QUALITY IN SPORT
eISSN 2450-3118 · Open Access · Peer-reviewed
apcz.umk.pl/QS Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń

MLICZEK, Aleksandra, ROCZYŃSKI, Brajan and POLOK, Izabela. Iliotibial Band Syndrome (ITBS) – Etiology, Diagnosis and Physiotherapeutic Management. A Literature Review. Quality in Sport. 2026;65:74229. https://doi.org/10.12775/QS.2026.65.74229

ARTICLE TIMELINE
Received: 11.07.2026. Revised: 03.08.2026. Accepted: 03.08.2026. Published: 10.08.2026.

The journal has been awarded 20 points in the parametric evaluation by the Polish Ministry of Higher Education and Science (Annex to the announcement of 05.01.2024, No. 32553). Unique Journal 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).

Iliotibial Band Syndrome (ITBS) – Etiology, Diagnosis and Physiotherapeutic Management. A Literature Review

Authors:

Aleksandra Mliczek

ORCID https://orcid.org/0009-0000-9883-3307

E-mail al.mliczek@gmail.com

University Clinical Hospital in Poznań

49 Przybyszewskiego Street, 60-355 Poznań, Poland

Brajan Roczyński

ORCID https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9705-4557

E-mail brajan.roczynski@wp.pl

University Clinical Hospital in Poznań

49 Przybyszewskiego Street, 60-355 Poznań, Poland

Izabela Polok

ORCID https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6029-165X

E-mail izapolok999@gmail.com

University Clinical Hospital in Poznań

49 Przybyszewskiego Street, 60-355 Poznań, Poland

Corresponding author:

Aleksandra Mliczek, al.mliczek@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Iliotibial band syndrome (ITBS) is a leading cause of lateral knee pain in endurance athletes, with an incidence of 5-14% among runners. Long regarded as a "friction syndrome" caused by the band sliding over the lateral femoral epicondyle, this model has been increasingly challenged by anatomical and imaging studies, with direct consequences for clinical management.

Aim: To systematize current knowledge on the etiology, clinical presentation, diagnosis and therapeutic management of iliotibial band syndrome, based on available literature.

Material and methods: A narrative review was conducted based on original studies, systematic reviews and clinical overviews addressing the anatomy, biomechanics, etiology, diagnosis, and conservative and surgical management of ITBS.

Results: Cadaveric and imaging studies show the band is firmly tethered to the femur, contradicting the friction theory and supporting a compression-based mechanism affecting an innervated fat pad. ITBS is an overuse injury linked to training errors, altered hip/knee kinematics and hip abductor weakness, though causality for the latter remains unresolved. Diagnosis is mainly clinical, based on history and tenderness over the epicondyle, with the Noble and Ober tests as supportive tools; MRI and ultrasound are reserved for atypical cases.

Management progresses from relative rest, through hip- and kinetic-chain physiotherapy as the mainstay, to physical modalities and, rarely, injection or surgery.

Conclusions: Understanding of ITBS has shifted from a friction- to a compression-based model, favoring hip and kinetic-chain strengthening over ITB stretching. Diagnosis remains clinical, with imaging as confirmatory. The causal role of hip weakness, inconsistent biomechanical findings, and the relevance of distal structures like the gastrocnemius warrant further research.

Keywords: iliotibial band syndrome, ITBS, runner's knee, iliotibial band, knee overuse injury, sports physiotherapy

1. Introduction

Lateral knee pain is a frequent complaint among physically active people, and iliotibial band syndrome (ITBS) is consistently reported as one of its leading causes, particularly in endurance athletes such as long-distance runners, cyclists and triathletes. It is the most common injury of the lateral side of the knee in runners, with an incidence estimated to be between 5% and 14% [1].

The iliotibial band (ITB) is a thick, longitudinally oriented band of connective tissue running along the lateral aspect of the thigh, whose anatomy and biomechanical role are described in detail in Section 2. Disruption of its normal biomechanics, combined with repetitive cyclic loading, can lead to the painful symptoms typical of ITBS [1].

Despite its clinical familiarity, ITBS remains a condition whose underlying mechanism is not fully settled. For many years, clinicians and researchers described it as a “friction syndrome”, but over the last two decades this label has been increasingly questioned in light of anatomical dissection studies and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) work [2]. This shift in understanding has direct consequences for how the condition is explained to patients and how rehabilitation programs are designed, since interventions historically justified by the friction model—such as aggressive stretching of the band—may not be biomechanically appropriate if the pathomechanism is, in fact, one of tissue compression [2].

The aim of this paper is to systematize current knowledge regarding the etiology, clinical presentation, diagnosis and therapeutic management of iliotibial band syndrome, based on available scientific literature.

2. Anatomy and Biomechanics of the Iliotibial Band

The iliotibial band is a thick, longitudinally oriented band of dense fibrous connective tissue that represents a thickened lateral portion of the fascia lata, extending from the region of the iliac crest to the proximal tibia [2,3]. Proximally, it receives fibers from two muscles arranged in series: the tensor fasciae latae anteriorly and part of the gluteus maximus posteriorly [2]. Distally, its most consistently described insertion is at Gerdy's tubercle on the anterolateral tibia, although anatomical studies have also documented additional attachment sites, including fibers extending to the patella, to the lateral femoral condyle region and to the lateral intermuscular septum along the linea aspera [2,3].

Functionally, the band is understood to act as a passive stabilizer of the hip and knee in the frontal plane [2]. This frontal-plane role is anatomically plausible because the ITB crosses both joints and is loaded by tensor fasciae latae and gluteus maximus, so its stabilizing effect depends on limb posture rather than acting as a fixed ligament alone [2,4]. Imaging and anatomy reviews also describe the iliotibial tract and its associated muscles as contributing to hip abduction and knee stabilization, which is consistent with a lateral stabilizing role during gait [5].

3. Etiology and Pathomechanism

The classic theory of ITBS pathomechanism, which has dominated the literature since the 1970s, assumed that the pain symptoms resulted from repetitive friction of the distal portion of the iliotibial band against the lateral femoral epicondyle during knee flexion and extension, within a range of flexion close to 30 degrees. According to this concept, repeated dynamic sliding of the band over the bony prominence was thought to lead to inflammation of the bursa and surrounding tissues [2,6].

However, more recent anatomical studies using cadaveric dissection and imaging techniques challenge this concept. It has been shown that the iliotibial band is firmly attached to the femur by numerous fibrous connections along its entire length, including at the lateral epicondyle, which practically precludes the free sliding motion of the band relative to the bone described by the friction theory [7,8]. An alternative, now more widely accepted concept suggests that the source of pain is compression of a richly innervated and vascularized layer of fat and connective tissue located between the band and the epicondyle, which undergoes alternating tension and compression during movement [7,8].

Regardless of the exact tissue-level mechanism, ITBS is generally considered an overuse injury resulting from the accumulation of repetitive microtrauma under conditions of insufficient tissue recovery [9,10]. Contributing factors include weakness of the hip abductor and external rotator muscles, excessive hip adduction and internal rotation of the lower limb during the stance phase of gait and running, as well as training errors, including too rapid an increase in training intensity or volume [11,12].

4. Risk Factors

4.1. Training-related risk factors

Training errors are consistently identified as important contributors to ITBS. These include abrupt increases in training volume or intensity, a sudden rise in weekly mileage, running on cambered or sloped surfaces, and a high proportion of downhill running, all of which are thought to increase strain on the ITB or the time spent with the knee flexed near the so-called impingement zone [9,13,14]. Classic epidemiological work on running injuries more broadly identified rapid changes in training habits, footwear, and running surface as recurring themes across multiple categories of overuse injury, including ITBS [15].

4.2. Biomechanical risk factors

A substantial body of biomechanical research has examined gait and running mechanics in individuals with ITBS, with mixed and sometimes contradictory findings. Prospective studies have found that runners who subsequently developed ITBS demonstrated greater peak hip adduction and greater knee internal rotation during running compared with runners who remained asymptomatic, suggesting that excessive frontal- and transverse-plane motion at the hip and knee may increase strain on the iliotibial band [2,16]. However, cross-sectional comparisons of runners with an existing history of ITBS to healthy controls have produced less consistent results, with some studies reporting reduced rather than increased hip adduction in previously affected runners, a pattern that has been interpreted as reflecting a compensatory, pain-avoidance strategy rather than the original causative mechanism [2,17].

A systematic review of biomechanical risk factors associated with ITBS in runners concluded that, while several kinematic variables have been proposed, the overall quality and consistency of the supporting evidence remains limited, and no single biomechanical variable can currently be considered a definitive, isolated cause of the condition [18]. Classic biomechanical work comparing runners with and without ITBS found no significant differences in sagittal-plane running kinematics between affected and unaffected limbs, underlining that the biomechanical picture of ITBS is considerably more complex than sagittal-plane knee motion alone [19].

Hip abductor weakness has traditionally been considered both a cause and a marker of ITBS, and several cross-sectional studies have documented reduced hip abduction strength in runners with the condition [2,20]. However, because all of the supporting evidence to date is cross-sectional, it remains uncertain whether weakness precedes and predisposes to ITBS or develops secondarily, as a consequence of pain-related inhibition of the hip musculature once the syndrome is established; recent authors have argued that the latter explanation is, on balance, more consistent with the available prospective evidence [2].

4.3. Anatomical and other risk factors

Anatomical variables proposed as risk factors include internal tibial torsion, excessive foot pronation, genu varum secondary to medial compartment osteoarthritis, and leg-length discrepancy, all of which are thought to potentially alter the tension transmitted through the iliotibial band during gait [14]. An association has also been described between ITBS and greater trochanteric pain syndrome, attributed to shared alterations in proximal hip biomechanics and tension within the fascial complex spanning the hip and thigh [14]. Because the iliopatellar fibers of the band connect to the lateral patella, patellofemoral pain is also commonly observed alongside ITBS in the same patients [14]. Equipment-related factors, including worn or inappropriate footwear and the absence of individually fitted orthotic inserts, are frequently cited in clinical literature, although the strength of the supporting evidence for these specific factors is generally weaker than for training-load-related variables [9].

5. Clinical Presentation

The hallmark symptom of iliotibial band syndrome (ITBS) is well-localized pain over the lateral aspect of the knee, centered on the lateral femoral epicondyle, roughly two to three centimeters proximal to the joint line [10,21,22]. Onset is characteristically insidious and follows a period of repetitive knee-flexion activity — most often running, but also cycling or other endurance sports — rather than a single traumatic event, and is frequently preceded by an abrupt change in training load, surface, or footwear [13,14].

In the earliest stages, discomfort is activity-dependent: it appears only after a given distance or duration of exercise, forces the athlete to slow down or stop, and then resolves relatively quickly with rest [10,13]. As the condition progresses without adequate management, the pain-free interval shortens, so that discomfort begins earlier in a session, and in more advanced cases it can persist after exercise has stopped and interfere with everyday movements that load the lateral knee, such as descending stairs or squatting [6,10]. Some patients also report a sensation of snapping, clicking, or catching at the lateral knee during repeated flexion–extension, corresponding to the shift in tension between the anterior and posterior fibers of the band described in cadaveric and imaging studies [2,8].

On examination, the most consistent finding is focal tenderness on palpation over the lateral femoral epicondyle or immediately proximal to it, sometimes accompanied by mild soft-tissue swelling or localized warmth in more acutely irritated cases [10,14].

Findings elsewhere in the kinetic chain are also common and clinically informative: many symptomatic runners demonstrate weakness or fatigability of the hip abductors on manual muscle testing, and, in women specifically, current ITBS has been associated in pooled analyses with reduced isometric hip abductor strength and smaller peak hip internal rotation during running compared with uninjured controls [12]. As discussed earlier, the direction of this relationship remains unresolved, so these findings should prompt a broader functional assessment of the hip and pelvis rather than being treated as diagnostic in isolation [6].

6. Diagnosis

ITBS is, in the great majority of cases, a clinical diagnosis, established through a targeted history and physical examination rather than through imaging [22]. The history should specifically probe recent changes in training volume, intensity, surface camber, and footwear, as well as any prior episodes of lateral knee pain, since these details carry more diagnostic weight for ITBS than for most of its differential diagnoses [14].

Two provocative maneuvers are most often used at the bedside. The Noble compression test involves applying firm pressure over the lateral femoral epicondyle while the examiner passively extends the patient's knee from a flexed position; reproduction of the patient's familiar pain at approximately 30 degrees of flexion—the point at which the underlying soft tissue is maximally compressed—is considered a positive finding [22,23]. The Ober test and its modified, knee-extended variant are traditionally used to assess perceived "tightness" of the band by positioning the patient side-lying and observing hip adduction range with the hip extended and abducted [24,25]. However, contemporary anatomical work has shown that neither version of the Ober test is substantially altered by sectioning the iliotibial band itself, which means a positive result more likely reflects restriction at the hip joint capsule or in the gluteal musculature than true shortening of the band, and both provocative tests should therefore be interpreted as supportive rather than definitive [2].

Imaging plays a secondary, confirmatory role and is generally reserved for atypical presentations, cases that fail to respond to an adequate trial of conservative treatment, or situations in which another diagnosis is genuinely being considered [26]. MRI is generally regarded as the more sensitive imaging modality for confirming ITBS in cases where the clinical picture remains unclear. It commonly shows abnormal signal or fluid deep to the distal ITB at the lateral femoral epicondyle, consistent with adjacent soft-tissue inflammation or edema [27–29]. Alongside this signal change, the band itself is frequently reported to appear structurally thickened at this level, with measurable differences compared to asymptomatic controls - though this finding is not universal, and some MRI series describe the soft-tissue abnormality without any corresponding increase in band thickness [27,30–32]. Ultrasound offers a more accessible and considerably less costly alternative to MRI for imaging the distal iliotibial band, and, similarly to MRI, it is capable of measuring band thickness and cross-sectional area with comparable diagnostic relevance [33]. On gray-scale imaging, it can also demonstrate soft-tissue edema or a discrete fluid collection between the band and the lateral femoral epicondyle, mirroring the abnormalities seen on MRI [33]. Where ultrasound offers a genuine advantage over MRI is in its dynamic capability: because the probe can be held in place while the knee is actively moved, the examiner can assess the behavior of the band and the underlying fat pad in real time through flexion and extension, including any abnormal gliding pattern at the epicondyle [34]. This dynamic element has practical value beyond diagnosis alone—a running-provocation protocol, for instance, demonstrated measurable post-run thickening of the band together with increased vascularity in the adipose tissue beneath it, illustrating how ultrasound can be used not only to confirm the diagnosis at rest but also to capture activity-related changes that a single static MRI scan would miss [35].

A structured differential diagnosis remains essential whenever the presentation is atypical in location, chronicity, or response to treatment. Alternative sources of lateral knee pain include lateral meniscal pathology, lateral collateral ligament strain, biceps femoris tendinopathy, patellofemoral pain (which frequently coexists with ITBS through the shared iliopatellar fibers of the band), and stress fracture [36].

7. Therapeutic Management

7.1. Acute phase

Management in the acute, symptomatic phase is aimed primarily at reducing the mechanical and inflammatory load on the lateral knee while the underlying training or biomechanical contributors are addressed. Relative rest from the specific aggravating activity—rather than complete cessation of exercise—is typically the first recommendation, often combined with a temporary switch to lower-impact cross-training such as swimming or stationary cycling with the saddle raised to reduce the degree of knee flexion under load [10,13,14]. Ice applied intermittently to the lateral knee and short courses of oral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory medication are commonly used to control acute pain and swelling, a combination that has long featured in reviews of the condition alongside early activity modification [14,26]. These measures address symptoms rather than the underlying training or biomechanical contributors, and contemporary summaries of the evidence emphasize that they should be regarded as a bridge into active rehabilitation rather than a stand-alone treatment [21].

7.2. Physiotherapy and corrective training

Physiotherapy constitutes the mainstay of definitive management for the large majority of patients with ITBS. Traditional rehabilitation protocols have combined stretching directed at the iliotibial band with strengthening of the hip abductors and external rotators, reflecting the long-standing assumption that a tight, weak proximal complex increases strain on the distal band [13,26]. Given the anatomical and diagnostic limitations already discussed, the evidence base has shifted toward strategies grounded in the current compression-based understanding of the condition, with hip strengthening remaining well supported empirically regardless of whether the underlying weakness is causal or secondary [2,6,12,17,20].

A systematic review of conservative treatment strategies for ITBS concluded that structured exercise programs reliably improve pain and function in affected runners, while noting that the comparative superiority of any single exercise approach over another remains only partly resolved in the current literature [9]. Because running-related injury risk in general reflects the interaction between running biomechanics and hip muscle strength, assessment and correction of proximal control is increasingly framed as part of a broader kinetic-chain approach rather than an isolated knee-focused intervention [11].

Newer biomechanical work supports extending this kinetic-chain view beyond the hip alone. Co-activation of the gastrocnemius alongside the muscles that feed into the iliotibial band has been shown to influence frontal-plane knee kinematics, suggesting that lower-leg and ankle control may also merit attention in more resistant cases [4]. Similarly, because the pattern of muscle activation feeding into the band has been shown to change measurably over the course of a fatiguing run, rehabilitation programs increasingly incorporate fatigue-resistance and neuromuscular control training, rather than maximal-strength work alone, particularly in the later stages of return to running [37]. Stretching retains a place for some patients in early-stage rehabilitation, though it is best regarded as one component of an individualized program rather than a primary corrective strategy [26].

7.3. Physical modalities

A range of adjunctive physical modalities is used alongside structured exercise, generally with a more limited evidence base than for hip- and kinetic-chain-focused rehabilitation. Extracorporeal shockwave therapy has been reported to reduce pain in patients with persistent symptoms and is considered a reasonable adjunct in cases that respond slowly to exercise alone [9]. Manual and myofascial techniques, including massage and self-administered soft-tissue work directed at the lateral thigh, continue to be used clinically, though their effects on pain and function are generally regarded as short-lived and adjunctive rather than corrective [26].

7.4. Invasive and surgical treatment

Invasive and surgical options are reserved for the minority of patients whose symptoms remain refractory after a sustained, well-structured trial of conservative treatment [10,14]. A local corticosteroid injection around the point of maximal tenderness, increasingly delivered under ultrasound guidance for improved accuracy, is typically the first invasive step considered, offering short-term symptomatic relief before more invasive measures are contemplated [14,33]. Surgical management is considered only once non-operative measures, including targeted physiotherapy and, where appropriate, injection therapy, have been exhausted [10,26].

Several surgical techniques have been described in the literature, including open or arthroscopic release or Z-lengthening of the posterior fibers of the distal band and excision of an inflamed bursa where one is present, with reviews of the condition consistently framing surgery as a last-resort option after failed conservative care rather than a routine part of management [10,26]. Because the iliotibial band also functions as an important secondary restraint against anterolateral rotational instability of the knee, surgeons should weigh the theoretical risk of destabilizing the lateral knee against the expected symptomatic benefit of releasing or lengthening the band, particularly in athletes with any pre-existing rotational laxity [38]. Reported outcomes across the various described techniques are generally favorable in case series, with most patients able to return to their prior level of sporting activity, although comparative trials directly ranking the different surgical approaches against one another remain scarce [10].

8. Discussion

The evidence reviewed here converges on one overarching theme: ITBS has shifted, over roughly the last two decades, from a "friction" model to a compression-mediated model affecting a richly innervated fat pad deep to the distal band [2,7,8]. This is not merely semantic—the friction model implied the band itself slides across the epicondyle, which justified aggressive ITB-directed stretching [6,13]; cadaveric evidence that the band is firmly tethered to the femur removes that anatomical basis [2,7,8]. Clinical practice has followed only partially: stretching is still widely taught [13,26], but contemporary reviews increasingly treat it as adjunctive, with hip- and kinetic-chain-focused strengthening as the better-supported primary intervention [2,6,9].

A second unresolved issue is the direction of causality between hip abductor weakness and ITBS. Cross-sectional studies consistently find weaker hip abductors in runners with current ITBS [12,20], but since none of this evidence is prospective, pain-related inhibition following injury onset is an equally plausible explanation as a pre-existing deficit [2]. The one prospective study of future ITBS identified kinematic predictors—greater peak hip adduction and knee internal rotation—rather than strength deficits [16]. This means hip strengthening should be framed to patients as an empirically effective intervention [2,6,9], not necessarily as "correcting the cause".

A third difficulty is the heterogeneity of the biomechanical literature: kinematic risk-factor studies report inconsistent, sometimes contradictory findings, with reduced rather than increased hip adduction in some retrospective cohorts—plausibly a pain-avoidance compensation rather than a primary risk factor [2,17,18]. Differences in study design and in whether sexes are analyzed separately [12] likely contribute, and no single kinematic variable currently functions as a reliable screening tool [18].

The imaging literature is more internally consistent: MRI and ultrasound converge on signal change or fluid deep to the distal band with variable thickening [27–29,31,33], structurally supporting the compression model. Ultrasound's dynamic capability — demonstrating post-run thickening and increased vascularity [35]—adds a temporal dimension MRI lacks and may help clarify whether structural change precedes or follows symptom onset.

Finally, emerging work on structures beyond the hip—gastrocnemius co-activation's effect on frontal-plane knee kinematics [4] and fatigue-related changes in muscle activation during running [37]—suggests the kinetic-chain framing of ITBS may need to extend further down the limb than current hip-centric protocols address, though this remains untested in controlled trials.

Overall, day-to-day management is reasonably well supported — activity modification, hip-focused strengthening, and judicious imaging or injection in refractory cases [6,9,10,14]—while the relative contribution of proximal weakness, distal fatigue, and anatomical variation to the underlying pathomechanism remains incompletely mapped. Prospective cohort studies tracking strength, kinematics, and imaging from before injury onset are the most promising route to closing this gap.

9. Conclusions

Iliotibial band syndrome remains one of the most common causes of lateral knee pain in runners and other endurance athletes, but the model used to explain it has changed substantially: the traditional friction-based account has been superseded by a compression-based model implicating a richly innervated fat pad deep to the distal band [2,7,8]. This shift has direct clinical consequences, most notably a move away from ITB-directed stretching and toward hip abductor and kinetic-chain strengthening as the primary rehabilitative strategy [2,6,9].

Diagnosis remains predominantly clinical, based on a characteristic history of activity-related lateral knee pain and focal tenderness at the lateral femoral epicondyle, with provocative tests such as the Noble compression test and the Ober test serving a supportive rather than definitive role, particularly given evidence that the Ober test does not specifically isolate ITB length [2,22–25]. Imaging, whether MRI or ultrasound, is reserved for atypical or refractory presentations and consistently demonstrates soft-tissue signal change and variable band thickening at the lateral epicondyle, lending structural support to the compression model [27–29,31–34].

Management follows a staged approach: relative rest and symptomatic measures in the acute phase, hip- and kinetic-chain-focused physiotherapy as the mainstay of definitive treatment, adjunctive physical modalities such as extracorporeal shockwave therapy for slower-responding cases, and injection or surgical release reserved for the minority of patients who fail a sustained trial of conservative care [6,9,10,14,26].

Several questions remain unresolved and warrant targeted future research: whether hip abductor weakness is a cause or a consequence of ITBS, since current evidence is exclusively cross-sectional [2,12,20]; why biomechanical risk-factor studies produce such inconsistent findings across prospective, cross-sectional, and retrospective designs [17,18]; and whether extending rehabilitative attention to more distal structures such as the gastrocnemius offers meaningful additional benefit [4,37]. Prospective, adequately powered cohort studies that track strength, kinematics, and imaging findings from before injury onset through recovery are the most promising route to resolving these gaps and to refining evidence-based management of this common but still imperfectly understood condition.

Disclosures

Author's Contribution:

Conceptualization: Aleksandra Mliczek

Methodology: Aleksandra Mliczek, Brajan Roczyński

Validation: Izabela Polok

Formal analysis: Brajan Roczyński, Izabela Polok

Investigation: Izabela Polok

Resources: Aleksandra Mliczek

Data curation: Brajan Roczyński

Writing–original draft: Aleksandra Mliczek

Writing-review and editing: Izabela Polok

Visualization: Aleksandra Mliczek

Supervision: Izabela Polok

Project administration: Aleksandra Mliczek

Funding: This research did not receive external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgements: Not applicable

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

All authors have read and agreed with the published version of the manuscript.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process: In preparing this work, the authors used ChatGPT (OpenAI) for the purpose of language editing and grammar correction only. After using this tool, the authors reviewed and edited the text as needed and accept full responsibility for the substantive content of the publication.

Bibliography

1. Van Der Worp MP, Van Der Horst N, De Wijer A, Backx FJG, Nijhuis-van Der Sanden MWG. Iliotibial Band Syndrome in Runners: A Systematic Review. Sports Med. 2012;42:969–92. http://doi:10.1007/BF03262306

2. Hutchinson LA, Lichtwark GA, Willy RW, Kelly LA. The Iliotibial Band: A Complex Structure with Versatile Functions. Sports Med. 2022;52:995–1008. http://doi:10.1007/s40279-021-01634-3

3. Kaplan EB. The Iliotibial Tract: Clinical and Morphological Significance. J Bone Jt Surg. 1958;40:817–32. http://doi:10.2106/00004623-195840040-00006

4. Chevalier A, Van Overmeire A, Vermue H, Pringels L, Herregodts S, Victor J, et al. Effect of iliotibial band and gastrocnemius activation on knee kinematics. The Knee. 2023;40:238–44. http://doi:10.1016/j.knee.2022.11.025

5. Flato R, Passanante GJ, Skalski MR, Patel DB, White EA, Matcuk GR. The iliotibial tract: imaging, anatomy, injuries, and other pathology. Skeletal Radiol. 2017;46:605–22. http://doi:10.1007/s00256-017-2604-y

6. Geisler PR. Current Clinical Concepts: Synthesizing the Available Evidence for Improved Clinical Outcomes in Iliotibial Band Impingement Syndrome. J Athl Train. 2021;56:805–15. http://doi:10.4085/1062-6050-548-19

7. Fairclough J, Hayashi K, Toumi H, Lyons K, Bydder G, Phillips N, et al. Is iliotibial band syndrome really a friction syndrome? J Sci Med Sport. 2007;10:74–6. http://doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2006.05.017

8. Fairclough J, Hayashi K, Toumi H, Lyons K, Bydder G, Phillips N, et al. The functional anatomy of the iliotibial band during flexion and extension of the knee: implications for understanding iliotibial band syndrome. J Anat. 2006;208:309–16. http://doi:10.1111/j.1469-7580.2006.00531.x

9. Sanchez-Alvarado A, Bokil C, Cassel M, Engel T. Effects of conservative treatment strategies for iliotibial band syndrome on pain and function in runners: a systematic review. Front Sports Act Living. 2024;6:1386456. http://doi:10.3389/fspor.2024.1386456

10. Strauss EJ, Kim S, Calcei JG, Park D. Iliotibial Band Syndrome: Evaluation and Management: Am Acad Orthop Surg. 2011;19:728–36. http://doi:10.5435/00124635-201112000-00003

11. Venable EN, Seynaeve LA, Beale ST, Gamez Jr. A, Domingo A, Rosenthal MD, et al. Relationships between Running Biomechanics, Hip Muscle Strength, and Running-Related Injury in Female Collegiate Cross-country Runners. Int J Sports Phys Ther. 2022;17. http://doi:10.26603/001c.38017

12. Foch E, Brindle RA, Pohl MB. Lower extremity kinematics during running and hip abductor strength in iliotibial band syndrome: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Gait Posture. 2023;101:73–81. http://doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2023.02.001

13. Fredericson M, Weir A. Practical Management of Iliotibial Band Friction Syndrome in Runners: Clin J Sport Med. 2006;16:261–8. http://doi:10.1097/00042752-200605000-00013

14. Hadeed A, Tapscott DC. Iliotibial Band Syndrome. In: StatPearls [Internet]. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing; 2026 [cited 2026 Jul 8]. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK542185/ PubMed PMID: 31194342.

15. Messier SP, Pittala KA. Etiologic factors associated with selected running injuries. Med Sci Sports Exerc. 1988;20:501–5. PubMed PMID: 3193867. http://doi:10.1249/00005768-198810000-00012 PubMed PMID: 3193867.

16. Noehren B, Davis I, Hamill J. ASB Clinical Biomechanics Award Winner 2006. Clin Biomech. 2007;22:951–6. http://doi:10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2007.07.001

17. Foch E, Reinbolt JA, Zhang S, Fitzhugh EC, Milner CE. Associations between iliotibial band injury status and running biomechanics in women. Gait Posture. 2015;41:706–10. http://doi:10.1016/j.gaitpost.2015.01.031

18. Aderem J, Louw QA. Biomechanical risk factors associated with iliotibial band syndrome in runners: a systematic review. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2015;16:356. http://doi:10.1186/s12891-015-0808-7

19. Orchard JW, Fricker PA, Abud AT, Mason BR. Biomechanics of Iliotibial Band Friction Syndrome in Runners. Am J Sports Med. 1996;24:375–9. http://doi:10.1177/036354659602400321

20. Fredericson M, Cookingham CL, Chaudhari AM, Dowdell BC, Oestreicher N, Sahrmann SA. Hip Abductor Weakness in Distance Runners with Iliotibial Band Syndrome: Clin J Sport Med. 2000;10:169–75. http://doi:10.1097/00042752-200007000-00004

21. Pawlina M, Pawełczak N, Oskroba A, Orzechowska A, Ziętara K, Stawikowski C, et al. Development of diagnosis and treatment in the iliotibial band syndrome. J Educ Health Sport. 2023;13:153–8. http://doi:10.12775/JEHS.2023.13.03.022

22. Peacock J. Iliotibial Band Syndrome. In: Kahn SB, Xu RY, editors. Musculoskeletal Sports and Spine Disorders [Internet]. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2017 [cited 2026 Jul 10]. p. 247–9. Available from: http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-319-50512-1_55 http://doi:10.1007/978-3-319-50512-1_55

23. Sukanya Baruah1 , R.V. Vijayakumar. Cross-Sectional Study to Identify Iliotibial Band Syndrome Causes among Treadmill Runners and Its Impact on Functional Activities. Indian J Physiother Occup Ther - Int J. 2020;14:265–70. http://doi:10.37506/ijpot.v14i1.3484

24. Sharma M, Khan AR, Hussain A. COMPARISON THE PREVALENCE AND ASSOCIATED RISK FACTORS OF ILIOTIBIAL BAND SYNDROME AMONG CYCLISTS AND RUNNERS. A CROSS SECTIONAL STUDY. J Popul Ther Clin Pharmacol. 2023. http://doi:10.53555/jptcp.v30i18.3202

25. Sindagi NS, Bisen RR. Prevalence of iliotibial band tightness in software professionals in north west Pune cross sectional observational study. Int J Community Med Public Health. 2025;12:3951–6. http://doi:10.18203/2394-6040.ijcmph20252835

26. Lavine R. Iliotibial band friction syndrome. Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med. 2010;3:18–22. http://doi:10.1007/s12178-010-9061-8

27. Nishimura G, Yamato M, Tamai K, Takahashi J, Uetani M. MR findings in iliotibial band syndrome. Skeletal Radiol. 1997;26:533–7. http://doi:10.1007/s002560050281

28. Muhle C, Ahn JM, Yeh L, Bergman GA, Boutin RD, Schweitzer M, et al. Iliotibial Band Friction Syndrome: MR Imaging Findings in 16 Patients and MR Arthrographic Study of Six Cadaveric Knees. Radiology. 1999;212:103–10. http://doi:10.1148/radiology.212.1.r99jl29103

29. Murphy BJ, Hechtman KS, Uribe JW, Selesnick H, Smith RL, Zlatkin MB. Iliotibial band friction syndrome: MR imaging findings. Radiology. 1992;185:569–71. http://doi:10.1148/radiology.185.2.1410374

30. Ekman EF, Pope T, Martin DF, Curl WW. Magnetic Resonance Imaging of Iliotibial Band Syndrome. Am J Sports Med. 1994;22:851–4. http://doi:10.1177/036354659402200619

31. Agridag Ucpinar B, Bankaoglu M, Eren OT, Erturk SM. Measurement of iliotibial band diameter in iliotibial band friction syndrome and comparison with an asymptomatic population. Acta Radiol. 2021;62:1188–92. http://doi:10.1177/0284185120958407

32. Park J, Cho HR, Kang KN, Choi KW, Choi YS, Jeong HW, et al. The role of the iliotibial band cross-sectional area as a morphological parameter of the iliotibial band friction syndrome: a retrospective pilot study. Korean J Pain. 2021;34:229–33. http://doi:10.3344/kjp.2021.34.2.229

33. Jiménez Díaz F, Gitto S, Sconfienza LM, Draghi F. Ultrasound of iliotibial band syndrome. J Ultrasound. 2020;23:379–85. http://doi:10.1007/s40477-020-00478-3

34. Jelsing EJ, Finnoff JT, Cheville AL, Levy BA, Smith J. Sonographic Evaluation of the Iliotibial Band at the Lateral Femoral Epicondyle: Does the Iliotibial Band Move? J Ultrasound Med. 2013;32:1199–206. http://doi:10.7863/ultra.32.7.1199

35. Abdelshahed D, Neuman S, Oh-Park M. Dynamic Change in Ultrasonographic Findings in Iliotibial Band Syndrome After Running. Am J Phys Med Rehabil. 2018;97:e13–e13. http://doi:10.1097/PHM.0000000000000760

36. Khaund R, Flynn SH. Iliotibial band syndrome: a common source of knee pain. Am Fam Physician. 2005;71:1545–50. PubMed PMID: 15864895. https://www.aafp.org/afp/2005/0415/p1545

37. Chen SF, Wang Y, Bing F, Zhang M. The effects of alteration in muscle activation on the iliotibial band during an exhaustive run. BMC Sports Sci Med Rehabil. 2023;15:99. https://doi:10.1186/s13102-023-00709-0

38. Van Der Wal WA, Meijer DT, Hoogeslag RAG, LaPrade RF. The Iliotibial Band is the Main Secondary Stabilizer for Anterolateral Rotatory Instability and both a Lemaire Tenodesis and Anterolateral Ligament Reconstruction Can Restore Native Knee Kinematics in the Anterior Cruciate Ligament Reconstructed Knee: A Systematic Review of Biomechanical Cadaveric Studies. Arthroscopy. 2024;40:632. https://doi:10.1016/j.arthro.2023.05.005