furthermore, the quality of clinical education, specifically regarding the clarification of tendon repair mechanisms, is as critical to patient adherence as the technical precision of the exercise protocol itself (19).

### **8.3. Future Directions: Personalization and Regenerative Medicine**

The future of LET management is focused on the increasing personalization of therapeutic pathways and the continued refinement of regenerative medicine techniques. Although current biological therapies, such as platelet rich plasma (PRP) and mesenchymal stem cell applications, remain the subject of academic debate due to heterogenous results in meta-analyses, their targeted use in the degenerative stage of the tendon remains a promising area for further investigation (13, 15, 20). A primary clinical challenge remains the standardization of diagnostic terminology and the development of universal rehabilitative algorithms that integrate biomechanical loading with neurophysiological modulation (18, 21). Future longitudinal research should prioritize the identification of predictive biomarkers to enable the early detection of tendinopathic changes in high risk cohorts prior to the onset of irreversible structural degeneration (14, 22).

### **8.4. Final Conclusions**

In summary, lateral elbow tendinopathy necessitates a radical paradigm shift from traditional, passive symptom masking to a structured, load based model of clinical care. High quality orthopaedic intervention requires the absolute prioritization of mechanotransduction driven protocols, specifically incorporating isometric exercises for acute analgesia and Heavy Slow Resistance training for sustained matrix synthesis (14, 18, 22). Passive treatments, including corticosteroids and systemic NSAIDs, should be relegated to a secondary role, given their documented potential to impede long term tissue quality and escalate the socioeconomic burden of recurrence (13, 16, 17). The integration of the biopsychosocial framework and the enhancement of patient health literacy are no longer optional adjuncts but prerequisites for achieving sustainable functional recovery and professional reintegration (14, 19, 24, 25). Ultimately, the successful management of both the athletic and occupational patient depends upon the specialist's ability to bridge the gap between advanced tendon science and individualized, criterion based clinical practice, thereby ensuring the highest standards of quality in sports medicine and long term musculoskeletal health (13, 23).

## **Disclosure**

### **Authors' Contributions:**

Conceptualization, WK and KBo; methodology, JF and PG; investigation, WK, ZW, and SD; data curation, PG and MO; writing – original draft preparation, WK and KBo; writing – review and editing, JF, KBr, MJ, and PG; supervision, PT. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

### **Funding**

This research received no external funding.

### **Institutional Review Board Statement**

Not applicable

### **Informed Consent Statement**

Not applicable

### **Availability of Data and Materials**

This review is based on previously published studies. No new datasets were generated or analyzed.

### **Conflict of Interest**

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

### **Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process**

In the development of this manuscript, generative AI was employed to assist with translation, linguistic editing, structural organization, and the standardization of references according to AMA guidelines. Subsequent to this, a rigorous manual evaluation was performed by the authors to verify all scientific data and conclusions. The authors hold full accountability for the final text, ensuring that the synthesis remains strictly aligned with the evidence-based, peer-reviewed research discussed throughout this review.

## REFERENCES

1. Shiri R, Viikari-Juntura E. Lateral and medial epicondylitis: role of occupational factors. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol*. 2011;25(1):43-57. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.berh.2011.01.013>
2. Sanders TL Jr, Maradit Kremers H, Bryan AJ, et al. The epidemiology and health care burden of tennis elbow: a population-based study. *Am J Sports Med*. 2015;43(5):1066-1071. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0363546514568087>
3. Coombes BK, Bisset L, Vicenzino B. Management of lateral elbow tendinopathy: one size does not fit all. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*. 2015;45(11):938-949. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2015.5841>
4. Challoumas D, Biddle M, Millar NL. Recent advances in tendinopathy. *Fac Rev*. 2020;9:16. <https://doi.org/10.12703/b/9-16>
5. Millar NL, Silbernagel KG, Thorborg K, et al. Tendinopathy. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2021;7(1):1. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-020-00234-1>
6. Karanasios S, Korakakis V, Whiteley R, Vasilogeorgis I, Woodbridge S, Gioftsos G. Exercise interventions in lateral elbow tendinopathy have better outcomes than passive interventions, but the effects are small: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 2123 subjects in 30 trials. *Br J Sports Med*. 2021;55(9):477-485. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2020-102525>
7. Cook JL, Rio E, Purdam CR, Docking SI. Revisiting the continuum model of tendon pathology: what is its merit in clinical practice and research? *Br J Sports Med*. 2016;50(19):1187-1191. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-095422>
8. Docking SI, Cook J. How do tendons adapt? Going beyond tissue responses to understand positive adaptation and pathology development: a narrative review. *J Musculoskelet Neuronal Interact*. 2019;19(3):300-310.
9. Nijs J, George SZ, Clauw DJ, et al. Central sensitisation in chronic pain conditions: latest discoveries and their potential for precision medicine. *Lancet Rheumatol*. 2021;3(5):e383-e392. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2665-9913\(21\)00032-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2665-9913(21)00032-1)

10. Alanazi SMJ, Sarrafan S, Alanazi AA. Advances in the diagnosis, management, and rehabilitation of lateral epicondylitis: a comprehensive review of recent evidence. *J Pioneering Med Sci.* 2025;14(7):35-39. <https://doi.org/10.47310/jpms2025140707>
11. Lucado AM, Day JM, Vincent JI, et al. Lateral elbow pain and muscle function impairments. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2022;52(12):CPG1-CPG111. <https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2022.0302>
12. Young I, Dunning J, Mourad F, Escaloni J, Bliton P, Fernández-de-Las-Peñas C. Clinimetric analysis of the numeric pain rating scale, patient-rated tennis elbow evaluation, and tennis elbow function scale in patients with lateral elbow tendinopathy. *Physiother Theory Pract.* 2025;41(8):1712-1720. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09593985.2025.2450090>
13. Wolf JM. Lateral epicondylitis. *N Engl J Med.* 2023;388(25):2371-2377. <https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMcp2216734>
14. Ahmed AF, Rayyan R, Zikria BA, Salameh M. Lateral epicondylitis of the elbow: an up-to-date review of management. *Eur J Orthop Surg Traumatol.* 2023;33(2):201-206. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00590-021-03181-z>
15. Karabinov V, Georgiev GP. Lateral epicondylitis: new trends and challenges in treatment. *World J Orthop.* 2022;13(4):354-364. <https://doi.org/10.5312/wjo.v13.i4.354>
16. Kim YJ, Wood SM, Yoon AP, Howard JC, Yang LY, Chung KC. Efficacy of nonoperative treatments for lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Plast Reconstr Surg.* 2021;147(1):112-125. <https://doi.org/10.1097/PRS.00000000000007440>
17. Ibrahim NH, El Tanawy RM, Mostafa AFS, Mahmoud MF. Extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT) versus local corticosteroid injection in treatment of lateral epicondylitis (tennis elbow) in athletes: clinical and ultrasonographic evaluation. *Egypt Rheumatol Rehabil.* 2021;48:32. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s43166-021-00081-2>
18. Di Filippo L, Vincenzi S, Pennella D, Maselli F. Treatment, diagnostic criteria and variability of terminology for lateral elbow pain: findings from an overview of systematic reviews. *Healthcare.* 2022;10(6):1095. <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare10061095>

19. Konarski W, Poboży T. A clinical overview of the natural course and management of lateral epicondylitis. *Orthopedics*. 2023;46(4):e210-e218. <https://doi.org/10.3928/01477447-20230329-05>
20. Chen Z, Baker NA. Effectiveness of eccentric strengthening in the treatment of lateral elbow tendinopathy: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *J Hand Ther*. 2021;34(1):18-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jht.2020.02.002>
21. Stegink-Jansen CW, Bynum JG, Lambropoulos AL, Patterson RM, Cowan AC. Lateral epicondylosis: a literature review to link pathology and tendon function to tissue-level treatment and ergonomic interventions. *J Hand Ther*. 2021;34(2):263-297. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jht.2021.05.005>
22. Landesa-Piñeiro L, Leirós-Rodríguez R. Physiotherapy treatment of lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review. *J Back Musculoskelet Rehabil*. 2022;35(3):463-477. <https://doi.org/10.3233/BMR-210053>
23. Chen D, Lin Z, Liu Y, Zhou H. Diagnosis, treatment, and prevention of tennis elbow. In: *Second International Conference on Biological Engineering and Medical Science (ICBioMed 2022)*. Vol 12611. SPIE; 2023:1261138. <https://doi.org/10.1117/12.2669337>
24. Miskiewicz M, Capotosto S, Wang ED. Evaluation of readability of patient education materials on lateral epicondylitis (tennis elbow) from the top 25 orthopedic institutions. *JSES Int*. 2023;7(5):877-880. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jseint.2023.05.006>
25. Dziegciarczyk A, Banyś F, Wiak I, et al. Approaches to treating tennis elbow: surgical vs. conservative treatment. *Quality in Sport*. 2024;34:56235. <https://doi.org/10.12775/QS.2024.34.56235>
26. Łukawski A, Szałajska J, Wojtach K, et al. Treating chronic tendinopathy: physical therapy, surgery and other form of therapy. *Quality in Sport*. 2024;29:55586. <https://doi.org/10.12775/QS.2024.29.55586>