

Review Article

Physiotherapy treatment of lateral epicondylitis: A systematic review

Laura Landesa-Martínez^a and Raquel Leirós-Rodríguez^{b,*}

^aFaculty of Physical Therapy, University of Vigo, Pontevedra, Spain

^bSALBIS Research Group, Universidad de León, Nursing and Physical Therapy Department, Spain

Received 19 February 2021

Accepted 12 July 2021

Abstract.

BACKGROUND: Lateral epicondylitis is a tendinopathy with a prevalence of between 1–3% of the population aged 35–54 years. It is a pathology with a favorable evolution, but with frequent recurrences (which imply an economic extra cost).

OBJECTIVE: The objective of this review was to determine the efficacy of physiotherapy treatment for the treatment of epicondylitis and, if any, to identify the most appropriate techniques.

METHODS: A systematic search was carried out in October 2020 in the databases of PubMed, Cinahl, Scopus, Medline and Web of Science using the search terms: *Physical therapy modalities, Physical and rehabilitation medicine, Rehabilitation, Tennis elbow and Elbow tendinopathy.*

RESULTS: Nineteen articles were found, of which seven applied shock waves, three applied orthoses, three applied different manual therapy techniques, two applied some kind of bandage, one applied therapeutic exercise, one applied diacutaneous fibrolysis, one applied high intensity laser, and one applied vibration.

CONCLUSIONS: Manual therapy and eccentric strength training are the two physiotherapeutic treatment methods that have the greatest beneficial effects, and, furthermore, their cost-benefit ratio is very favorable. Its complementation with other techniques, such as shock waves, bandages or Kinesio[®] taping, among others, facilitates the achievement of therapeutic objectives, but entails an added cost.

Keywords: Tennis elbow, physical therapy modalities, rehabilitation, tendinopathy, lateral epicondylitis

1. Introduction

Lateral epicondylitis (LE) is a tendinopathy of the forearm extensor muscles, often caused by overuse or repetitive use (mostly of the extensor carpi radialis brevis), forced extension or direct trauma in the epicondyle [1]. Histologically, it presents signs of tendon degeneration, such as the presence of fibroblasts, vascular hyperalgesia and disorganised collagen [2]. The pain is usually localised in the epicondyle, although in more severe cases it can expand to the shoulder and

wrist, and it is usually triggered by exerting pressure on the epicondyle, resisting wrist and/or third finger extension and stretching of the epicondylar muscles [3]. LE has an approximate rate of 40% and a prevalence of 1–3% of the general population, being most common in the age range of 35–54 years [4,5]. Regarding duration, its natural evolution is considered to be favourable at two years, since it usually relapses after asymptomatic periods. Due to the latter phenomenon, this disorder implies a great economic investment [4].

Different treatment approaches have been proposed, such as the recommendation of rest, drugs, surgery, etc. [6]. The first therapeutic step usually involves rest and the administration of drugs that provide short-term pain relief, but also bad results for the resolution of the problem and for the prevention of relapses [7]. With the

*Corresponding author: Raquel Leirós-Rodríguez, Faculty of Health Sciences s/n Ponferrada 24401, Spain. E-mail: rleir@unileon.es.

Table 1
Search strategy according to the focused question (PICO)

Database	Search equation
PubMed	(“Physical Therapy Modalities”[Mesh]) AND “Tennis Elbow”[Mesh] (“Physical Therapy Modalities”[Mesh]) AND “Elbow Tendinopathy”[Mesh] (“Rehabilitation”[Mesh] AND “Tennis Elbow”[Mesh]) (“Rehabilitation”[Mesh] AND “Elbow Tendinopathy”[Mesh])
Medline	(MH “Physical Therapy Modalities”) AND (MH “Tennis Elbow”) (MH “Physical Therapy Modalities”) AND (MH “Elbow Tendinopathy”) (MH “Rehabilitation”) AND (MH “Tennis Elbow”) (MH “Rehabilitation”) AND (MH “Elbow tendinopathy”)
Cinahl	(MH “Physical Therapy”) AND (MH “Tennis Elbow”) (MH “Physical Therapy”) AND (MH “Elbow tendinopathy”) (MH “Rehabilitation”) AND (MH “Tennis Elbow”) (MH “Rehabilitation”) AND (MH “Elbow tendinopathy”)
Web of science	TOPIC: (‘physical therapy modalities’) AND TOPIC: (‘tennis elbow’) TOPIC: (‘physical therapy modalities’) AND TOPIC: (‘elbow tendinopathy’) TOPIC: (‘rehabilitation’) AND TOPIC: (‘elbow tendinopathy’) TOPIC: (‘rehabilitation’) AND TOPIC: (‘tennis elbow’)
Scopus	(TITLE-ABS-KEY (“Physical Therapy Modalities”) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (“Tennis Elbow”)) AND PUBYEAR > 2014 (TITLE-ABS-KEY (“Physical Therapy Modalities”) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (“Elbow tendinopathy”)) AND PUBYEAR > 2014 (TITLE-ABS-KEY (“rehabilitation”) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (“Tennis Elbow”)) AND PUBYEAR > 2014 (TITLE-ABS-KEY (“rehabilitation”) AND TITLE-ABS-KEY (“Elbow tendinopathy”)) AND PUBYEAR > 2014

surgical approach, immediate pain relief is achieved in 80–97% of cases, although 1.5% of intervened patients underwent a second surgical procedure in the following 18–24 months [8]. Lastly, the physiotherapeutic treatment has been shown to be effective [2] and, in general, it must include manual therapy to relieve the pain and improve the joint’s range of motion (ROM) [6], taking into account that it must be performed under the pain threshold [9]. It is worth highlighting that, in this pathology, as in the rest of tendinopathies, good results are obtained from strengthening the affected area [10]; for example, eccentric training has been reported to decrease pain and improve functionality, since, during exercise: (a) the blood flow in the neovessels of the tendon is temporarily interrupted; (b) a constant mechanical stimulus is generated, which would lead to the remodeling of the tendon, and (c) collagen synthesis increases in damaged tendons [11,12].

The aim of this review was to determine the efficacy of the new physical therapy (PT) techniques for the treatment of LE that have been studied in the last years and identify the most adequate techniques.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Search strategy and information sources

This study was registered on PROSPERO (ID: CRD42021230014) and followed the Preferred Report-

ing Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) reporting guidelines and the recommendations from the Cochrane Collaboration [13,14]. The PICO question was then chosen as follows: P – population: men and women diagnosed with LE; I – intervention: physical therapy techniques; C – control: different physiotherapy and/or pharmacological treatment interventions (platelet-rich plasma, corticosteroids and naproxen); O – outcome: intensity and frequency of pain, range of movement and degrees of functionality and perceived disability, mainly; S – study designs: experimental studies.

A systematic search of publications was conducted in October 2020 in the following databases: PubMed, SpringerLink, SportsDiscus, Medline, Scopus, and Web of Science. The search strategy included different combinations with the following Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) terms: Physical therapy modalities, Physical and rehabilitation medicine, Rehabilitation, Tennis elbow and Elbow tendinopathy. The search strategy according to the focused PICOS question is presented in Table 1.

2.2. Eligibility criteria

After removing duplicates, two reviewers (L.L.-P. and R.L.-R.) independently screened articles for eligibility. In case of disagreement, both reviewers debated until an agreement was reached. For the selection of results, the inclusion criteria established that the articles




Fig. 1. PRISMA flow diagram.

81 must have been published in the last five years (from
82 2015 to the present), that the sample of studies consisted
83 exclusively of patients with LE (regardless of its
84 duration) and that the authors applied a treatment inter-
85 vention that included at least one physical therapy tech-
86 nique. On the other hand, studies were excluded from
87 this review if they had a non-experimental methodology
88 and their full text was not available.

89 2.3. Study selection, data collection process, data 90 items and summary measures

91 After screening the data, extracting, obtaining and
92 screening the titles and abstracts for inclusion criteria,
93 the selected abstracts were obtained in full texts. Tit-
94 les and abstracts lacking sufficient information regard-
95 ing inclusion criteria were also obtained as full texts.
96 Full text articles were selected in case of compliance
97 with inclusion criteria by the two reviewers using a data
98 extraction form. The two reviewers mentioned inde-
99 pendently extracted data from included studies using a
100 customized data extraction table in Microsoft Excel. In

101 case of disagreement, both reviewers debated until an
102 agreement was reached.

103 The following data from the included articles for fur-
104 ther analysis: demographic information (title, authors,
105 journal and year), characteristics of the sample (age,
106 inclusion and exclusion criteria, and number of partici-
107 pants), study-specific parameter (study type, duration
108 of intervention, number of sessions, techniques of phys-
109 ical therapy included in the intervention, follow-up and
110 drop-out) and results obtained. Tables were used to de-
111 scribe both the studies' characteristics and the extracted
112 data. When possible, the results were gathered based on
113 type of intervention applied. The Oxford 2011 Levels
114 of Evidence and the Jadad scale were used to assess the
115 quality of studies.

116 3. Results

117 3.1. Study selection

118 Out of 1955 search results, 458 studies were consid-
119 ered eligible for inclusion after removing duplicates.

120 Among the 458 papers screened, 439 were excluded
121 after abstract and title screening. Kappa score of re-
122 viewer 1 and 2 was 0.187, indicating slight agreement.
123 Of the 19 full-text articles assessed for eligibility, all
124 were finally included in the synthesis, as depicted by
125 the PRISMA flowchart in Fig. 1.

126 3.2. Study characteristics and risk of bias

127 All the studies have been published in the last 5 years
128 (from 2015 to 2020). Of the 19 articles, seven applied
129 extracorporeal shock waves (SW) [15–21], five applied
130 ultrasounds (US) [15,16,19,22,23], five applied conven-
131 tional physiotherapy techniques (thermotherapy [19],
132 electrotherapy [19,21,23], cryotherapy [21], educa-
133 tion [24,25]), six manual therapy [22–24,26–28], seven
134 applied orthoses or taping techniques [21,22,25,28–31],
135 nine applied therapeutic exercises [17,21,22,24,25,28,
136 30–32], and one applied a laser [33]. The methodolog-
137 ical characteristics of the analysed studies are shown
138 in Table 2 and the characteristics of the interventions
139 applied in them are presented in Table 3.3.

140 Regarding the experimental designs, 14 studies were
141 randomized and controlled trials [15–17,21–26,28,
142 30–33] and the remaining five studies were quasi-
143 experimental [18–20,27,29].

144 The methodological quality of the studies was three
145 points or more on the JADAD scale in 52.6% of the
146 studies [17,21–23,25,30,31,33] but was zero in 26.3%
147 of the results [18–20,27,29]. At the same time, as can
148 be seen in Table 2, the level of evidence provided
149 was between I (73.7%) [15–17,21–26,28,30–33] and II
150 (26.3%) [18–20,27,29].

151 3.3. Results of individual studies

152 One of the revised studies evaluated the effect of
153 SW [17] in combination and comparison with a pro-
154 gramme of strength and mobility exercises. The ap-
155 plication of SW was conducted in two stages: in the
156 first stage, the energy density was 0.348 mJ/cm², at
157 5 Hz and 300 pulses; in the second stage, the energy
158 density was 0.372 mJ/cm², at 3.5 Hz and 1200 pulses.
159 Although the authors observed that the pain intensity
160 and degree of disability decreased significantly in both
161 groups, such decrease was greater in the SW group.
162 Moreover, the duration of the sick leave was shorter
163 with SW. However, the grip strength did not improve
164 significantly in any case. In this line, Altun et al. [19]
165 compared the efficacy of SW with a conventional PT
166 treatment (thermotherapy, ultrasound [US] and transcu-

167 taneous electrical nerve stimulation [TENS]). SW were
168 applied to the lateral epicondyle (at 15 Hz, 1.4–1.6 bar
169 and 1500 pulses) and to the extensor muscles (at 21 Hz,
170 1.8 bar and 2000 pulses). This study showed significant
171 improvements in maximum grip strength and function-
172 ality in both groups (with no differences between them).
173 However, the pain intensity and the number of patients
174 with a positive result in the Thomsen and Maudsley
175 tests at one month after the intervention was signifi-
176 cantly lower in the conventional PT group with respect
177 to the SW group. Another study compared the effects
178 of SW on acute and chronic LE (of less than 3 months
179 and over 6 months of evolution, respectively) [18]. Both
180 groups received SW with pulses of 2000 Kg*m/s, at
181 5 Hz and 2.5 bar. The authors reported that both the
182 acute and chronic groups showed significant improve-
183 ments in pain intensity. In the intergroup comparison,
184 initially, the improvement was statistically greater in the
185 chronic patients; then, at 6 months after the interven-
186 tion, the improvement was greater in the acute patients.

187 Two studies were aimed at comparing the effects
188 of US and SW [15,16]. One of them applied the SW
189 sessions divided into two phases: a first phase of 2000
190 pulses, at 8 Hz and 1.5–2.5 bar in the epicondylar re-
191 gion, and a second phase of 2000 pulses, at 8 Hz and
192 2.5–3.5 bar in the extensor carpi radialis brevis [16].
193 The other study applied a total of 2000 pulses at a fre-
194 quency of 10–15 Hz and 1.5–2.5 bar, using ultrasound
195 gel as the means of transmission [15]. The parameters
196 of US application were also different. In one of the
197 studies, the authors applied a first phase with a head of
198 5 cm² around the epicondyle, at 0.5 W/cm² and 1 MHz
199 for 3 minutes through a pulsed application at 50%;
200 in the second phase, the same parameters were used
201 with an application time of 2 minutes [16]. The other
202 study used a transducer continuously in the painful area,
203 with an application area of 1 cm², at 1.5 W/cm² and
204 1 MHz [15]. Both studies obtained significant improve-
205 ments in grip strength [15], elbow functionality [15,16],
206 pain frequency [16], use of analgesics [16] and pain
207 intensity [15,16] with the two therapeutic modes; how-
208 ever, such improvements were statistically greater with
209 SW [15,16], although at 8 weeks the results of both
210 groups were similar [16] or even greater in the US
211 group [15,16].

212 Alessio-Mazzola et al. [20] compared the efficacy of
213 the platelet-rich plasma (PRP) treatment with that of
214 SW. Their intervention with echo-guided SW had a fre-
215 quency of 4 Hz, an intensity compatible with pain toler-
216 ance (initially 0.03–0.07 mJ/mm², which was increased
217 to 0.08–0.13 mJ/mm²) and a dose of 1000 pulses per
218

Table 2
Methodological characteristics of the studies analyzed

Authors	Design	Sample size	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Jadad scale				LE	
					RD*	BD**	WD***	FS		
Alessio-Mazzola et al. (2018)	QES	63	Pain of more than six months of evolution, persistence of pain and functional deterioration refractory to rest, ice and pharmacological therapy. Persistence of symptoms after previous treatments (laser, radiofrequency, ultrasound and electrotherapy). Previous treatments completed more than six months before.	Consumption of simultaneous drug treatment. Carry a pacemaker. History of surgery or trauma to the affected elbow, neurological or musculoskeletal disorders. Diagnosis of systemic diseases, blood disorder, epilepsy or infections. Presence of malformations or open wounds on the affected arm. Pregnant or lactating women.	0	0	0	0	0	II
Altun et al. (2018)	QES	73	Pain of more than six weeks of evolution, age over 18 years, tenderness to palpation anterior and distal to the epicondyle, positive test in resisted wrist extension with the elbow in extension and the forearm in pronation.	Diagnosis of nerve compression syndrome or cervical radiculopathy. History of surgery or trauma to the region. No consent to participate in the study.	0	0	0	0	0	II
Dones III et al. (2018)	QES	23	Positive result in the Cozen, Mill or Maudsley tests.	Physiotherapy treatment of the elbow in the last six months. Presence of orthopedic alterations or paresthesias in the elbow. History of fracture, arthritis, or nerve compression of the elbow. Multiple sclerosis diagnosis.	0	0	0	0	0	II
Dundar et al. (2015)	RCT	93	Pain in the epicondyle of less than three months of evolution. Tenderness to palpation of the epicondyle. Pain on wrist movement and/or third finger extension against resistance. Positive result to Mill's test.	Diagnosis of fibromyalgia, rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis, inflammatory arthropathy, carpal and/or ulnar tunnel syndrome, cervical radiculopathy, neurological deficit, systemic metabolic diseases, cervical and/or shoulder disorders. Previous treatment of epicondylitis. History of surgery, fracture in the elbow. Bilateral elbow pain.	1	1	1	1	3	I
Eraslan et al. (2017)	RCT	45	Diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis of more than three months of evolution, pain in the epicondyle and during the grip strength test, to the wrist extension against resistance or to the passive stretching of the wrist extensors.	Receipt of any other treatment during the study period. Diagnosis of inflammatory, autoimmune, endocrine or kidney diseases, cubital or carpal tunnel syndrome, cervical radiculopathy, arthritis, allergy to bandages or other pathologies in the affected upper limb. History of surgery or trauma to the affected upper limb or corticosteroid treatment in the previous three months.	2	0	1	1	3	I
Furnes et al. (2018)	RCT	45	Diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis. Older than 18 years. Pain at wrist extension and third finger against resistance.	Diagnosis of inflammatory arthritis, deformity in the affected elbow. History of surgery, shock wave treatments or injections in the affected elbow.	1	0	1	1	2	I
Giray et al. (2019)	RCT	30	Pain of less than three months of evolution, presence of pain in the lateral epicondyle, positive result in the Maudsley and/or Mill test. Diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis confirmed by ultrasound.	Diagnosis of cervical spondylosis or radiculopathy, diabetes mellitus, concomitant neuropathy, polyneuropathy, systemic arthritides. History of surgery or trauma to the elbow, injections and/or physical therapy treatment to the elbow. Bandage allergy. Pregnancy.	2	2	1	1	5	I

Table 2, continued

Authors	Design	Sample size	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Jadad scale			LE	
					RD*	BD**	WD***		
Gönen et al. (2017)	RCT	46	Result on the Visual Analogue Scale greater than 6, pain of less than three months of evolution, no previous treatment in the affected area, complete follow-up after receiving the intervention.	Other diagnoses in the cervical spine, upper limbs, vasculitis, infections, malignant diseases, connective tissue, rheumatic, dermatological or neurological. Pregnancy. Anticoagulant treatment. Age under 18 years. Invasive treatments in the previous three months.	2	0	1	3	I
Kachanat et al. (2019)	RCT	40	Pain of more than three months of evolution, limited range of motion of flexion and extension of the wrist and weakness in grip strength.	History of surgery, dislocation, fracture, osteoarthritis, or corticosteroid injection in the elbow.	2	2	1	5	I
Köksal et al. (2015)	QES	54	Diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis.	Diagnosis of local infection, arthritis, or bleeding disorder. Age under 18 years. Pregnancy.	0	0	0	0	II
Kubot et al. (2017)	RCT	60	Result on the Visual Analogue Scale higher than 6, pain of less than three months of evolution, no previous treatment in the affected area in the previous three months, complete follow-up after receiving the intervention.	Other diagnoses in the cervical spine, upper limbs, vasculitis, infections, malignant diseases, connective tissue, rheumatic, dermatological or neurological. Pregnancy. Anticoagulant treatment. Age under 18 years. Invasive treatments in the previous three months.	2	0	0	2	I
López-Celis et al. (2018)	RCT	54	Diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis. Presence of pain of more than three months of evolution. Positive result in the Cozen and/or Mill test. Age over 18 years. Delivery of informed consent for participation in the study.	Diagnosis of other concomitant pathologies in the affected upper limb, of inflammatory processes, contraindications for diacutaneous fibrolysis. History of previous surgery in the affected elbow or of injections in the previous three months in the affected elbow.	2	2	1	5	I
Nishizuka et al. (2016)	RCT	110	Pain of more than a week of evolution and on anterior and distal palpation of the epicondyle. Positive result to the Thomsen test.	Diagnosis of bilateral lateral epicondylitis or osteoarthritis. History of elbow surgery. Previous treatments in the elbow or use of corticosteroids in the previous six months.	2	0	1	3	I
Nowotny et al. (2018)	RCT	31	Result in the Placzek score higher than 4. Delivery of informed consent for participation in the study.	History of surgery or elbow fracture. Diagnosis of rheumatic arthritis, elbow instability, extensor radius tendon rupture, or cervical radiculopathy.	2	0	1	3	I
Olaussen et al. (2015)	RCT	177	Presence of pain at the resisted dorsiflexion of the wrist with the elbow extended, at the resisted extension of the third finger and/or at the radial deviation of the wrist of less than three months of evolution.	Bilateral pain and/or of less than two months of evolution, treatment with corticosteroids and/or physiotherapy during the previous year. History of previous surgery on the elbow. Presence of deformities in the elbow, referred pain in the neck and/or shoulder, fractures or ruptures of tendons of the forearm. Diagnosis of cervical radiculopathy, systemic musculoskeletal diseases, contraindications to corticosteroids, lidocaine or anti-inflammatory drugs. Pregnant or lactating women.	1	0	1	2	I

Table 2. continued

Authors	Design	Sample size	Inclusion criteria	Exclusion criteria	Jadad scale					LE
					RD*	BD**	WD***	FS		
Seo et al. (2018)	QES	20	Diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis.	Diagnosis of orthopedic or nervous system abnormalities affecting the arm or upper limb neuropathy.	0	0	0	0	0	II
Stasopoulos et al. (2016)	RCT	34	Diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis of more than a month of evolution. Pain on palpation of the epicondyle. Positive result in at least two of the following tests: Thomsen test, third finger against resistance, mill, force with grip dynamometer.	Diagnosis of some dysfunction of the shoulder, neck and/or chest, arthritis, neurological deficit, radial nerve entrapment. History of surgery on the elbow or of previous treatments for lateral epicondylitis during the month before the study.	1	2	1	1	4	I
Yalvaç et al. (2018)	RCT	50	Medical diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis, pain of more than three months of evolution, positive tests in wrist extension, third finger extension and passive wrist flexion.	History of elbow surgery and/or elbow or arm fracture. Corticosteroid treatment in the previous month. Diagnosis of cervical radiculopathy, neuropathic entrapment, acute infection or vascular disorder; Carrier of pacemaker or interstitial implant.	2	1	1	1	4	I
Yi et al. (2018)	RCT	34	Pain of less than six months of evolution, age older than 18 years, sensitivity to palpation anterior and distal to the epicondyle, positive result in the resistance wrist extension tests with the elbow in extension and the forearm in pronation. Delivery of informed consent for participation in the study.	Diagnosis of nerve compression syndrome, cervical radiculopathy, pain of less than six weeks of evolution. History of previous surgery or trauma to the elbow.	1	0	1	1	2	I

GD: Gestational diabetes; LE: Level of evidence; LOS: Longitudinal observational study; QES: Quasi-Experimental study; RCT: Randomized controlled trial. *RD: Randomization (1 point if randomization is mentioned; 2 points if the method of randomization is appropriate). **BD: Blinding (1 point if blinding is mentioned; 2 points if the method of blinding is appropriate). ***WD: Whittdrawals (1 point if the number and reasons in each group are stated).

Table 3
 Characteristics of the interventions of the studies analyzed

Authors	Intervention		Time of intervention	Number of sessions (frequency)
	Experimental group	Control group		
Alessio-Mazzola et al. (2018)	Group 1: Extracorporeal shock waves. Group 2: Platelet Rich Plasma injection.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	1 month	Group 1: 4 (weekly). Group 2: 1.
Altun et al. (2018)	Extracorporeal shock waves and CP.	CP (ultrasound and TENS).	3 weeks	3 (weekly).
Dones III et al. (2018)	Group 1: Biomechanical Taping (Standard Biomechanical Taping and two Vector Correction Dysfunction Techniques). Group 2: Biomechanical Taping (Vector Correction Dysfunction Technique, Standard Biomechanical Taping and other Vector Correction Dysfunction Technique). Group 1: High Intensity Laser Therapy. Group 2: High Intensity Laser Therapy placebo. Group 3: ferule.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	5 days	3 (alternating days).
Dundar et al. (2015)	Group 1: extracorporeal shock waves and CP. Group 2: Kinesio® taping and CP.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	Groups 1 and 2: 3 weeks. Group 3: 1 month.	Groups 1 and 2: 15 (5 each week). Group 3: 30 (daily). Group 1: 1. Group 2 and control: 15 (5 each week). 45 (daily).
Eraslan et al. (2017)	Vibration and CP.	CP (cryotherapy, TENS, and eccentric exercises).	3 weeks	5 (one every five days).
Furnes et al. (2018)	Group 1: Kinesio® taping and CP. Group 2: Kinesio® taping placebo and CP. Extracorporeal shock waves and CP.	CP (educational tips).	6 weeks	4 (weekly).
Giray et al. (2019)	Orthotics and CP.	CP (educational tips, stretching and eccentric strengthening).	2 weeks	3 (weekly).
Gönen et al. (2017)	Extracorporeal shock waves.	CP (exercise routine).	1 month	3 (one every the first three days).
Kachamat et al. (2019)	Extracorporeal shock waves.	CP (ultrasound, friction massage and stretching).	3 weeks	Group 1: 3 (weekly). Group 2: 10 (daily).
Köksal et al. (2015)	Group 1: Extracorporeal shock waves. Group 2: ultrasound.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	10 days	Group 1: 15 (5 each week). Group 2: 6 (2 each week). 180 (daily).
Kubot et al. (2017)	Group 1: diacutaneous fibrolysis and CP. Group 2: diacutaneous fibrolysis placebo and CP.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	Group 1: 3 weeks. Group 2: 10 days.	90 (daily).
López-Celis et al. (2018)	Orthotics and CP.	CP (stretching).	3 weeks	
Nishizuka et al. (2016)	Orthotics and CP.	CP (eccentric strengthening).	6 months	
Nowotny et al. (2018)	Orthotics and CP.	CP (eccentric strengthening).	3 months	

Table 3, continued

Authors	Intervention		Time of intervention	Number of sessions (frequency)
	Experimental group	Control group		
Olaussen et al. (2015)	Group 1: corticosteroid injection, drug treatment with naproxen and CP. Group 2: injection placebo, drug treatment with naproxen and CP.	Drug treatment with naproxen and CP (friction massage, Mills manipulation and stretching).	6 weeks	Groups 1 and 2: 2 (one session the first and the third weeks). Control group: 12 (two sessions each week). <i>Not applicable.</i>
Seo et al. (2018)	Eight variants of extensor carpi radialis brevis stretch.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	<i>Not applicable.</i>	<i>Not applicable.</i>
Stasinos et al. (2016)	Group 1: eccentric-concentric and isometric strengthening. Group 2: eccentric-concentric strengthening. Group 3: eccentric strengthening.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	1 month	30 (daily).
Yalvaç et al. (2018)	Group 1: extracorporeal shock waves. Group 2: ultrasounds.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	Group 1: 3 weeks. Group 2: 2 weeks.	Group 1: 3 (weekly). Group 2: 10 (5 each week).
Yi et al. (2018)	Group 1: orthosis and deep friction massage. Group 2: orthosis. Group 3: orthosis and cortisone injections.	<i>Not applicable.</i>	Groups 1 and 3: 1 week. Group 2: 6 weeks.	Groups 1 and 3: 7 (daily). Group 2: 42 (daily).

CP: conventional physiotherapy techniques.

219 session. The obtained results showed significant im-
220 provements in functionality and pain intensity in both
221 groups (with no differences between them). However,
222 the reincorporation of the participants to their usual
223 activities was significantly faster with PRP. Lastly,
224 Eraslan et al. [21] compared the effects of Kinesio[®]
225 taping (KT) [34], SW and conventional PT (cryother-
226 apy, TENS and a programme of eccentric exercises).
227 SW were applied at a dose of 2000 pulses and low-
228 energy density (0.06–0.12 mJ/mm²), which resulted
229 in significant improvements in pain intensity, muscle
230 state, maximum grip strength and functionality with the
231 application of both KT and SW in combination with
232 conventional PT and with the latter alone.

233 In addition to the above study, Nishizuka et al. [30]
234 analysed the effects of Tennis Elbow Support
235 (ALCARE), applied for over six hours per day in com-
236 bination and comparison with the execution of stretch-
237 ing exercises for the wrist extensor muscles. After the
238 treatment, pain intensity and the number of positive
239 Thomsen tests decreased significantly in both cases
240 (with no differences between them). They also evalu-
241 ated the efficacy of a dynamic extension orthosis called
242 CARP-X (Sporlastic) in combination and comparison
243 with the execution of eccentric strength exercises [31].
244 In this case, the maximum grip strength, pain inten-
245 sity and functionality improved in both groups progres-
246 sively after the treatment and nine months after the end
247 of the intervention, although strength did not improve
248 significantly in any case. Lastly, Kachanathu et al. [22]
249 evaluated the efficacy of the Futuro[®] splint (3M) for
250 6–8 hours per day in combination and comparison with
251 a programme of conventional PT (stretching, US and
252 deep friction massage). The splint was used to pre-
253 vent the complete flexion, and it was fixed to the ex-
254 tension range of 50–100°. After the intervention with
255 the orthosis, there were significant improvements in
256 pain intensity, wrist movement range and maximum
257 grip strength. Although the conventional PT group also
258 showed improvements, these were only significant in
259 the movement range.

260 Regarding the evaluation of bandages, Dones III et
261 al. [29] analysed the effectiveness of different appli-
262 cations of Biomechanical Taping (BMT): one group
263 received, firstly, the biomechanical bandage technique
264 with muscular energy (Standard Biomechanical Taping,
265 SBMT) and, subsequently, two vector correction dys-
266 function techniques (VCDT1 and VCDT2); the other
267 group received the same techniques, with a different
268 application sequence (first VCDT1, then SBMT and,
269 lastly, VCDT2). The authors identified that pain inten-

270 sity, maximum grip strength and functionality showed
271 significant improvements in all patients. However, both
272 immediately and one week after the intervention, the
273 group that received SBMT as the first technique ob-
274 tained better scores in pain intensity.

275 Finally, Giray et al. [25] evaluated the efficacy of
276 KT [35,36] in comparison with the application of a
277 placebo bandage and a programme of conventional PT.
278 All participants received the conventional PT interven-
279 tion with instructions on activity modification and a
280 home exercise programme of stretching and eccentric
281 strengthening. The obtained results showed that func-
282 tionality and pain intensity improved in all groups, al-
283 though the KT group obtained significantly better re-
284 sults. On the other hand, grip strength also improved in
285 the three groups, although with no statistical differences
286 between them.

287 Two studies determined the efficacy of deep fric-
288 tion massage in comparison with a corticosteroid injec-
289 tion [26,28]. In one of the cases, all participants received
290 a wrist splint and a daily protocol of conventional PT,
291 which included stretching and elbow and wrist mobility
292 exercises [28]. The results showed that pain intensity,
293 grip strength and functionality improved significantly
294 and similarly both with the massage and with the in-
295 jection, but not with the splint and the conventional
296 PT protocol. However, at 6 months after the treatment,
297 all groups showed improvements in all variables, al-
298 though such improvements were only significant in the
299 massage group. The other study applied corticosteroids
300 invasively in combination and comparison with a PT
301 intervention that included deep transverse friction mas-
302 sage at the origin of the tendon, Mill's manipulation
303 and wrist stretching exercises [26]. The results showed
304 that, in the PT group, there was a progressive improve-
305 ment in all variables, which was significant at 3, 6 and
306 12 months after the treatment. In the group the received
307 corticosteroids, the improvement percentage was better
308 at week 6 than in the subsequent evaluations. Between
309 groups, the perception of improvement in the corticos-
310 teroid group showed better results in the first evaluation
311 and worse results in the subsequent evaluations. Lastly,
312 there were no statistical differences between groups one
313 year after the evaluation.

314 On their part, the study of Seo et al. [27] was aimed
315 at determining the most effective stretching position for
316 the common extensor carpi radialis. They concluded
317 that the shear modulus was always significantly higher
318 when the wrist was flexed, especially with the elbow
319 extended and the forearm in the prone position.

320 Regarding methods of assisted manual therapy with
321 other instruments, studies have been conducted on di-

acutaneous fibrolysis (DF) [23] and vibration [24]. López-de-Celis et al. [23] evaluated the efficacy of DF in combination and comparison with US, TENS and stretching exercises with respect to a placebo group. Their results showed that, immediately after the treatment, the group that received DF presented significant improvements in all variables (pain intensity, maximum strength and functionality), whereas the conventional PT and placebo groups only presented significant changes in pain intensity, although with significantly lower changes compared to the DF group. However, at three months after the treatment, all variables improved in the three groups, with grip strength showing a significantly greater improvement in the DF group. Vibration assisted through a Tenease® device was evaluated in combination and comparison with a conventional treatment (information leaflet and education about LE, activities to be avoided and exercises to be performed) [24]. After the intervention, functionality improved in all participants, although such improvement was only significant with the conventional treatment. However, six months after the treatment, neither the quality of life nor pain intensity improved in any of the groups.

One study was aimed at comparing the efficacy of different modes of strength training for the wrist extensor muscles: eccentric, eccentric-concentric and eccentric-concentric combined with isometric training [32]. All participants showed significant improvements in pain intensity, functionality and maximum grip strength. In the intergroup comparison, the group that performed the eccentric-concentric training combined with isometric training obtained significantly better results with respect to the other two groups, both immediately after and one month after the intervention.

Lastly, Dundar et al. [33] explored the effects of high-intensity laser therapy (HILT) with pulse emissions (1064 nm), very high peak power (3 kW), high fluidity level (360–1780 mJ/cm²), short duration (120–150 μs), mean power of 10.5 W, a frequency of 10–40 Hz, a work cycle of 0.1%, a beam diameter of 0.5 cm and a dot size of 0.2 cm². This treatment was compared with a group who received placebo laser (with the device disconnected) and another group who only used an orthosis for the entire day. The groups that received laser and orthosis showed significant improvements in grip strength, pain intensity, disability degree and quality of life (with no significant differences between them). On the other hand, the placebo group showed no significant improvements in any case. However, the thickness of the common extensor tendon did not change with any of the interventions.

4. Discussion

The aim of this review was to determine the efficacy of PT for the treatment of LE and identify the most adequate techniques. After presenting the analysed studies, we can assert that, in general, PT techniques have a positive effect on the symptoms and resolution of the clinical characteristics of LE.

Pain intensity improved with all the applied treatments [15–24,30–33], although the interventions that included SW [15–20], PRP [20], US, friction and stretching exercises [22] and bandages [29] achieved positive results in less time (between 3 and 9 sessions). This finding is in line with previous investigations about the SW treatment of other tendinopathies [37,38]. For long-term pain relief, among the three studies that conducted more than one post-treatment evaluation [18,26,31], one of them applied SW and the other two carried out manual therapy [26], eccentric strengthening [26,31] and corticosteroid infiltration [26]. The latter [26] carried out the latest evaluation, obtaining positive results one year after the intervention.

Regarding pain, other studies evaluated the pressure pain threshold (PPT) [15,23,33], which is a specially relevant variable in tendinopathies [39] and in the evaluation of chronic pain [40,41]. This variable showed improvements with the interventions based on SW [15], orthosis [33], HILT [33], DF [23] and US, TENS and stretching exercises [23], since they can all affect hypercellularity, the collagen matrix, the proteoglycan content and neovascularisation, which is generated by the accumulation of microinjuries, due to the repetitive overload that exceeds the healing capacity of the tendon [42]. However, it is important to highlight that: (a) the combined application of US, TENS and stretching exercises obtained better results than DF [23]; and (b) the SW showed positive changes after only three sessions [15]. This could be due to the fact that the application of SW implies the administration of a series of short energy fluctuations that are rapidly transmitted, which is a method that has been revealed to be effective in the treatment of musculoskeletal disorders due to its angiogenic, analgesic and anti-inflammatory effects when applied on the painful area [43,44].

Functionality improved in all the studies in which it was evaluated [15,16,19–21,23–25,28,31,32], although SW obtained better effects than US [16], probably due to the fact that the latter showed lower reliability in the application of the selected frequency and presented an unpredictable behavior of their acoustic diffraction [45]. On the other hand, SW are more reliable [39] and their

efficacy increases when combined with strength exercises [46], as was also reported by Aydin et al. [17]. However, the use of orthoses did not show positive effects on functionality [28,31], which could be explained by the fact that, by restricting movement, they may lead to muscle disuse; therefore, if orthoses are combined with strength exercises, they may show better results [32,47]. The interventions based on conventional techniques (orthoses [28], stretching and mobility exercises [28] and education [24]) showed good results on functionality. Stretching exercises are commonly used in PT programmes, and it has been reported that the recovery time of a tendinopathy depends, to a great extent, on the frequency of their execution [48,49]. Moreover, the article by Yi et al. [28] also obtained good results in the friction massage group, probably due to the capacity of this technique to soften the extracellular matrix and cause a slight inflammation that activates the restoration of the conjunctive tissue; in fact, it has been demonstrated to reduce pain and improve functionality in muscle and ligamentous pathologies [50]. DF was also capable of improving functionality after six sessions [23]. This could be explained by the fact that its mechanism of action consists in ripping the conjunctive tissue fibres that form adhesions, in order to recover the normal glide between the different tissue layers [51]; thus, it can improve the ROM and reduce myotendinous reflexes [52]. Lastly, with all the interventions, the improvement of this variable was achieved in the short term, especially with the application of SW [15,16,20,21] and PRP [20] compared to US [15,16]. The positive effects obtained with SW in several of the analysed variables can be due to the fact that their optimal effect is attained at a maximum depth of 3.5 cm, where epicondylar tendons can be fully treated regardless of the size of the patient [53]. Similarly, with a high concentration of growth factors, PRP favours the resolution of tendinopathies and muscle and cartilage injuries [54].

Another aspect closely related to functionality and objectively quantifiable is grip strength, which was also analysed [15,17,19,22,23,25,26,28–32]. Regarding the improvement of this variable, the interventions based on therapeutic exercise [17,31] and manual therapy [26] obtained good results in the long-term, and even significantly higher results compared to those based on orthoses [31], SW [15,17,19] and corticosteroids [26]. This could be due to the fact that corticosteroids regulate the immune function of inflammatory cells and chemical mediators, thus decreasing pain; however, injections increase protein catabolism and reduce type I collagen and the synthesis of glycosaminoglycans, thereby de-

laying the healing process in the long term [55]. DF improved grip strength after one session [18], thanks to its capacity to improve the mechanical and inflammatory pain of the musculoskeletal system by removing the tissue adhesions and allowing the optimal glide of the myofibrils [52]. In the short term, SW also obtained good results in this variable [15,20,30], although they proved to be less effective when compared to KT [21]. KT reduces pain and edema and facilitates motor activity by activating the circulatory and nervous systems with movement, improves the ROM by relieving abnormal muscle tension and stimulates the mechanoreceptors by applying pressure on the skin, which are effects that have a direct impact on the generation of strength [56]. On the other hand, the improvements obtained with KT reach a limit in time after the intervention [22,25,29], unless this technique is combined with conventional PT methods, such as ergonomic measures, stretching exercises and strength training [25].

The ROM was only evaluated in the studies that used orthoses [22,31]; this variable was improved in both cases. However, also in both cases, the orthosis was applied in combination with strength exercises [31] or with US, friction and stretching exercises [22], which are techniques known for their improvement effect on joint mobility [11,48,50,57]. In fact, the improvement was greater with the intervention that only included eccentric exercises [31], since this training modality is currently among the most effective techniques in the treatment of tendinopathies [58–60]. This type of training leads to the production of collagen, reduces the prevalence of inflammation and neovascularisation and decreases pain by increasing tendinous resistance and desensitising the central nervous pathways of pain transmission [11,61].

Therefore, the treatment of LE should include eccentric strengthening, due to its benefits on pain reduction and the increase of tendinous resistance [11,58], with techniques such as friction massage and DF (depending on the patient's preferences), which are non-invasive and follow the same neurophysiological principles to reduce pain and inflammation, with the difference that DF can reach deeper layers [23,50,52], or KT, which stimulates circulation by displacing the skin, fascia and subcutaneous tissues, achieving the correction of the fascia, reducing pain and attaining neuromuscular reeducation with the stimulation of mechanoreceptors [55,56]. If the patient presents a lot of pain, orthoses are a non-invasive method with short-term efficacy for the immediate relief of pain and the improvement of hand functionality [3], although, in these cases, com-

plying with the guideline of exercises becomes more important for the prevention of their harmful effects. Lastly, it must be considered that, for the treatment of acute LE (processes of less than three months of evolution) [16,17,19,25,26,28,30,33,58], US and PRP are less effective. On the other hand, for the treatment of chronic LE [15,18,20–23], no particularities were found in terms of suitability for any techniques.

With respect to the methodological limitations of this study, it must be pointed out that the inclusion of non-controlled and non-randomised experimental studies reduces the validity of the conclusions drawn in this review. Moreover, the small sample size of some of the analysed articles limits the generalisation of their results. Regarding the operationalisation of the study variables, many of them were evaluated through methods that depend on the patient's subjectivity. Finally, in the results selection process, a considerable number of studies were eliminated because their full text was not available. On the other hand, this review has some strengths that must be highlighted, such as the comparison of different treatment techniques (including conventional low-cost techniques and other more recent methods that require greater economic investment and/or multidisciplinary intervention) and the fact that it is an update on the different PT techniques for the treatment of LE.

Future studies should conduct further RCT with larger sample sizes and compare the different combinations of the most effective techniques: manual therapy, strength training, SW and bandages. Furthermore, future research must compare and adequately define the particularities of the different approaches in acute and chronic LE.

5. Conclusions

Taken together, findings from papers included in the present systematic review suggested that manual therapy (e.g., stretching exercises and friction massages) and eccentric strength training are the two physiotherapy treatments with the most beneficial effects on LE, and their cost-benefit ratio is very favourable. Other techniques have positive effects, although they require greater economic investment, such as SW and the administration of PRP.

In any case, before deciding to perform surgical intervention, it is crucial to deplete all the conservative therapeutic options (drugs and PT), regardless of their economic cost. In addition, there are many PT tools

that can complement the mentioned techniques, such as cryotherapy, electrotherapy, ultrasound therapy, and the application of tapes or orthoses.

Conflict of interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Data availability

The data that support the findings of this study are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author.

Funding

No financial support was received from any commercial company.

References

- [1] Tarpada SP, Morris MT, Lian J, Rashidi S. Current advances in the treatment of medial and lateral epicondylitis. *J Orthop.* 2018; 15(1): 107-110.
- [2] Lenoir H, Mares O, Carlier Y. Management of lateral epicondylitis. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res.* 2019; 105(8): S241-S246.
- [3] Barati H, Zarezadeh A, MacDermid JC, Sadeghi-Demneh E. The immediate sensorimotor effects of elbow orthoses in patients with lateral elbow tendinopathy: A prospective crossover study. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2019; 28(1): e10-e17.
- [4] Sandhu KS, Kahal KS, Singh J, Singh J, Grewal H. A comparative study of activated platelet rich plasma versus local corticosteroid injection for the treatment of lateral epicondylitis: A randomised study. *Int J Orthop.* 2020; 6(1): 1274-1276.
- [5] Bisset LM, Vicenzino B. Physiotherapy management of lateral epicondylalgia. *J Physiother.* 2015; 61(4): 174-181.
- [6] Zhong Y, Zheng C, Zheng J, Xu S. Kinesio tape reduces pain in patients with lateral epicondylitis: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Surg.* 2020; 76: 190-199.
- [7] Boden AL, Scott MT, Dalwadi PP, Mautner K, Amadeus R, Gottschalk MB. Platelet-rich plasma versus tenex in the treatment of medial and lateral epicondylitis. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2019; 28(1): 112-119.
- [8] Holmedal O, Olaussen M, Mdala I, Natvig B, Lindbaek M. Predictors for outcome in acute lateral epicondylitis. *BMC Musculosket Disord.* 2019; 20: 375.
- [9] 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.
- [10] Ortega-Castillo M, Medina-Porqueres I. Effectiveness of the eccentric exercise therapy in physically active adults with symptomatic shoulder impingement or lateral epicondylar tendinopathy: A systematic review. *J Sci Med Sport.* 2016; 19(6): 438-453.

- 620 [11] Peterson M, Butler S, Eriksson M, Svärdsudd K. A randomized
621 controlled trial of accentric vs. concentric graded exercise
622 in chronic tennis elbow (lateral elbow tendinopathy). *Clin*
623 *Rehabil.* 2014; 28(9): 862-872. 684
- 624 [12] Finestone HM, Rabinovitch DL. Tennis elbow no more: Prac-
625 tical eccentric and concentric exercises to heal the pain. *Can*
626 *Fam Physician.* 2008; 54(8): 1115-1116. 685
- 627 [13] Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gotzsche PC,
628 Ioannidis JPA, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting
629 systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate
630 health care interventions: Explanation and elaboration. *J Clin*
631 *Epidemiol.* 2009; 62(10): e1-e34. 686
- 632 [14] Higgins JP, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page
633 MJ, Welch VA. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of*
634 *interventions.* New Jersey (NY): John Wiley & Sons; 2019. 687
- 635 [15] Yalvaç B, Mesci N, Külçü DG, Yurdakul OV. Comparison of
636 ultrasound and extracorporeal shock wave therapy in lateral
637 epicondylitis. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc.* 2018; 52(5): 357-
638 362. 688
- 639 [16] Kubot A, Grzegorzewski A, Synder M, Szymcack W, Ko-
640 zowski P. Radial extracorporeal shockwave therapy and ul-
641 trasound therapy in the treatment of tennis elbow syndrome.
642 *Ortop Traumatol Rehabil.* 2017; 19(5): 415-426. 689
- 643 [17] Gönen C, Aykut S, Öztürk K, Arslanoglu F, Yalin C, Kocaer
644 N. Long-term efficiency of extracorporeal shockwave therapy
645 on lateral epicondylitis. *Acta Orthop Belg.* 2017; 83: 438-444. 690
- 646 [18] Köksal İ, Güler O, Mahiroğulları M, Mutlu S, Çakmak S, Ak-
647 sahin E. Comparison of extracorporeal shock wave therapy in
648 acute and chronic lateral epicondylitis. *Acta Orthop Traumatol*
649 *Turc.* 2015; 49(5): 465-470. 691
- 650 [19] Altun RD, Incel NA, Cimen OB, Sahub G. Efficacy of ESWT
651 for lateral epicondylitis treatment: Comparison with physi-
652 cal therapy modalities. *J Musculoskeletal Res.* 2018; 21(1):
653 1850001. 692
- 654 [20] Alessio-Mazzola M, Repetto I, Biti B, Trentini R, Formica
655 M, Felli L. Autologous US-guided PRP injection versus US-
656 guided focal extracorporeal shock wave therapy for chronic
657 lateral epicondylitis: A minimum of 2-year follow-up ret-
658 rospective comparative study. *J Orthop Surg.* 2018; 26(1):
659 2309499017749986. 693
- 660 [21] Eraslan L, Yuce D, Erbilici A, Baltaci G. Does kinesi-
661 otaping improve pain and functionality in patients with newly di-
662 agnosed lateral epicondylitis? *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol*
663 *Arthrosc.* 2018; 26(3): 938-945. 694
- 664 [22] Kachanathu SJ, Alenazi AM, Hafez AR, Algarni AD, Alsubi-
665 heen AM. Comparison of the effects of short-duration wrist
666 joint splinting combined with physical therapy and physical
667 therapy alone on the management of patients with lateral epi-
668 condylitis. *Eur J Phys Rehabil Med.* 2019; 55(4): 488-493. 695
- 669 [23] López-de-Celis C, Barra-López M, González-Rueda V, Bueno-
670 Gracia E, Rodríguez-Rubio PR, Tricás-Moreno JM. Effective-
671 ness of diacutaneous fibrolysis for the treatment of chronic lat-
672 eral epicondylalgia: A randomized clinical trial. *Clin Rehabil.*
673 2018; 32(5): 644-653. 696
- 674 [24] Furness ND, Phillips A, Gallacher S, Sherard JC, Evans JP,
675 Toms AD. Vibration therapy versus standard treatment for
676 tennis elbow: A randomized controlled study. *J Orthop Surg.*
677 2018; 26(3): 2309499018792744. 697
- 678 [25] Giray E, Karali-Bingul D, Akyuz G. The effectiveness of kine-
679 siotaping, sham taping or exercises only in lateral epicondylitis
680 treatment: A randomized controlled study. *PM & R.* 2019;
681 11(7): 681-693. 698
- 682 [26] Olaussen M, Holmedal Ø, Mdala I, Brage S, Lindbaek M.
683 Corticosteroid or placebo injection combined with deep trans-
684 verse friction massage, mills manipulation, stretching and ec-
685 centric exercise for acute lateral epicondylitis: A randomised,
686 controlled trial. *Musculosket Disord.* 2015; 16(1): 122. 699
- 687 [27] Seo J, Yoon S, Lee J, Kim JK, Yoo JS. What is the most effec-
688 tive eccentric stretching position in lateral elbow tendinopathy?
689 *Clin Orthop Surg.* 2018; 10(1): 47-54. 700
- 690 [28] Yi R, Bratchenko WW, Tan V. Deep friction massage versus
691 steroid injection in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Hand.*
692 2018; 13(1): 56-59. 701
- 693 [29] Dones VC, III., Serra MAB, Kamus III, Esteban AC, Mercado
694 AMS, Rivera RGA, et al. The effectiveness of biomechanical
695 taping technique on visual analogue scale, static maximum
696 handgrip strength, and patient rated tennis elbow evaluation
697 of patients with lateral epicondylalgia: A cross-over study. *J*
698 *Bodywork Movement Ther.* 2019; 23(2): 405-416. 702
- 699 [30] Nishizuka T, Iwatsuki K, Kurimoto S, Yamamoto M, Hirata H.
700 Efficacy of a forearm band in addition to exercises compared
701 with exercises alone for lateral epicondylitis: A multicenter,
702 randomized, controlled trial. *J Orthop Sci.* 2017; 22(2): 289-
703 294. 703
- 704 [31] Nowotny J, El-Zayat B, Goronzy J, Biewener A, Bausenhardt
705 F, Greiner S, et al. Prospective randomized controlled trial in
706 the treatment of lateral epicondylitis with a new dynamic wrist
707 orthosis. *Eur J Med Res.* 2018; 23(1): 43. 704
- 708 [32] Stasinopoulos D, Stasinopoulos I. Comparison of effects of
709 eccentric training, eccentric-concentric training, and eccentric-
710 concentric training combined with isometric contraction in the
711 treatment of lateral elbow tendinopathy. *J Hand Ther.* 2017;
712 30(1): 13-19. 705
- 713 [33] Dundar U, Turkmen U, Toktas H, Ulasli AM, Solak O. Ef-
714 fectiveness of high-intensity laser therapy and splinting in lat-
715 eral epicondylitis; a prospective, randomized, controlled study.
716 *Lasers Med Sci.* 2015; 30(3): 1097-1107. 706
- 717 [34] Kase K. Clinical therapeutic applications of the kinesi-
718 o® taping method. Albuquerque (NM): Kinesio. 2003. 707
- 719 [35] MacDermid JC. The patient-rated tennis elbow evaluation
720 (PRTEE) user manual. Hamilton, (Canada): School of Reha-
721 bilitation Science, McMaster University. 2007. 708
- 722 [36] Shakeri H, Soleimanifar M, Arab AM, Behbahani SH. The
723 effects of KinesioTape on the treatment of lateral epicondylitis.
724 *J Hand Ther.* 2018; 31(1): 35-41. 709
- 725 [37] Melikyan EY, Shalin E, Miles J, Bainbridge LC. Extracor-
726 poreal shock-wave treatment for tennis elbow. *Bone Joint J.*
727 2023; 85-B(6): 852-855. 710
- 728 [38] Stasinopoulos D, Johnson MI. Effectiveness of extracorporeal
729 shock wave therapy for tennis elbow. *Br J Sports Med.* 2005;
730 39: 132-136. 711
- 731 [39] Zhang L, Cui Y, Liang D, Guan J, Liu Y, Chen X. High-energy
732 focused extracorporeal shock wave therapy for bone marrow
733 edema syndrome of the hip: A retrospective study. *Medicine.*
734 2020; 99(16): e19747. 712
- 735 [40] Coombes BK, Bisset L, Vicenzino B. Cold hyperalgesia as-
736 sociated with poorer prognosis in lateral epicondylalgia: A
737 1-year prognostic study of physical and psychological factors.
738 *Clin J Pain.* 2015; 31(1): 30-35. 713
- 739 [41] Tondelli T, Götschi T, Camenzind RS, Snedeker JG. Assessing
740 the effects of intratendinous genipin injections: Mechanical
741 augmentation and spatial distribution in an ex vivo degenera-
742 tive tendon model. *Plos One.* 2020; 15(4): e0231619. 714
- 743 [42] Zhang X, Zhang Y, Cai W, Liu Y, Liu H, Zhang Z, et al.
744 MicroRNA-128-3p alleviates neuropathic pain through target-
745 ing ZEB1. *Neurosci Lett.* 2020; 134946. 715
- 746 [43] Ji Q, Wang P, He C. Extracorporeal shockwave therapy as a
747 novel and potential treatment for degenerative cartilage and
716

- 748 bone disease: Osteoarthritis. A qualitative analysis of the liter-
749 ature. *Prog Biophys Mol Biol.* 2016; 121(3): 255-265.
- 750 [44] Iglesias E, de Frutos J, de Espinosa FM. Modeling piezoelec-
751 tric ultrasonic transducers for physiotherapy. *Bol Soc Españ*
752 *Cerám Vidrio.* 2015; 54(6): 231-235.
- 753 [45] Solanki CP, Chhatlani RM. A study to find out the effect of
754 extracorporeal shock wave therapy for chronic musculoskeletal
755 Conditions – A systematic review. *Indian J Physiother Occup*
756 *Ther.* 2019; 13(4): 428.
- 757 [46] Houck J, Neville C, Tome J, Flemister A. Randomized con-
758 trolled trial comparing orthosis augmented by either stretching
759 or stretching and strengthening for stage II tibialis posterior
760 tendon dysfunction. *Foot Ankle Int.* 2015; 36(9): 1006-1016.
- 761 [47] Umehara J, Nakamura M, Fujita K, Kusano K, Nishishita
762 S, Araki K, et al. Shoulder horizontal abduction stretching
763 effectively increases shear elastic modulus of pectoralis minor
764 muscle. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg.* 2017; 26(7): 1159-1165.
- 765 [48] Umegaki H, Ikezoe T, Nakamura M, Nishishita S, Kobayashi
766 T, Fujita K, et al. The effect of hip rotation on shear elastic
767 modulus of the medial and lateral hamstrings during stretching.
768 *Man Ther.* 2015; 20(1): 134-137.
- 769 [49] Stasinopoulos D, Johnson MI. Cyriax physiotherapy for tennis
770 elbow/lateral epicondylitis. *Br J Sports Med.* 2004; 38: 675-
771 677.
- 772 [50] Leite WB, Oliveira, ML, Ferreira, IC, Anjos CF, Barbosa
773 MA, Barbosa AC. Effects of 4-week diacutaneous fibrolysis
774 on myalgia, mouth opening, and level of functional severity
775 in women with temporomandibular disorders: A randomized
776 controlled trial. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther.* 2020; 43(8):
777 806-815.
- 778 [51] Fanlo-Mazas P, Bueno-Gracia E, de Escudero-Zapico AR,
779 Tricás-Moreno JM, Lucha-López MO. The effect of diacu-
780 taneous fibrolysis on patellar position measured using ultra-
781 sound scanning in patients with patellofemoral pain syndrome.
782 *J Sport Rehab.* 2019; 28(6): 564-569.
- 783 [52] Radinmehr H, Nakhostin-Ansari N, Naghdi S, Olyaei G,
784 Tabatabaei A. Effects of one session radial extracorporeal
785 shockwave therapy on post-stroke plantarflexor spasticity: A
786 single-blind clinical trial. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2017; 39(5): 483-
787 490.
- [53] Formica M, Cavagnaro L, Formica C, Mastrogiacomo M,
788 Basso M, Di Martino A. What is the preclinical evidence on
789 platelet rich plasma and intervertebral disc degeneration? *Eur*
790 *Spine J.* 2015; 24(11): 2377-2386.
- [54] Barnett J, Bernacki MN, Kainer JL, Smith HN, Zaharoff AM,
792 Subramanian SK. The effects of regenerative injection ther-
793 apy compared to corticosteroids for the treatment of lateral
794 epicondylitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arch*
795 *Physiother.* 2019; 9(1): 12.
- [55] Karabay I, Doğan A, Ekiz T, Füsün B, Ersöz M. Training pos-
797 tural control and sitting in children with cerebral palsy: Kinesio
798 taping vs. neuromuscular electrical stimulation. *Complement*
799 *Ther Clin Pract.* 2016; 24: 67-72.
- [56] Pieters L, Lewis J, Kuppens K, Jochems J, Brujstens T,
801 Joosens L, et al. An update of systematic reviews examining
802 the effectiveness of conservative physical therapy interventions
803 for subacromial shoulder pain. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.*
804 2020; 50(3): 131-141.
- [57] Stasinopoulos D. The effectiveness of isometric contractions
806 combined with eccentric contractions and stretching exercises
807 on pain and disability in lateral elbow tendinopathy. A case
808 report. *J Nov Physiother.* 2015; 5(238): 2.
- [58] Lepley LK, Lepley AS, Onate JA, Grooms DR. Eccentric
810 exercise to enhance neuromuscular control. *Sports Health.*
811 2017; 9(4): 333-340.
- [59] Goodall S, Thomas K, Barwood M, Keane K, González JL, St
813 Clair A, et al. Neuromuscular changes and the rapid adaptation
814 following a bout of damaging eccentric exercise. *Acta Physiol.*
815 2017; 220(4): 486-500.
- [60] Martínez-Silvestrini JA, Newcomer KL, Gay RE, Schaefer
817 MP, Kortebein P, Arendt KW. Chronic lateral epicondylitis:
818 Comparative effectiveness of a home exercise program includ-
819 ing stretching alone versus stretching supplemented with ec-
820 centric or concentric strengthening. *J Hand Ther.* 2005; 18(4):
821 411-420.
- [61] Toprak-Celenay S, Korkut Z, Oskay K, Aydın A. The effects
823 of pelvic floor muscle training combined with kinesio taping
824 on bladder symptoms, pelvic floor muscle strength, and quality
825 of life in women with overactive bladder syndrome: A ran-
826 domized sham-controlled trial. *Physiother Theory Pract.* 2020;
827 1-10.
- 828