AMERICAN COLLEGE OF OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE

Elbow Disorders

Effective July 14, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The Evidence-based Practice Elbow Disorders Panel's recommendations are based on critically appraised higher-quality research evidence and on expert consensus observing First Principles when higher quality evidence was unavailable or inconsistent (see Methodology). The reader is cautioned to utilize the more detailed indications, specific appropriate diagnoses, temporal sequencing, preceding testing or conservative treatment, and contraindications that are elaborated in more detail for each test or treatment in the body of this guideline in using these recommendations in clinical practice or medical management. These recommendations are not simple "yes/no" criteria.

All ACOEM guidelines include analyses of numerous interventions, whether or not FDA-approved. For non-FDA-approved interventions, recommendations are based on the available evidence; however, this is not an endorsement of their use. In addition, many of the medications recommended are utilized off-label. (For example, anti-epileptic agents have been used off-label since the 1960s to treat chronic pain.)

Recommendations are made under the following categories:

- Strongly Recommended, "A" Level
- Moderately Recommended, "B" Level
- Recommended, "C" Level
- Insufficient-Recommended (Consensus-based), "I" Level
- Insufficient-No Recommendation (Consensus-based), "I" Level
- Insufficient-Not Recommended (Consensus-based), "I" Level
- Not Recommended, "C" Level
- Moderately Not Recommended, "B" Level
- Strongly Not Recommended, "A" Level

WORKFLOWS

- Master Algorithm. ACOEM Guidelines for Care of Acute and Subacute Elbow Disorders
- Algorithm 1. Initial Evaluation of Elbow Disorders
- Algorithm 2. Initial and Follow-up Management of Elbow Disorders
- Algorithm 3. Evaluation of Slow-to-Recover Patients with Elbow Disorders (Symptoms >4 Weeks)
- Algorithm 4. Surgical Considerations for Patients with Anatomic and Physiologic Evidence of Nerve Compression Coupled with Persistent Elbow Symptoms
- Algorithm 5. Further Management of Elbow Disorders

INTRODUCTION

The following elbow disorders are discussed in this guideline: biceps tendinosis, biceps strains and tears, elbow contusion, elbow dislocation, elbow fracture, elbow osteoarthrosis, elbow osteonecrosis, elbow pain, elbow sprain, lateral epicondylalgia, medial epicondylalgia, olecranon bursitis, pronator syndrome, radial nerve entrapment, and ulnar neuropathy at the elbow.

Other prominent disorders, which include cervical radiculopathy and cervical and upper thoracic spinal stenosis (see Cervical and Thoracic Spinal Disorders guideline for extensive discussions), are not reviewed in this guideline in detail, but should be considered in the

differential diagnosis of elbow pain and symptoms. Additional diagnostic considerations include hand and forearm disorders (see the Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines); atherosclerotic abnormalities such as aneurysms, avulsion fractures, mononeuritis, benign tumors or cancer, crystal arthropathies (e.g., gout, pseudogout, hydroxyapatite); infections including septic arthritis, Lyme disease, reactive arthritis (formerly Reiters) or hepatitis B and C; and inflammatory or "collagen vascular" disorders such as rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, ankylosing spondylitis, dermatomyositis, and polymyalgia rheumatica.

BASIC PRINCIPLES AND DEFINITIONS

Acute, Subacute and Chronic Pain: For purposes of identifying interventions at different stages of diseases, acute pain is defined as pain for up to a 1 month duration, subacute pain is from 1 to 3 months duration, and chronic pain is over 3 months duration (see Chronic Pain guideline for additional information).

Active Therapy: The term "active therapy" is commonly used to describe treatment that requires the patient to assume an active role in rehabilitative treatment. Although there is no one specific treatment defined by this term, it most commonly includes therapeutic exercises, particularly aerobic activities and muscle reconditioning (weight lifting or resistance training) [(1)], activities of daily living, community reintegration, and cognitive therapy. Some authors include active stretching and treatment with psychological, social and/or educational components requiring active participation from the patient [(2)].

Active Exercise Therapy: Active exercise therapy typically consists of cardiovascular training and muscle strengthening [(3,4)], although it may also include progressive or occasionally even active stretching, especially in patients with substantially reduced ranges of motion. Active exercise therapy is used as a primary treatment for chronic pain, is frequently initiated in the course of treating subacute pain, and is a primary treatment after various surgeries. The goal of active exercise therapy is to improve function [(3)]. The word "active" is used to differentiate individualized exercise programs designed to address and rehabilitate specific functional, anatomic, or physiologic deficits from passive treatment modalities or from forms of exercise that require very little effort or investment on the part of the patient or clinician.

Allied Health Therapies: There are a number of treatment approaches that require extensive training and development of specific skills. The treatment approaches in this category include manipulation, mobilization, massage, and acupuncture.

Bursae: Fluid-filled sacs within the body which provide lubrication in areas, such as points where muscles move over bony projections.

Bursitis: Bursitis occurs when the bursae become inflamed and irritated. This results in pain when the overlying muscle is used. It may occur from a number of exposures, including when there is trauma, bumping the elbow, direct pressure, or with forceful and unaccustomed use usually involving leaning on the elbow.

Delayed Recovery: This is most commonly defined as an increase in the period of time prior to returning to work or to usual activities, when compared with the length of time expected, based on reasonable expectations, disorder severity, age, and treatments provided.

Elbow Dislocation: Elbow dislocations are relatively uncommon and they usually result from a violent or high-speed collision or from falls. Pain is usually severe, associated with an inability to use the arm. Most other dislocations in adults occur due to either a congenital malformation of the elbow joint or recurrent dislocations associated with ligamentous laxity.

Elbow Joint: The elbow joint is a synovial hinge type joint based on the articulation of the ulna and the trochlea of the humerus. Ligaments support the joint. Absent ligamentous laxity or prior dislocations, dislocation of the elbow joint is difficult in adults due to the lack of joint laxity and typically requires considerable force. By contrast, dislocation of the radial head in young children is common and requires considerably less force.

Elbow Pain: Pain originating from the elbow is usually felt in the center of the joint and generally does not radiate. Pain in the elbow may also be due to referred pain from cardiovascular or metastatic processes, cervical or upper thoracic disc herniation with neurological impingement, and chest disorders including arteriosclerotic disorders.

Enthesitis: "Irritation" of the muscular or tendinous attachment to bone, usually related to high force use, particularly if unaccustomed. Signs of traditional inflammation are not present, thus the suffix produces a misnomer despite widespread use.

Enthesopathy: Disorder of the muscular or tendinous attachment to bone.

Epicondylitis: Pain at the lateral or medial epicondyle of the elbow (humerus) from any cause. Traditional signs of inflammation are absent. The more accurate term for this condition is epicondylalgia, as classic inflammation is absent and histopathological findings of degenerative changes are common [5,6,7,8,9].

Epicondylalgia: Pain in the epicondyle from any cause (it can be located at the origin of a tendon or be referred).

Functional Capacity Evaluation (FCE): A comprehensive battery of performance-based tests used to attempt to assess an individual's ability for work and activities of daily living [10]. An FCE may be done to identify a person's ability to perform specific job tasks associated with a job (job-specific FCE) or their ability to perform physical activities associated with any job (general FCE). See also the Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines).

Functional Improvement (especially Objective Evidence): Entails tracking and recording evidence that the patient is making progress towards increasing their functional state. Validated tools are preferable.

Functional Restoration: A term initially used for a variant of interdisciplinary pain alleviation or at least amelioration characterized by objective physical function measures, intensive graded exercise and multi-modal pain/disability management with both psychological and case management features [11-17]. The term has become popular as a philosophy and an approach to medical care and rehabilitation. In that sense, the term refers to a blend of various techniques (physical and psychosocial) for evaluating and treating the chronic non-malignant pain patient, particularly in the workers' compensation setting (see Chronic Pain guidelines).

Inflammation: A localized protective response elicited by an injury or destruction of tissues, which serves to destroy, dilute, or wall off (sequester) both the injurious agent and the injured tissue. Inflammation is characterized in the acute form by four classical signs: 1) pain

(dolor); 2) heat (calor); 3) redness (rubor); and 4) swelling (tumor). Loss of function (functio laesa) may also occur. Histologically, inflammation involves a complex series of events, including dilatation of arterioles, capillaries, and venules, with increased permeability and blood flow; exudation of fluids, including plasma proteins; and leukocytic migration into the inflammatory focus. Classic inflammatory responses are found in infectious diseases. Most elbow disorders exhibit only one classic sign of inflammation [(18)] – that of pain; therefore, these disorders do not qualify as an acute inflammatory process in which three of the four classical signs must be present.

Olecranon Bursa: The olecranon bursa lies between the olecranon process and overlying dermis.

Olecranon Bursitis: Olecranon bursitis occurs when the trochanteric bursa is "inflamed," although in most cases, there are not classic symptoms and signs of inflammation. Classic inflammation may occur in the olecranon bursa with arthropathies or infectious agents. Patients usually complain of swelling over the point of the elbow (olecranon process). Pain may or may not be present, and if marked, suggests an inflammatory condition such as infection or crystal arthropathy. The elbow joint itself is not involved. The condition is thought to occur either as a result of an acute trauma such as a fall, bump or blow, or leaning on the elbow.

Osteonecrosis [Avascular Necrosis (AVN)]: Osteonecrosis occurs when the tenuous blood supply to the bone is interrupted. Osteonecrosis can be a result of traumatic or nontraumatic factors and most commonly occurs in the femoral and humeral heads. Barotrauma (i.e., rapid decompression) is the most common known occupational factor. The condition is painless in its early stages, but when it advances, patients generally present with pain and limitation of motion. Pain is usually exacerbated by use and relieved with rest.

Pain Behavior: Verbal and non-verbal actions (e.g., grimacing, groaning, limping, using pain relieving or support devices, requesting pain medications, etc.) which communicate the concept of pain to others.

Passive Modality: Various types of clinician-given treatments in which the patient is passive. These treatments include medication, injection, surgery, allied health therapies (e.g., massage, acupuncture, manipulation), and various physical modalities such as hydrotherapy (e.g., whirlpools, hot tubs, spas), ultrasound, TENS, other electrical therapies, and heat and cryotherapies.

Primary Prevention: Primary prevention involves preventing the condition or risk factor from developing (e.g., physical activity programs to prevent obesity which results in osteoarthrosis.

Rehabilitation: Rehabilitation is used in these *Guidelines* to mean physical medicine, therapeutic and rehabilitative evaluations, and procedures. Rehabilitation services are delivered under the direction of trained and licensed individuals such as physicians, occupational therapists, and physical therapists. Sometimes mental health professionals are incorporated in the treatment team, particularly for select chronic pain patients. Jurisdictions may differ on qualifications for licensure to perform rehabilitative evaluations and interventions.

Secondary Prevention: Secondary prevention involves reduction in exposure or risk factor after the risk factor has already developed, but before the disease has occurred (e.g., use of fall protection equipment to prevent fractures).

Sprain: Disruption of a joint's ligaments. The mechanism involves an acute, high-force deviation of the joint beyond the normal range of motion.

Strain: Disruption of a myotendinous junction, usually from a high force, unaccustomed exertion(s). It may also occur during an accident. This term is occasionally used to describe non-specific muscle pain in the absence of knowledge of an anatomic pathophysiological correlate.

Synovitis: Synovitis refers to inflammation of a synovial membrane, although in most cases, there are not classic symptoms and signs of inflammation. Classic inflammation occurs however with crystalline arthropathies or infectious agents. Synovitis is usually painful, especially with motion. Fluctuating swelling may occur due to effusion within the synovial sac.

Synovial Membrane: The synovial membrane incorporates the entire femoral head, the anterior neck, and the proximal half of the posterior neck of the femur.

Tendinitis: This term has been used to denote a tendon abnormality usually accompanied by pain and tenderness over the tendon or tendon origin/insertion on examination. Infrequently, there may be warmth or swelling. However, tendinitis implies "inflammation," and there is scientific agreement that classic signs of inflammation are absent in nearly all cases. More commonly, there may be signs of mild inflammation. Therefore, the term "tendinitis" is often replaced by the more accurate term "tendinosis. " There is also some suboptimal use of the term "tendinitis" among some practitioners to label nonspecific pain with tendinitis.

Tendinosis: A tendon disorder that most commonly consists of an underlying, chronic degenerative tendon condition. When symptomatic, there usually is pain and tenderness over the tendon. Some warmth may be present, but redness is usually absent. It may be associated with limited movement [9,19]. Tendinosis is believed to usually occur due to an interaction of individual and physical factors, which may include vocational and avocational activities. Tendinoses are the most common types of musculoskeletal disorders, likely outpacing arthroses. The severity of these disorders is thought to be influenced by numerous factors including:

- The person's age, presence of various medical conditions and habits, level of fitness, and general health (chronic tendon degeneration is more common with age) [20]. Poor fitness is theorized to make physical injuries more common.
- The amount of forceful use and lack of recovery time (e.g., hours of work per day, per week, and per month as well as number of breaks per day) [21,22,23].
- The person's genetics (e.g., a higher initial Type III/Type I collagen ratio in the tendons).
- Potential ergonomic risk factors associated with musculoskeletal disorders (i.e., excessive force, repetition, sustained exertion, vibration, improperly fitted tools or sports equipment, or poor technique) [21,22,23].

Tendinosis is also associated with cardiovascular disease risk factors in the shoulder's rotator cuff, thus as extensive array of additional individual risk factors, though as yet

largely undefined, may also be operant for this condition at the elbow (see Shoulder Disorders guideline).

Tenosynovitis: Tenosynovitis is most commonly used to refer to pain generated from the sheath and structures surrounding a tendon. The term technically refers to inflammation of a tendon sheath although in most cases there are not classic symptoms and signs of inflammation. Classic inflammation may occur with inflammatory arthropathies, such as rheumatoid arthritis, or with infections. The term should be avoided for elbow disorders as tendon sheaths are absent in this body region.

Tertiary Prevention: Tertiary prevention has most typically been defined as amelioration of the condition after it has already developed. For example, after a patient has osteonecrosis, precluding them from diving or other decompression activities is a method of tertiary prevention.

Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC): Most common outcome measure other than standard pain ratings and Visual Analog Scale (VAS) pain ratings. It combines subjective ratings of pain with activities, stiffness, physical function, social function and emotional function measures [(24)].

IMPACT

Upper-extremity musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) continue to account for a significant number of work-related illnesses and disabilities in the United States. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, non-traumatic MSDs make up 65% of all occupational illnesses in the United States [(25)]. Work-related elbow disorders are among the most common causes of reported occupational injuries and workers' compensation claims. These disorders are broadly and most accurately classified as MSDs [(21)]. In 2008, MSDs accounted for 29% of all workplace injuries requiring time away from work, compared to 30% of total days-away-from-work cases in 2006 [(26)]. There were a total of 335,390 MSDs in 2007 requiring a median of 9 days away from work, two more days than the median for all days-away-from-work cases. This is a decline of 21,770 cases (6 percent) from 2006, and an 11 percent decline from 2005 [(26)].

Upper extremity MSDs, including elbow disorders, now account for at least 4% of all state workers' compensation claims, an increase from 1% seen a decade ago [(27,28,29)]. Of these, the State of Washington has reported that elbow disorders accounted for the third highest incidence rate with 29. 7 injuries per 10,000 full-time employees [(30)].

WORK-RELATEDNESS

A determination of work-relatedness requires a careful history regarding occupational physical factors, non-work activities, individual or personal factors, and psychosocial, psychiatric, and other risk factors, as well as a thoughtful careful assessment of the relative contribution each makes to the patient's problem while incorporating epidemiological evidence (see the Work-Relatedness guideline). However, many conditions have no apparent cause and thus are defined as idiopathic.

Acute occupational elbow injuries related to a specific acute traumatic event are non-controversial, the location of that event determines work-relatedness. Most jurisdictions also request an opinion from physicians as to whether a disease or disorder should be considered work related for the purpose of a workers' compensation claim. Physicians need

to remember that their role is to supply opinion and that the medical/scientific answer and the legal answer as determined by regulations and case law precedents in a particular jurisdiction (workers' compensation system) are different (see the Work-Relatedness guideline). With some noteworthy exceptions, there are few if any quality epidemiological studies supporting work relatedness for many elbow disorders. Thus, aside from these specific circumstances (e.g., occupational fractures and other acute trauma, biceps ruptures from a maximal lift, osteonecrosis from barotraumas, lateral epicondylitis when performing stereotypical high-force work, olecranon bursitis after a fall on the elbow), most opinions are speculative.

Some elbow symptoms are occupational in origin, differing by industry, job task, or disorder in question. By analogy to the hand and wrist, decisions about which jobs to analyze, and their prioritization, are thought to be of increasing importance as the proportion of affected individuals has been identified as in excess of 50% of the workforce per annum in settings of combinations of high force and high stereotypical occupational activity. In general, prioritization of job analyses in workplace settings is based on the numbers of affected individuals, reported and perceived rates of MSDs, costs and severity of the disorders, and planned job redesigns. From an occupational health care perspective, ergonomic analysis of a job may also be indicated for failure to improve in the absence of other plausible explanations. The employer's role in accommodating activity limitations and preventing further problems through ergonomic changes may be a key factor in hastening the employee's return to full activity, particularly among workers with a history of high job physical factors. In some cases, it may be desirable to conduct an ergonomic analysis of the activities that may be contributing to the symptoms.

INITIAL ASSESSMENT

The physician performing an initial evaluation of a patient with elbow pain or other symptoms should seek a discrete explanatory diagnosis (see General Approach to Initial Assessment and Documentation guideline). A careful, thorough history is required [31,32]. Review of systems that also involves the hand, shoulder, spine, and chest is necessary. The examination of the patient with elbow symptoms generally needs to focus on the elbow joint and include relevant neighboring structures similar to the review of systems. Findings of the medical history and physical examination can alert the physician to other pathology that presents with pain or other constitutional symptoms. Certain findings, referred to as red flags, raise suspicion of serious underlying medical conditions (see Table 1). Potentially serious disorders include infections, tumors, and systemic rheumatological disorders. The absence of red flags generally rules out the need for special studies, referral, or inpatient care for many patients during the first 4 weeks when spontaneous improvement or recovery is expected.

Elbow disorders may be classified into one of four working categories (note, these categories are somewhat arbitrary with significant overlap between the groups):

- **Potentially serious elbow disorders:** Fracture, acute dislocation, infection, or neurovascular compromise. These disorders are usually associated with trauma.
- **Mechanical disorders:** Derangements of the elbow that are related to acute trauma, such as ligament sprain or tears, contusions, or bursitis. Many musculoskeletal disorders are often categorized as mechanical disorders, although there is evidence that these disorders may be associated with degenerative changes.

- **Degenerative disorders:** Consequences of aging, medical conditions, or forceful, or prolonged physical exertion, or a combination thereof. This category includes tendinosis.
- **Non-specific disorders:** Self-limiting disorders in the absence of objective physiological findings. Non-specific disorders do not suggest necessarily internal derangement or referred pain.

Evaluation and Diagnostic Issues

- The elbow joint should be carefully evaluated with a history, physical examination, and focused diagnostic testing. A complete physical examination is recommended, since pain can be referred from the neck, shoulder, or chest.
- The initial elbow examination or consultation of patients with acute, subacute or chronic elbow symptoms should focus on detecting both remedial conditions and any red flags for alternate conditions. The presence of red flags generally requires either urgent testing and treatment or referral for appropriate care.
- In the absence of red flags, the clinician should prescribe efficacious treatments, monitoring patients for complications, facilitating the healing process, and returning the individual to modified alternative or full-duty work.
- Initial evaluation of elbow joint pain only requires elbow x-rays in some cases depending on history and presentation. X-rays of the neck and shoulder may also be indicated in certain circumstances.
- Diagnostic ultrasound is seldom necessary. However, it may be helpful in select cases involving biceps tendinosis, severe strains, or refractory epicondylalgia.
- Magnetic resonance imaging is particularly helpful for diagnosing osteonecrosis, biceps tendinosis, and biceps tears.
- CT scanning may be helpful in evaluating the patient with a traumatic elbow dislocation or arthroplasty-associated recurrent dislocation.

HISTORY

The medical history is usually the most important aspect in the evaluation of a patient. Many disorders of the elbow will be diagnosable with a high degree of accuracy prior to examination based upon a careful medical history. Of critical importance in the occupational setting is the recording of the patient's report of the mechanism(s) of injury. An accurate record is also often critical in subsequent case review. Asking the patient open-ended questions, such as those provided in the Medical History Questionnaire, allows the physician to gauge the need for further information. Discussion or more specific inquiries will usually produce the detail necessary for clinical decision-making. It may be helpful to use standardized questionnaires such as the DASH (Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand) [33] outcome measure or the Upper Extremity Function Scale for Upper Extremity Disorders [34].

See Table 1 on red flags for potentially serious elbow disorders.

PHYSICAL EXAMINATION

Guided by the medical history, the physical examination should include:

- General observation of the patient
- Focused examination of the forearm, arm, elbow, and shoulder with discussion of the symptoms
- Neurovascular assessment

The physician should seek objective evidence including signs of pathology that are consistent with the patient's subjective complaints. In many cases, careful examination will reveal one or more truly objective findings, such as swelling, deformity, atrophy, reflex changes, or spasm [35].

Subjective Evidence: Symptoms

Subjective symptoms are perceptible only to the patient. Examples of subjective findings include pain, tenderness to palpation, numbness and tingling, pain-limited decreased range of motion, and weakness.

Objective Evidence: Signs

A sign is any objective evidence of a disease. Examples of objective evidence signs include visible changes, swelling, deformity, redness, heat, reflex changes, spasm, palpable changes, atrophy, nonresistant passive range of motion, and imaging findings. Such evidence is perceptible to the examining physician, as opposed to the subjective sensations (symptoms) of the patient [18]. Objective evidence should be thoroughly documented in the medical record especially for reference during future visits. For most patients with elbow disorders, no truly objective physical examination evidence exists. Therefore, meticulous documentation of the patient's symptoms at each visit is particularly important.

Accurate interpretation of physical examination findings requires the physician to be cognizant of the interplay between the performance of many physical examination techniques and the patient's responses. A number of physical examination findings are actually a combination of objective and subjective evidence. Compliance with the maneuver or a patient response is required for the interpretation of the results. Examples include tenderness on palpation, reflexes, or ranges of motion or elicitation of pain with a maneuver (such as resisted wrist extension inducing lateral or medial elbow pain).

Anatomy

The elbow has four basic movements – flexion, extension, pronation, and supination. From a functional perspective of the muscles, the physician may look at the elbow based on the three main groups of muscles/tendons:

1. Those that attach to the lateral epicondyle or condyle – extend the wrist and supinate the elbow.
2. Those that attach to the medial epicondyle or condyle – flex the wrist and pronate the elbow.
3. Those that cross the elbow from the upper arm or shoulder – flex and extend the elbow and also supinate and pronate, but do not insert into it (except for triceps into the olecranon).

While there are many muscles and tendons associated with elbow and wrist movement, this guideline will only address those that commonly cause elbow pain or produce referred pain to the elbow [36].

Flexion of the elbow: The main flexors are the biceps brachii, brachialis, and brachioradialis [31]. The long head of the biceps brachii originates on the supraglenoid tuberosity, while the short head originates on the coracoids process and insertions are on the tuberosity of the radius and bicipital aponeurosis to the fascia of the forearm. The brachialis muscle arises from the lower half of the anterior humerus and inserts on the tuberosity and coronoid

process of the ulna. The brachioradialis muscle originates on the lateral supracondylar ridge and inserts on the radial styloid. Pertaining to the elbow, other than epicondylalgia, the biceps brachii are most often involved in clinical tendinoses and ruptures.

Extension of the elbow: Triceps muscles (long, medial, and lateral heads) are the main elbow extensors. They originate from the infraglenoid tuberosity of the scapula, posterior aspect of the humerus and lateral aspect of the humerus. They insert on the posterior and upper olecranon and fascia of the forearm. The anconeus originates from the posterior aspect of the lateral epicondyle, inserts on the olecranon and upper posterior ulna, and is a minor elbow extensor. Triceps tendinoses of the elbow occur, but are not clinically common in employed populations.

Supination: The biceps is the main supinator. The supinator muscle also supinates the hand. The supinator originates on the lateral epicondyle and ulna below the radial notch. It inserts on the radial tubercle and oblique line of the radius.

Pronation: Pronation is accomplished by the pronator teres and pronator quadratus. The pronator teres originates above the medial epicondyle and medial side of the coronoid process of the ulna and inserts on the lateral side of the radius. The pronator quadratus originates on the lower anterior shaft of the ulna and inserts on the medial anterior surface of the distal radius.

A. FOCUSED ELBOW EXAMINATION

The physician should examine both elbows for comparison and differences should be noted beginning with careful observation. This should include inspection for visible changes, swelling, deformity, redness, heat, spasm, and atrophy. Atrophy of the muscles of the ulnar or radial hand intrinsic muscles is an objective finding, arising only after weeks to months of disuse or denervation. Deformities may include claw phenomenon. Deformities due to fractures are often subtle. Dislocations may be associated with visible, objective abnormal findings. Signs of infection or inflammation (redness, heat, swelling, tenderness, etc.) or gross tumor (palpable mass) may also be obvious.

Next, active range of motion is assessed. If active range of motion is limited, then passive range of motion is assessed to help determine if the limitation appears fixed or is rather painful or otherwise limited. Movements to evaluate limitation include elbow flexion and extension, forearm pronation and supination, wrist flexion, extension, and ulnar and radial deviation. Limitation of motion or pain at the extremes of flexion or extension suggests an intra-articular abnormality or at least a joint-associated abnormality. An apparent loss of motion in one elbow may be equally present in the non-affected limb, indicating either a congenital problem or voluntary limitation of movement, which in either case would be unrelated to a unilateral injury.

Particularly in the setting of trauma, tests for joint integrity are necessary. These tests include assessment for instability of the elbow including the pivot shift test for posterolateral instability (lateral ulnar collateral ligament), and valgus and varus tests.

Palpation is performed on the elbow to ascertain points of tenderness. Palpation is also performed to detect swelling, tumors, osteophytes, and other abnormalities. Individuals with lateral epicondylalgia tend to have tenderness over the epicondyle proper, the radial head, and/or two centimeters distant to the epicondyle [34,35,37,38]. Similarly, those with medial epicondylalgia tend to have tenderness either over the epicondyle and/or several

centimeters distal [37]. Muscle-strength testing is often helpful. However, weakness in the absence of atrophy is particularly difficult to assess. Pain-limited weakness is common and makes determination of true muscular weakness substantially more difficult. Weakness on the unaffected side should be noted.

Reflexes help to detect abnormalities in nerves, nerve roots, spinal cord, and higher level functioning. Sensory examination of the elbow includes fine touch, two-point discrimination, and vibratory sense and position sense in the distal extremity. For the vast majority of common elbow problems, a full sensory examination is not required. However, when symptoms that could represent a nervous system disorder are present, appropriate examination is necessary.

The physician should generally examine one joint above and below the joint being examined, particularly if symptoms are present elsewhere. Thus, examination of the shoulder and forearm are required. Examination of the neck is also required in many evaluations of the elbow to exclude cervical pathology as it is a common source of patients' elbow complaints. Special examination maneuvers are performed to help diagnose an elbow disorder [23,31]. Common maneuvers include:

- **Resisted wrist extension.** Performed with the shoulder forward flexed approximately 60 degrees and the arm extended, this maneuver will produce pain in the lateral elbow in patients with lateral epicondylalgia.
- **Resisted wrist flexion.** Pain is produced in the medial elbow in those with medial epicondylalgia.
- **Resisted middle finger extension.** Performed similarly to resisted wrist extension, pain is produced in the lateral elbow with resisted middle finger extension and is indicative of lateral epicondylalgia. Some consider this sign more important in radial tunnel syndrome, but quality studies documenting this do not exist and it is positive in many patients with lateral epicondylalgia.
- **Resisted supination.** This maneuver is positive for weakness in those with ruptures of the biceps tendon, biceps tendinoses, musculocutaneous nerve, C5 or C6 nerve root problems. Patients with lateral epicondylalgia and biceps tendinoses will tend to have pain with this maneuver.
- **Resisted pronation.** This maneuver demonstrates weakness in those with rupture of the pronator origin from the medial epicondyle, and median nerve, C6 and C7 nerve root problems. Patients with medial epicondylalgia will tend to have pain with this maneuver.
- **Shaking hands sign.** Patients with significant lateral epicondylalgia will tend to have reproduction of their pain with a firm handshake. This test may also be positive with radial nerve entrapment.

Another test used to diagnose elbow disorders is the Hoffman-Tinel's test. However, it should be noted that this test is increasingly thought to have low value in the diagnosis of any peripheral neuropathy.

B. NEUROVASCULAR SCREENING

Physicians should assess the neurological and vascular status of the elbow and distal upper extremity, especially following dislocation, fractures, or other substantial trauma or if other symptoms suggest the need for this evaluation. Evidence of problems with the median, ulnar, and radial nerve distributions should be sought. Evaluation for evidence of cervical disc disease associated with radiculopathy that radiates to the elbow should also be

performed. C5 radiculopathy may result in weakness of elbow flexion, and T1 lesions may weaken the hand intrinsic muscles in a manner that is similar to entrapment of the ulnar nerve. C6 radiculopathy can cause lateral elbow pain, and as noted above, should be considered in the differential diagnosis of lateral elbow pain. Concomitant neck pain or stiffness, and/or thumb tingling can be helpful indications in that differential analysis. Both left and right sides should be examined for consistency.

C. ASSESSING RED FLAGS

Physical examination evidence of neurovascular compromise, fracture, unreduced dislocation, infection, or tumor that correlates with the medical history and with test results may indicate a need for immediate treatment and/or consultation. The examination may further reinforce or reduce suspicion of these diagnoses.

DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA

The criteria presented in Table 2 follow the clinical thought process, from the mechanism of illness or injury, to unique symptoms and signs of a particular disorder, to test results (if any tests are needed to guide treatment at this stage). Elbow disorders, as described by the patient, can sometimes be consistent with radiating symptoms from the neck or shoulder, and the examining physician's diagnostic acumen is important in determining the source. For example, mid-upper-arm pain on arm elevation is most likely related to a problem originating in the shoulder area, not the elbow, although patients may have pain in both areas. It is important to note that lateral elbow pain can be due to cervical disc disease (C6), radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome), synovitis due to degeneration, or true epicondylitis (enthesitis) [39]. A complaint of tingling and/or numbness in the fourth and fifth fingers is usually due to ulnar nerve impingement at the elbow, C8 cervical radiculopathy, or impingement of the ulnar nerve at the wrist. Thoracic outlet syndrome can be considered, although that condition is generally believed to be quite uncommon (see Shoulder Disorders guideline). For the differential diagnosis of lateral epicondylalgia, C6 radiculopathy is believed to be the most common alternate diagnosis and not infrequently presents with lateral elbow pain and paresthesias in the thumb. The differential diagnosis of medial epicondylalgia similarly includes C8 radiculopathy presenting as medial elbow pain and paresthesias in the fourth and fifth digits.

Medial collateral ligament problems may also present with medial elbow pain. Concomitant existence of medial epicondylalgia with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow frequently occurs. In cases of complaints that cannot be classified as a specific pathophysiological condition, a diagnosis of non-specific pain should be used. This is far preferable to specific labeling, which may not be accurate. Non-specific or regional pain will more frequently be the most appropriate diagnosis if there are no specific physical findings. The criteria presented in Table 2 list the probable diagnosis or injury, potential mechanism(s) of illness or injury, symptoms, signs, and appropriate tests and results to consider in assessment and treatment.

For most patients presenting with non-traumatic elbow disorders, special studies are not needed during the first 4 weeks. Most patients improve quickly, provided red flag conditions are ruled out. Also, of note, a number of patients with elbow symptoms will have associated disease such as diabetes mellitus, hypothyroidism, renal disease, and one or more of the arthritides which are often heretofore undiagnosed. When medical history and/or physical

examination findings indicate or other risk factors are present, testing for these or other comorbid condition(s) is recommended.

TESTING PROCEDURES

Antibodies

There are numerous antibodies that are markers for specific rheumatic diseases (e.g., rheumatoid factor, anti-nuclear antibodies, anti-Sm, anti-Ro, anti-La for rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, Sjogren's, mixed connective tissue disorder, etc.). Patients with rheumatic disorders are at increased risk for degenerative joint disease of the elbow [40,41,42,43,44].

Elbow Arthroscopy

Arthroscopy of the elbow has been used for diagnosis and treatment of some patients with elbow disorders [45,46,47]; however, indications for either diagnostic or therapeutic procedures are not well defined with quality studies.

Bone Scans

Bone scans involve intravenous administration of a radioactive tracer medication that is preferentially concentrated in areas of metabolic activity in bone [48,49]. The radioactivity is then detected by a large sensor, and converted into images of the skeleton. There are many causes for abnormal radioactive uptake, including metastases, infection, inflammatory arthropathies, fracture or other significant bone trauma. Thus, positive bone scans are not highly specific. Bone scans have been used for diagnosis of early osteonecrosis prior to findings on x-ray, among other uses [50,51,52,53].

Computerized Tomography (CT)

Computerized tomography remains an important imaging procedure, particularly for bony anatomy, whereas MRI is superior for soft tissue abnormalities [54,55,56]. CT may be useful for elbow joint abnormalities where advanced imaging of the bones is required. CT may be helpful for evaluation of AVN and following traumatic dislocations or arthroplasty-associated recurrent dislocations. CT also may be useful to evaluate patients with contraindications for MRI (most typically an implanted metallic-ferrous device) [55].

C-Reactive Protein, Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate, and Other Non-Specific Inflammatory Markers

There are many markers of inflammation that may be measured serologically. These include C-reactive protein (CRP), erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR), ferritin, and an elevated total protein-albumin gap [57,58,59,60].

Electromyography and Nerve Conduction Studies (Electrodiagnostic Studies)

Electrodiagnostic (ED) studies have been used to confirm diagnostic impressions of other peripheral nerve entrapments, including all peripheral nerves in the upper extremity. They may be particularly helpful to distinguish a peripheral entrapment from cervical radiculopathy [61,62] (see Cervical and Thoracic Spine Disorders guideline for discussion of ED studies for evaluation of spine-related disorders that may present as elbow pain). NCS and EMG may be normal, particularly in some mild cases of neuropathies. If ED studies are negative, tests may be repeated later in the course of treatment if symptoms persist. It is also important to recognize that ED studies are abnormal in a considerable proportion of

patients who are without symptoms [63]. Thus, ED studies in a patient with a low pre-test probability of peripheral nerve entrapment may result in inappropriate diagnosis [64,65].

Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is considered the imaging test of choice for viewing soft tissues (including ligamentous injuries around the elbow). MRI is helpful for evaluating extent of biceps tendinosis and ruptures. MRI is considered the gold standard for evaluating osteonecrosis after x-rays [66,67,68,69,70,71,72,73,74,75]. However, for most elbow disorders, MRI is not used as an imaging procedure.

Roentgenograms (X-Rays)

X-rays show bony structure and remain the initial test for evaluation of most cases of elbow pain [76,77]. Two or three views are generally performed [78,79,80,81,82,83,84,85,86,87].

Single Proton Emission Computed Tomography (SPECT) and Positron Emission Tomography (PET)

Single proton emission computed tomography (SPECT) is a 3-dimensional imaging technique in which radionucleotide tracers that release gamma radiation are used to create multiplanar re-formations. Positron emission tomography (PET) is another major technique that investigates functional and, to a lesser degree, anatomical details within the brain, but uses positron-emitting radionucleotides.

Ultrasound

Diagnostic ultrasound has been used to evaluate the elbow joint, especially for epicondylalgia [88].

INITIAL CARE

Initial treatment should generally be guided by implementing the strongest evidence-based recommendations that are considered 1st-line interventions. Exceptions include treatments that are accepted as best practices, but have not been subjected to RCTs or crossover trials (e.g., antibiotics for diabetics with “dirty” lacerations). Careful consideration of the indications and limitations described in the full text for each recommendation is critical to understanding the best application for each intervention. If treatment response is inadequate (i.e., if symptoms and activity limitations continue), 2nd- and 3rd-line recommendations may be considered [89]. Physicians should consider the possibilities of diagnosed and previously undiagnosed medical diseases such as diabetes mellitus, hypothyroidism, or various arthritides.

Comfort is often a patient’s primary concern. Nonprescription analgesics will provide sufficient pain relief for most patients with acute or subacute elbow symptoms. If the patient’s response to treatment is inadequate (i.e., symptoms and activity limitations continue), pharmaceuticals, orthotics, or physical methods can be prescribed. Co-morbid conditions, adverse effects, cost, and clinician and patient preferences should be considerations in guiding the choice of recommendations.

For treatments of uncertain effectiveness that are free of undue risk and individual and aggregate cost, a therapeutic trial may be appropriate if adverse effects and effectiveness are carefully followed. The effectiveness of such a trial should be measured by objective findings appropriate for the patient and the intervention, and should be documented

accordingly. The trial should be promptly discontinued if it does not result in subjective or functional improvement. Part of the initial treatment plan for all disorders should include patient education. For most diagnoses this is critical to successful treatment.

Patient Education Issues

- Patient education is best accomplished if similar advice is given by all health care team members.
- Patients need reassurance that elbow pain is common and generally resolves with time.
- Work-related and activity modifications are often helpful.
- Biceps tendinosis generally responds well to non-operative management. Serious biceps tears usually require surgical repairs and the majority of patients regain full function. Partial tears require judgment regarding whether operative or non-operative approaches are likely to result in better outcomes for a patient. The need for surgery is thought to increase with the size of the tear.
- Olecranon bursitis and epicondylalgia are common and usually resolve completely.
- Pronator syndrome, radial, and ulnar neuropathies generally have a good prognosis, although some cases require surgery.
- Fractures and dislocations require urgent treatment, and many (especially radial head fractures) have good prognoses. Alternately, complex or compound fractures may have poor prognoses, although nearly all patients have good functional recoveries after treatment.
- Osteoarthrosis generally responds to treatment with NSAIDs or acetaminophen.
- Patients should be encouraged to maintain a high level of function; however, modifications may be helpful in reducing stresses to the elbow.
- Rest and immobilization are discouraged in the management of elbow disorders other than fractures, as they usually cause further disability and prolong treatment.

Occupational Issues

- Patients with elbow fractures may require more time off work, especially if one-handed work is unavailable. In general however, patients should be encouraged to return to normal activity or work as soon as possible. Some situations require modified duty. However, the more activities are reduced, the more time generally required to rehabilitate the patient.
- If elbow pain is present, reduced activity may be necessary if the physical requirements of the job exceed the patient's tolerance.
- Modification of offending or aggravating activity(ies) may require consultation with a qualified professional trained in ergonomic analysis, particularly in the setting of high job-physical demands, especially high force combined with high repetition.
- Work technique may need to be changed to address for example, excessive grip force or sustained wrist extension.
- Ergonomic biomechanical advice on the efficient use of the elbow may be helpful. For example, with lateral epicondylalgia, it may help to lift with palm up and not palm down to reduce stress on the lateral elbow (caused by resisted wrist extension). For medial epicondylalgia, it may be helpful to lift palm down to reduce stress on the medial elbow (caused by resisted wrist flexion).
- A functional capacity evaluation (FCE) can establish appropriate physical capacity for work although results should be interpreted with caution and testing should be preferably

conducted by a health professional (e.g., occupational or physical therapist) well experienced in dealing with patients who may self-limit due to pain. Non-physical factors, return to work programs and participatory ergonomics, should be addressed as needed. Empower patients to accept responsibility for managing their recovery.

Adaptive Equipment/Assistive Devices and Other Allied Health Therapies

- Elbow straps (proximal forearm epicondylitis bands) may be helpful for epicondylalgia.
- Wrist splints are often helpful for patients with radial neuropathies and pronator syndrome. Some clinicians also prescribe wrist splints for lateral epicondylalgia.
- When immobilization is utilized, range-of-motion exercises should usually involve the elbow, wrist, and shoulder to avoid adhesive capsulitis ("frozen shoulder").
- Elbow braces are commonly prescribed for nocturnal use in patients with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow.
- Ice, heat, ultrasound, and other similar modalities are sometimes used for elbow pain in the clinical setting.
- Consider heat and ice as a part of self care at home, particularly in the acute pain setting. Heat/ice should provide temporary relief of symptoms, but can reinforce pain and illness behaviors in persons with chronic pain. While many believe heat is not indicated in the acute phase of many injuries, acute low back pain has been demonstrated to be successfully treated with heat. Quality evidence is lacking to oppose the use of heat for acute injuries.
- There is no evidence to support prolonged and repetitive use of therapeutic modalities (e.g., massage, electrical therapies, manipulation, and acupuncture) result in meaningful, functional improvements. Long-term treatment, particularly if there is no documentation of functional improvement, is not indicated in managing patients with chronic pain.

Exercise Issues

- Graded exercises to assist in achieving a return to normal function are indicated.
- Gentle exercises are useful to regain normal range of motion in the acute pain and post-operative settings. Aggressive stretching may be contraindicated if symptoms are aggravated. It is also important for patients to understand that while exercises after surgery can have some discomfort, they should not experience significant increase in pain or new onset of swelling.
- Quality studies of exercises for treatment for elbow disorders are lacking. By inference from studies of many other MSDs, conditioning, aerobic and strengthening exercises are likely most helpful for the rehabilitation of most chronic elbow pain conditions. Consultation with a physical or occupational therapist to determine the most appropriate exercises for the patient is in order.

Medications

- Initial management of most elbow pain conditions is with NSAIDs and acetaminophen.
- Topical NSAIDs are effective for epicondylalgia.
- Opioids should be avoided for most patients. Opioids might be needed for managing select patients with acute trauma during the initial post-injury period.

- Glucocorticoid injections are indicated for select use in patients with epicondylalgia, particularly if other treatments have been unsuccessful.

Other Issues

- If significant symptoms causing self-limitations or restrictions persist beyond 4 to 6 weeks, referral for specialty evaluation (e.g., occupational medicine, physical medicine and rehabilitation, or orthopaedic surgery) may be indicated to assist in confirming the provisional diagnosis and in determining further management.
- Non-physical factors (i.e., psychiatric, psychosocial, workplace, or socioeconomic issues) should be investigated and addressed, particularly in cases of delayed recovery or delayed return to work. These factors are often not overt and specific inquiries are required to identify these issues.

FOLLOW-UP VISITS

Patients with potentially work-related elbow symptoms should generally have a follow-up visit approximately every 3 (severe disorders) to 7 days (typical disorder severity) to monitor medication use and/or a physical or occupational therapist visit for counseling regarding contributing physical factor avoidance (e.g., reducing force, avoiding static positions), sleep posture, and other concerns. More frequent follow-up is usually required for patients who are not working. Education is recommended to include answering questions and making sessions interactive so that the patient is involved in their recovery, including identifying potential barriers to recovery and return to normal function and work. More specific guidance for follow-up visits may be included in the discussion of each disorder topic.

MONITORING / AUDITING CRITERIA

The clinician is recommended to assure:

1. Imaging of the elbow is not done at initial evaluation for non-traumatic injuries. Target <10%
2. Lateral epicondylalgia patients are treated with an NSAID absent a contraindication. Target 100%
3. Lateral epicondylalgia patients without sufficient results from NSAID and elbow strap are treated with iontophoresis with either glucocorticosteroid or NSAID. Target >75%
4. Ulnar neuropathy at the elbow patients are taught to sleep with the elbows extended. Target 100%
5. Patients with cubital tunnel ulnar neuropathy at the elbow who fail non-operative management undergo simple aponeurotic release. Target >80%

ERGONOMIC INTERVENTIONS

In order to facilitate recovery and prevent recurrence of elbow musculoskeletal disorders, the physician may recommend work and activity modifications or ergonomic redesign of the workplace [(90)]. The employer's role in accommodating activity limitations and preventing further problems through ergonomic changes is crucial in hastening the employee's return to full activity. In some cases it may be desirable to conduct an ergonomic analysis of the activities that may be contributing to the symptoms. A broad range of ergonomic surveys and instruments is available for estimating duration of hand intensive activities, grasp repetition rates, pinch force, part or tool weights, reach distance, frequency of motion, and wrist and hand postures, as well as psychological factors such as organizational relationships

and job satisfaction. Such detailed measures may be necessary or useful for modifying activity, redesigning the workstation, or recommending organizational and management relief. Such situations may require a therapy plan of care to include an ergonomic analysis or call for referral to certified professional ergonomists, a human factors engineer or other professionals with the capabilities to perform these analyses.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS

Return-to-work programs have not been well studied among patients with elbow disorders (see Chronic Pain guideline). Several studies suggest that job physical demands, lack of job accommodation, and psychosocial conditions are the most important factors in predicting work disability [91,92,93]. In the United States, these programs are typically informal, involve early, if not immediate, interventions involving the patient, clinician, workplace supervisor and insurer to return the worker to productive work. Some involve physical or occupational therapists, particularly if the employer has difficulty identifying modified duty positions, although many occupational physicians also perform those services. More formalized evaluations are sometimes performed for patients with chronic lost-time injuries. Return-to-work programs in Europe typically involve only patients with chronic pain with long-standing lost-time. They have typically involved a team of clinicians, formal meetings and return to work activities.

WORK ACTIVITIES

Table 3 provides consensus recommendations on activity modification and duration of absence from work. These guidelines are intended for patients without comorbidity or complicating factors. The recommendations are targets to provide a guide from the perspective of physiologic recovery. Key factors to consider in disability duration are age and job activities. By communicating with patients and employers, physicians can make it clear that:

- Limit forceful wrist movement that involve extrinsic muscles attached at the elbow.
- Forceful repetitive grasping may increase elbow symptoms.
- Sustained or repeated hyperflexion of the elbow may increase ulnar nerve symptoms.
- Modified work and workplace activity guides may allow for recovery or time to (re)build activity tolerance through exercise.

Significant reductions in unnecessary lost work time can occur when the patient, physician, and employer work together to develop and apply modified work activities [94,95,96,97,98].

BICEPS AND TRICEPS TENDINOSIS

OVERVIEW

Biceps tendinosis (or tendinitis) is a true muscle strain involving the muscle-tendon junction of the biceps brachii [99,100]. (See ACOEM Shoulder Disorders Guideline for bicipital tendinitis and ruptures at the shoulder.) It typically occurs in the setting of the use of high force, particularly if unaccustomed [99,101]. Symptoms are non-radiating pain in the muscle-tendon junction and there are generally no paraesthesias [102]. Pain limited weakness is a common complaint. While frequently considered two discrete entities of tendinosis vs. rupture, there is considerable overlap ranging from mild to moderate to severe ruptures. The greater the degree of rupture, the greater the likelihood surgery may be needed to attempt to restore

the greatest degree of function, particularly in working age patients. The overall quality of evidence has been notably poor [102,103].

Triceps tendinosis (or tendinitis) is a true muscle strain involving the muscle-tendon junction of the triceps. It is believed to be analogous to biceps tendinosis, including high force mechanism of injury [99,100,101,104,105]. There are no quality trials for treatment of this condition; thus, treatment by analogy to biceps tendinoses and tears is recommended including surgical repairs (see above) [99,100,104,105].

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

Individuals seem to vary in their susceptibility to tendinoses with some never apparently experiencing this condition. Many people experience mild tendon problems, but recover. Others develop chronic tendinosis that is not infrequently attributed to physical exertion. Many individuals develop chronic tendon injuries in multiple places of the body. Usually, a careful medical history will reveal some contributing associated factor(s), but tendon injury occasionally occurs without an obvious cause.

Theoretically, the tendinosis cycle begins when breakdown exceeds repair. One theory is that physical exertion causes micro-injuries that accumulate with time. The tensile strength of collagen is exceeded, and the tendon tries to repair itself, but the cells produce new collagen with an abnormal structure and composition. The new collagen has an abnormally high Type III/Type I ratio. Experiments have shown that the excess Type III collagen at the expense of Type I collagen weakens the tendon, making it prone to further injury. Part of the problem may be that the new collagen fibers are less organized into the normal parallel structure, making the tendon less able to withstand tensile stress along the direction of the tendon [106]. Therefore, according to this theory, tendinosis is a slow accumulation of minor injuries that are not repaired properly and that leave the tendon vulnerable to additional injury. This failed healing process may be one reason why some people with tendinosis do not completely clinically heal following an injury and encounter difficulties in returning to their previous level of activity. Once the tendinosis cycle starts, the tendon is believed to rarely heal back to its pre-injury state, although many patients appear to clinically resolve.

Relative rest is thought to be an essential part of the acute healing process for tendinosis, too much rest causes deconditioning of muscles and tendons. Also, some individuals heal without any change in physical activities. The weaker muscles and tendons leave the area more vulnerable to injury. Thus, the area may become weaker on a large scale as well as on a cellular scale. This cycle of injury/rest/deconditioning/more injury may be difficult to break. Gradual, careful physical exercises are believed to be most effective.

DIAGNOSIS

INITIAL ASSESSMENT

X-rays are sometimes used to evaluate patients with biceps tendinosis and tears, although MRI and ultrasound are more commonly utilized.

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is often used to evaluate patients with biceps tendinosis and tears [107].

Ultrasound has been used to evaluate patients with biceps tendinosis and tears.

There are no quality studies for evaluation or treatment of biceps tendinosis or tears. Patients with severe or complete ruptures should be referred to a surgeon to evaluate the need for surgical repair. Other patients should receive treatment including activity limitations and pain management strategies generally centering on NSAIDs.

DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA

Biceps tendinosis is diagnosed based on a combination of typical inciting event (usually high force exertion such as maximal lift, or unaccustomed stereotypical high force use) combined with characteristic localized elbow pain to the affected myotendinous junctions as they insert in the distal biceps' tendon in the distal upper arm. Focal tenderness is present over the affected, disrupted junctions. Ecchymosis may be present and is generally proportionate to the degree of tear of the junctions and/or rupture. Biceps ruptures involve a larger degree of tear of the myotendinous junctions up to, and including a complete rupture of one half or, rarely, both of the biceps brachii. These ruptures have a greater degree of associated weakness for elbow flexion. The physical examination also includes palpable abnormalities sometimes described as a "ropey" feeling biceps in the area of the insertion. An accompanying hematoma is often present.

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

X-RAYS

X-RAYS FOR BICEPS TENDINOSIS OR RUPTURES

Recommended

X-rays are recommended for biceps tendinosis or ruptures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

X-rays are not the first imaging study for consideration, as MRI or ultrasound is generally preferable. However, x-rays are particularly warranted if there is an acute traumatic event to help rule-out fracture. X-rays are not invasive, have low adverse effects, and are low cost. Therefore, they are recommended.

MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI)

MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI) FOR BICEPS TENDINOSIS OR RUPTURES

Recommended

Magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) is recommended for biceps tendinosis or ruptures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with moderate to severe biceps tendinosis or ruptures, particularly in whom the need for surgery is uncertain. Patients with complete ruptures generally do not require MRI

as it usually does not alter the need for surgery. Patients with mild tears generally do not require MRI as the test does not alter the treatment plan and the good prognosis.

Rationale

MRIs are likely the most common imaging study to evaluate the degree of rupture. MRIs may assist in evaluating the need for surgery particularly in those patients with moderately severe tears in whom the degree of rupture may help identify whether surgery is likely to be beneficial. MRIs are not invasive, have low adverse effects, and are high cost. Therefore, they are recommended.

ULTRASOUND

DIAGNOSTIC ULTRASOUND FOR BICEPS TENDINOSIS OR RUPTURES

Recommended

Diagnostic ultrasound is recommended for the evaluation and diagnosis of biceps tendinosis or ruptures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with moderate to severe biceps tendinosis or ruptures, particularly those for whom the need for surgery is uncertain. Patients with complete ruptures generally do not require diagnostic ultrasound as it usually does not alter the need for surgery. Patients with mild tears generally do not require ultrasound as the test does not alter the treatment plan and the good prognosis. Ultrasound should generally not be performed in addition to MRI as it usually does not add additional information of benefit.

Rationale

After MRI, diagnostic ultrasound is likely the second most common imaging study to evaluate the degree of biceps tendinosis or rupture. Ultrasound may assist in evaluating the need for surgery particularly in those patients with moderately severe tears in whom the degree of rupture may help identify whether surgery is likely to be beneficial. Ultrasound is not invasive, has low adverse effects, and is moderate cost. Therefore, it is recommended.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

ACTIVITY MODIFICATION AND EXERCISE

EXERCISES FOR BICEPS TENDINOSIS, RUPTURES, OR POSTOPERATIVE PATIENTS

Recommended

Range-of-motion transitioning to strengthening exercises is recommended for treatment of biceps tendinosis, ruptures and post-operative patients.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

All biceps tendinosis patients are candidates.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Patients require individualized treatment plans based on pre-injury conditioning, injury severity, stage and progress. Generally, exercises begin with gentle stretching and progress to strengthening. Many, if not most patients require formal therapy. Mildly affected patients may recover sufficiently with fewer appointments. Two to three appointments per week for 4 to 6 weeks may be needed for more severely affected patients, followed by weekly appointments for another 4 to 6 weeks. Mildly affected patients who require supervised therapy may require as few as two or three appointments to institute a home exercise program that is gradually progressed.

Indications for discontinuation

Varies widely depending on severity, preinjury conditioning and job demands. Generally requires at least 2 to 3 weeks of supervision, with more severely affected patients, patients with high job physical demands and post-operative patients requiring up to 3 months.

Rationale

There are no quality trials that evaluate exercises to rehabilitate non-operatively treated biceps tendinosis and ruptures. Exercises are believed to be critical for rehabilitation of these injuries. Transitioning from stretching to strengthening is required. Supervised therapy is often needed for more severely affected patients and post-operative patients. Workers with high job physical demands also frequently require supervised therapy to help assist with achieving an appropriate level of capacity prior to attempting return to high job demands. Exercises are not invasive and have low adverse effects. Costs range from low to high depending on numbers of appointments required. Exercise is recommended.

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR BICEPS TENDINOSIS AND TEARS

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for the treatment of pain from biceps tendinosis and tears.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Most patients with biceps tendinosis and tears require pain medication for pain control and most are likely candidates for treatment with NSAIDs. Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal bleeding may be better candidates for treatment with acetaminophen or a COX-2 inhibitor. (See Hip and Groin Disorders guideline.)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Dosing per manufacturer's recommendation. Many patients have sufficient pain that scheduled dosing is recommended in the acute healing phase. As-needed dosing may be sufficient for mild cases or those with less pain.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, of development of adverse effects.

Rationale

There is no quality evidence for use of NSAIDs for treatment of these patients, however they address pain management. NSAIDs are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low cost and are thus recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of NSAIDs and acetaminophen for biceps tendinosis and tears.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR BICEPS TENDINOSIS AND TEARS

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for the treatment of pain from biceps tendinosis and tears.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Most patients with biceps tendinosis and tears require pain medication for pain control and most are likely candidates for treatment with NSAIDs. Patients at high risk for

gastrointestinal bleeding may be better candidates for treatment with acetaminophen or a COX-2 inhibitor. (See Hip and Groin Disorders guideline).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Dosing per manufacturer's recommendation. Many patients have sufficient pain that scheduled dosing is recommended in the acute healing phase. As-needed dosing may be sufficient for mild cases or those with less pain.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, of development of adverse effects.

Rationale

There is no quality evidence for use of NSAIDs for treatment of these patients, however they address pain management. NSAIDs are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low cost and are thus recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of NSAIDs and acetaminophen for biceps tendinosis and tears.

OPIOIDS FOR SELECT PATIENTS WITH BICEPS TENDINOSIS

Sometimes Recommended

Opioids are recommended for treatment of select patients with pain from moderately severe to severe biceps tendinosis or ruptures, particularly with nocturnal sleep disruption. Post-operative patients are also candidates.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Select patients with severe pain from moderately severe to severe biceps tendinosis and ruptures with insufficient control from other means, including acetaminophen and NSAIDs or with contraindications for NSAIDs. Post-operative patients are candidates. Considerable cautions are recommended concerning opioids and minimum numbers of doses should be prescribed as duration of treatment for elbow sprains is usually limited.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

As-needed dosing with generally nocturnal dosing preferred for many patients. Post-operative patients may require scheduled dosing for the first few post-operative days. Most non-operative patients should be weaned off opioids within 7 to 10 days after the event.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain sufficiently to not require opioids, consumption that does not follow prescription instructions, adverse effects.

Rationale

Many patients will require a few days of treatment with opioids in the acute post-operative period, while non-operative patients do not generally require opioids. Patients with moderately severe to severe biceps tendinosis or inadequate control with NSAIDs may require opioids. There is no quality evidence for use of opioids for treatment of these patients, however they address pain management. There are major concerns regarding adverse effects of opioids including mortality. However, it is presumed that few doses combined with short term use provides sufficient margin of safety for these medications. Opioids are not invasive, are low cost, but have high adverse effect profiles. They are recommended for limited duration use in select patients.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of opioids for patients with biceps tendinosis or ruptures.

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

DEVICES

SLINGS AND SPLINTS FOR BICEPS TENDINOSIS, RUPTURES AND POSTOPERATIVE PATIENTS

Recommended

Slings and splints are recommended for the treatment of biceps tendinosis, ruptures, and post-operative patients.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Moderate to severely affected patients, especially for the first week. Post-operative patients also usually treated with posterior splints for approximately 2 weeks (range 1 to 6 weeks) (Rineer et al., 2009, Sutton et al., 2010).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Generally should be used for less than 7 to 10 days with gradual reduction in use. Range of motion exercises of the elbow and shoulder are recommended several times daily for non-operative patients while using a sling or splint to prevent after complications from reduced ranges of motion. Operative patients require rest prior to resumption of exercises.

Rationale

There are no quality trials. Slings and splints have been used to treat biceps tendinosis and ruptures. Prolonged use is believed to result in reduced ranges of motion and other complications such as adhesive capsulitis. Range-of-motion exercises are recommended while using a sling or splint. Slings and splints are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low to moderate cost, and are recommended.

SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

SURGICAL REPAIR FOR DISTAL BICEPS RUPTURES

Recommended

Surgical repair of distal biceps ruptures is recommended.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Biceps tendon ruptures that are either complete, large or in select patients with moderately severe biceps tendinosis patients who fail to adequately progress with non-operative care with which they have demonstrated compliance. Patients with high job physical demands but only moderate tears are also candidates for surgery to attempt to regain sufficient function to return to those job tasks.

Rationale

Quality studies are not available on surgery for biceps ruptures. There are multiple reconstruction procedures involving local repair, autografts and allografts (Hamer et al., 2008, Boyd et al., 1961, Failla et al., 1990, Hovelius et al., 1977, Kelly et al., 2000, D'Alessandro et al., 1993). There is some evidence suggesting higher surgical complication rates among those over 3 to 12 weeks post-rupture (Kelly et al., 2000, Darlis et al., 2006, Kaplan et al., 2002, Morrison et al., 2002, Ramsey, 1999, Sanchez-Sotelo et al., 2002, Sharma et al., 2004, Strauch et al., 1997). There is not quality evidence of benefits due to the low incidence and severity of these issues (Hamer et al., 2008). However, while surgery is high cost, invasive, and has some potential for adverse effects, outcomes appear much better with surgery as this muscle is the main forearm flexor. Thus, while there is insufficient evidence, surgery for a ruptured biceps is recommended.

PROGNOSIS

Patients are often instructed to perform gentle range-of-motion exercises within pain-free range a few times a day to maintain as normal a range of motion during healing as practical. Excessive stretching however should generally be avoided during the acute healing phase. Heavy or moderately heavy forceful use should also be avoided in the acute healing phase. In addition, interventions are provided to address modifications to performance of ADLs and IADLs.

FOLLOW-UP CARE

MONITORING PROGRESS

Patients should be re-evaluated approximately every 7 to 14 days to evaluate progress. If there is a lack of progress, diagnostic testing (see above) and/or referral for potential surgical repair should be considered.

BICEPS AND TRICEPS STRAINS AND TEARS

OVERVIEW

A strain consists of a partial or complete disruption of a myotendinous junction. A biceps strain involves one or both tendons of the biceps brachii at the elbow. Bicipital tendinosis involves the long head of the biceps at the shoulder and is a more common condition (see ACOEM Shoulder Disorders Guideline); it is sometimes also referred to as biceps strain.

High-force activities generally cause biceps strains and tears, particularly when unaccustomed activities are involved. Prior strains presumably increase the probability of a future strain or tear. A complete muscular tear of the biceps may occur. Strains are treated by removal from high-force activities, and NSAIDs and therapy are used for more severely affected cases. Severe or complete biceps tears are usually treated surgically. Triceps tendon strains and tears are comparable to the biceps strains although less common. The triceps insertion on the olecranon is involved and treatment is similar to that recommended for biceps strains.

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

Biceps strains and ruptures involve myotendinous strains in the biceps insertion(s) at the elbow. Symptoms usually occur acutely and are associated with a maximal forceful use. These injuries are considered more analogous to acute injuries than diseases, although repeated unaccustomed use may have precipitated the event. Thus, the nature of the forceful unaccustomed use determines whether the condition is work-related.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

See also recommendations on the treatment of Biceps Ruptures.

REHABILITATION

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-

up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies).

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

PROGNOSIS

Biceps strains may not require work limitations if mild and the patient has the ability to avoid the high force activity. However, the more forceful the work and more significant the symptoms, the more likely work limitations will be needed for biceps strains. Biceps tears/ruptures require work limitations during the recovery phase that typically include no use for a period of at least a couple weeks followed by graded increase in activities.

ELBOW CONTUSION

OVERVIEW

A contusion is an injury of a part without a break in the skin and with a subcutaneous hemorrhage. It is an acute injury with bruising [(18)].

Contusions result from blunt force trauma that ruptures blood vessels, producing bruises (ecchymoses). Common occupational causes include falls, motor vehicle accidents, and being struck by objects. These are generally self-limited conditions absent underlying structural damage. Treatment usually consists of ice, acetaminophen, NSAIDs, and relative rest.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

ACTIVITY MODIFICATION AND EXERCISE

RANGE-OF-MOTION EXERCISES FOR CONTUSIONS

Recommended

Range-of-motion exercises are recommended for treating elbow contusions.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies for any of these interventions. Medical management of contusions is recommended to be directed at maintaining normal elbow function. With significant contusion-related injury, there is a risk of deep tissue involvement, potentially leading to scarring and limitation of motion. Accordingly, treatment should include anti-inflammatory medications with avoidance of immobilization except as necessitated by other injuries. Anti-inflammatory medications serve as an analgesic in the doses that are used for contusions. Early mobilization should also be encouraged to prevent impairment and disability and can be best accomplished through instruction in the initial clinical visit. Medical management can be summarized as protection, rest, ice, compression, elevation, and range-of-motion exercises. Range-of-motion exercises should primarily involve the elbow, but may also include the shoulder and wrist, particularly if a sling is prescribed. They are all thought to be helpful, are not invasive, have low adverse effects especially for short-term use and are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of NSAIDs, acetaminophen, ice, compression, range of motion exercises, and avoidance of immobilization for elbow contusions.

IMMOBILIZATION FOR CONTUSIONS

Not Recommended

Immobilization is not recommended for elbow contusions.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies for any of these interventions. Medical management of contusions is recommended to be directed at maintaining normal elbow function. With significant contusion-related injury, there is a risk of deep tissue involvement, potentially leading to scarring and limitation of motion. Accordingly, treatment should include anti-inflammatory medications with avoidance of immobilization except as necessitated by other injuries. Anti-inflammatory medications serve as an analgesic in the doses that are used for contusions. Early mobilization should also be encouraged to prevent impairment and

disability and can be best accomplished through instruction in the initial clinical visit. Medical management can be summarized as protection, rest, ice, compression, elevation, and range-of-motion exercises. Range-of-motion exercises should primarily involve the elbow, but may also include the shoulder and wrist, particularly if a sling is prescribed. They are all thought to be helpful, are not invasive, have low adverse effects especially for short-term use and are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of NSAIDs, acetaminophen, ice, compression, range of motion exercises, and avoidance of immobilization for elbow contusions

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR ELBOW CONTUSIONS

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for treating elbow contusions.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies for any of these interventions. Medical management of contusions is recommended to be directed at maintaining normal elbow function. With significant contusion-related injury, there is a risk of deep tissue involvement, potentially leading to scarring and limitation of motion. Accordingly, treatment should include anti-inflammatory medications with avoidance of immobilization except as necessitated by other injuries. Anti-inflammatory medications serve as an analgesic in the doses that are used for contusions. Early mobilization should also be encouraged to prevent impairment and disability and can be best accomplished through instruction in the initial clinical visit. Medical management can be summarized as protection, rest, ice, compression, elevation, and range-of-motion exercises. Range-of-motion exercises should primarily involve the elbow, but may also include the shoulder and wrist, particularly if a sling is prescribed. They are all thought to be helpful, are not invasive, have low adverse effects especially for short-term use and are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of NSAIDs, acetaminophen, ice, compression, range of motion exercises, and avoidance of immobilization for elbow contusions.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR ELBOW CONTUSIONS

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for treating elbow contusions.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies for any of these interventions. Medical management of contusions is recommended to be directed at maintaining normal elbow function. With significant contusion-related injury, there is a risk of deep tissue involvement, potentially leading to scarring and limitation of motion. Accordingly, treatment should include anti-inflammatory medications with avoidance of immobilization except as necessitated by other injuries. Anti-inflammatory medications serve as an analgesic in the doses that are used for contusions. Early mobilization should also be encouraged to prevent impairment and disability and can be best accomplished through instruction in the initial clinical visit. Medical management can be summarized as protection, rest, ice, compression, elevation, and range-of-motion exercises. Range-of-motion exercises should primarily involve the elbow, but may also include the shoulder and wrist, particularly if a sling is prescribed. They are all thought to be helpful, are not invasive, have low adverse effects especially for short-term use and are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of NSAIDs, acetaminophen, ice, compression, range of motion exercises, and avoidance of immobilization for elbow contusions.

HOT AND COLD THERAPIES

ICE FOR CONTUSION

Recommended

Ice is recommended for treating elbow contusions.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies for any of these interventions. Medical management of contusions is recommended to be directed at maintaining normal elbow function. With significant contusion-related injury, there is a risk of deep tissue involvement, potentially leading to scarring and limitation of motion. Accordingly, treatment should include anti-inflammatory medications with avoidance of immobilization except as necessitated by other injuries. Anti-inflammatory medications serve as an analgesic in the doses that are used for contusions. Early mobilization should also be encouraged to prevent impairment and disability and can be best accomplished through instruction in the initial clinical visit. Medical management can be summarized as protection, rest, ice, compression, elevation, and range-of-motion exercises. Range-of-motion exercises should primarily involve the elbow, but may also include the shoulder and wrist, particularly if a sling is prescribed. They are all thought to be helpful, are not invasive, have low adverse effects especially for short-term use and are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of NSAIDs, acetaminophen, ice, compression, range of motion exercises, and avoidance of immobilization for elbow contusions.

REHABILITATION

COMPRESSION FOR CONTUSIONS

Recommended

Compression is recommended for treating elbow contusions.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies for any of these interventions. Medical management of contusions is recommended to be directed at maintaining normal elbow function. With significant contusion-related injury, there is a risk of deep tissue involvement, potentially leading to scarring and limitation of motion. Accordingly, treatment should include anti-inflammatory medications with avoidance of immobilization except as necessitated by other injuries. Anti-inflammatory medications serve as an analgesic in the doses that are used for contusions. Early mobilization should also be encouraged to prevent impairment and disability and can be best accomplished through instruction in the initial clinical visit. Medical management can be summarized as protection, rest, ice, compression, elevation, and range-of-motion exercises. Range-of-motion exercises should primarily involve the elbow, but may also include the shoulder and wrist, particularly if a sling is prescribed. They are all thought to be helpful, are not invasive, have low adverse effects especially for short-term use and are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of NSAIDs, acetaminophen, ice, compression, range of motion exercises, and avoidance of immobilization for elbow contusions.

ELBOW DISLOCATION

OVERVIEW

Dislocation of the elbow generally occurs as a result of significant, high-force trauma, and only dislocation of the shoulder is more common clinically [(31)]. The most common mechanism is falling onto an outstretched hand, resulting in a posterior dislocation (98% of cases). Severe pain and inability to use the elbow and hand are typical presenting complaints. Accompanying fractures and vascular and neurological problems are common, and a combination of fracture and dislocation is called complex or complex instability. (405, 406) Radial head fractures are present approximately 10% of the time [(108)]. A combination of dislocation, radial head and ulnar coronoid process fractures is called the terrible triad injury [(109-113)].

Most elbow dislocations occur due to violent or high-speed collisions, falls, or are congenital due to joint malformation or excessive laxity. The mechanism of injury determines whether the condition is work-related. X-rays and relocation, which may call for anesthesia, are required.

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

Elbow dislocations, fractures, and sprains are consequences of significant trauma. The mechanism of the trauma determines whether the condition is work-related.

DIAGNOSIS

INITIAL ASSESSMENT

There are no quality studies for evaluation or treatment of dislocated elbows. An evaluation of the motor, sensory, and vascular system is required to rule-out accompanying injuries. Medical management of the dislocated elbow should include an x-ray to assure that there is no fracture. If the elbow remains dislocated, it should be reduced as soon as possible by a health care professional experienced in joint relocation. Injection of an anesthetic into the swollen joint space may help. The longer the elbow remains dislocated, the higher the probability that general anesthesia will be required to successfully reduce the elbow. Post-reduction x-rays are necessary, as well as an exam to be sure that the reduction is successful and that there is no loose body present. A posterior splint is to be applied for 10 days. Range-of-motion exercises are recommended after immobilization. Range-of-motion exercises should primarily involve the elbow, but should also include the shoulder (to prevent frozen shoulder), and the wrist.

DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA

Dislocations are diagnosed based on a combination of typical inciting event (usually fall or trauma) combined with deformity and inability to use the arm. Persistent dislocation involves a complete inability to use the arm and deformity. Those that spontaneously reduced are usually accompanied by ongoing, though reduced pain and may have hemarthrosis.

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

X-RAYS FOR ELBOW DISLOCATION

Recommended

X-rays that include at least two to three views are recommended for elbow dislocation to rule-out fractures. Repeat x-rays after reduction are also recommended.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating x-rays for elbow dislocations. However, x-rays are used to rule-out fractures which are found approximately 10% of the time. Additionally,

post-reduction x-rays are recommended. Thus, they are recommended to eliminate concomitant diagnoses of elbow fractures.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW

Some patients with dislocations have been treated with NSAIDs and acetaminophen. Some patients with dislocations have been treated with opioids. Posterior splints and a sling are used after reduction of a dislocated elbow. Some patients with dislocations have been treated with anesthetic intraarticular injection(s) either pre-reduction or post-reduction for pain control.

Some patients require general anesthesia to facilitate reduction of a dislocated elbow. Surgery may also be required to repair ligaments if there is either sufficient laxity that recurrent dislocations occur or are otherwise unstable [77].

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR ELBOW DISLOCATION

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for treatment of pain from elbow dislocations.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Most patients with elbow dislocation requiring medication for pain control may be candidates. Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal bleeding may be better candidates for treatment with acetaminophen or a COX-2 inhibitor (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

As needed dosing is often sufficient. Most patients require a few days treatment and then generally have insufficient pain for further treatment.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, of development of adverse effects.

Rationale

There is no quality evidence for use of NSAIDs for treatment of patients with elbow dislocation; however, they address pain management. NSAIDs are not invasive, have low adverse effects, and are low cost. Thus, they are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of NSAIDs and acetaminophen for elbow dislocation.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR ELBOW DISLOCATION

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for treatment of pain from elbow dislocations.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Most patients with elbow dislocation requiring medication for pain control may be candidates. Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal bleeding may be better candidates for treatment with acetaminophen or a COX-2 inhibitor (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

As needed dosing is often sufficient. Most patients require a few days treatment and then generally have insufficient pain for further treatment.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, of development of adverse effects.

Rationale

There is no quality evidence for use of NSAIDs for treatment of patients with elbow dislocation; however, they address pain management. NSAIDs are not invasive, have low adverse effects, and are low cost. Thus, they are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of NSAIDs and acetaminophen for elbow dislocation.

OPIOIDS FOR SELECT PATIENTS WITH ELBOW DISLOCATIONS

Sometimes Recommended

Opioids are recommended for treatment of select patients with pain from elbow dislocations

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Select patients with severe pain from elbow dislocation with insufficient control from other means, including acetaminophen and NSAIDs or with contraindications for NSAIDs.

Considerable cautions are recommended concerning opioids and minimum numbers of doses should be prescribed as duration of treatment for elbow dislocations is usually quite limited.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

As-needed dosing. Among the few patients requiring opioids, most require at most a few days treatment and then generally have insufficient pain for further treatment with opioids.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain sufficiently to not require opioids, consumption that does not follow prescription instructions, adverse effects

Rationale

Most patients do not require opioids. Some patients, particularly with more severe dislocations may require opioids. There is no quality evidence for use of opioids for treatment of these patients; however, they address pain management. There are major concerns regarding adverse effects of opioids including mortality. However, it is presumed that few doses combined with short-term use provides sufficient margin of safety for these medications. Opioids are not invasive, are low cost, but have high adverse effect profiles. They are recommended for limited duration use in select patients with elbow dislocations.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of opioids for elbow dislocation.

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

DEVICES

POSTERIOR ELBOW SPLINT AND SLING FOR DISLOCATED ELBOW

Recommended

Posterior elbow splint and slings are recommended for treatment of dislocated elbows.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Dislocated elbows after reduction.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Posterior splints are usually applied for approximately 10-17 days (Josefsson et al., 1987). Range-of-motion exercises are recommended after immobilization. (An RCT in a foreign

language reported early mobilization was superior to plaster immobilization for pure posterior dislocations (Rafai et al., 1999)).

Rationale

There is one moderate-quality trial that suggests immobilization results in comparable outcomes to surgery for simple dislocations (Josefsson et al., 1987). A posterior splint has been used for treatment of these dislocations and is to be applied for approximately 10 to 17 days. Range-of-motion exercises are recommended after immobilization. Splints are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low to moderate cost, and are recommended.

INJECTION THERAPIES

ANESTHETIC INTRA-ARTICULAR INJECTIONS FOR PRE- OR POST-REDUCTION PAIN

Recommended

Anesthetic, with or without opioid, intraarticular injection(s) are recommended either pre-reduction or post-reduction for pain management.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Either pre-reduction to assist with pain control and facilitate reduction or post-reduction for pain control.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Short- or intermediate-acting injectable anesthetics are recommended. Generally only one injection is necessary, usually approximately 5 to 10mL. In some cases, a second may be reasonable.

Rationale

There are no quality trials. Most patients do not require intraarticular anesthetic injections. Some require these injections to assist with obtaining sufficient pain relief to facilitate reduction and thus avoid general anesthesia. Some require these injections after reduction for pain control. Generally, pre-reduction injections utilize more short-term anesthetics and post-reduction injections utilize longer lasting anesthetics. These injections are invasive, have modest adverse effects and are moderately costly, but are recommended to facilitate reduction and/or pain control.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of opioid anesthetic intraarticular injections for pre- or post-reduction pain.

SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

GENERAL ANESTHESIA TO FACILITATE REDUCTION IN SELECT PATIENTS

Sometimes Recommended

General anesthesia is recommended to facilitate reduction in select patients.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Failure to obtain reduction, generally including use of intraarticular anesthetic injection.

Rationale

There are no quality trials addressing the use of general anesthesia to facilitate reduction of a dislocated elbow. Most patients do not require general anesthesia to obtain sufficient muscular relaxation for reduction. In cases where reduction is not obtained and intraarticular injection with anesthetics is insufficient to obtain reduction, general anesthesia is used. General anesthesia is at least modestly invasive, has adverse effects and is high cost, however, it is recommended when other measures fail.

SURGERY FOR ELBOW JOINTS THAT RECURRENTLY DISLOCATE OR ARE UNSTABLE AFTER DISLOCATION

Sometimes Recommended

Surgery is recommended to repair elbow joints that either recurrently dislocate or are otherwise unstable after dislocation(s).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Recurrent elbow dislocations and/or unstable elbows after dislocation(s).

Rationale

There are no quality trials addressing surgery for dislocated elbow joints. Most patients do not require surgical repair after elbow dislocation. However, some have unstable joints due to ligament and/or capsular damage and laxity. Others have recurrent dislocations. Surgical repair is successful in some to improve or resolve these issues. Surgery is invasive, has adverse effects, is costly but is recommended for select patients.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis.

REHABILITATION

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal

potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies)

PROGNOSIS

Fractures require work limitations to avoid use of the fractured arm. Functional restrictions of the affected extremity are limited by an immobilization technique. Activities should be modified to allow for splinting and immobilization of the forearm. Return to work will likely be influenced by the patient and clinician's subjective assessment of disability and perception of job difficulty. It may be helpful to refer the patient to an occupational therapist to address the appropriate activity modification, compensatory strategies, adaptive equipment, and environmental modification throughout the period of the patient’s recovery and rehabilitation. The other injuries may or may not require work limitations depending on severity of the injury and the task demands. However, moderate to severe sprains and dislocations likely necessitate splinting and limitations.

FOLLOW-UP CARE

Patients should be re-evaluated 7 to 10 days after reduction. Range-of-motion exercises should be progressed at that point. If there is failure to progress, additional testing is indicated, including for ruling out fracture.

Most patients with a dislocated elbow are treated with a posterior splint after reduction. They usually are instructed to perform gentle range of motion exercises a few times a day to prevent prolonged rehabilitation to regain normal range of motion after the splint is removed. In addition, interventions are provided to address modifications to performance of ADLs and IADLs.

JOB ANALYSIS

Job analyses may be beneficial to prevent future occurrences of these types of injuries (e.g., machine guarding, icy walkways, tool kickback). Some of these, particularly compartment syndrome and fractures should generally be analyzed for root cause and potential remediation, as these injuries are generally viewed as critical incident cases.

ELBOW FRACTURE

OVERVIEW

Elbow fractures include both frank and stress fractures. All fractures involve an application of force that is beyond the bone strength. Occupational fractures most commonly result from falls and motor vehicle accidents. Non-displaced radial head fractures are usually treated with slings and have excellent prognoses. Other fractures may require surgical fixation, casting, and/or cast bracing. Stress fractures are caused by repeated applications of unaccustomed force over hours to days. Pain is frequently worse at night. These are usually treated with elimination of the offending exposure and observation.

Elbow fractures most commonly occur from falls. Radial head fractures typically occur from falls onto an outstretched hand. If the fracture is large and displaced or comminuted (Type III) or there is a large fracture with a displaced fragment (Type II), surgical referral is indicated. Capitellar fractures are rare [114,115,116,117,118,119] and usually occur from falling on an outstretched hand. Non-operative management is sometimes attempted, however most are believed to require surgical fixation [117]. Surgical repairs are often performed for these fractures [120-128].

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

Elbow dislocations, fractures, and sprains are consequences of significant trauma. The mechanism of the trauma determines whether the condition is work-related.

DIAGNOSIS

A clinical impression is made upon history of appropriate injury mechanism and physical examination findings of substantial tenderness particularly focally over a bone. Findings of (in)ability to use the elbow should be sought, as well as inspection for signs of deformity. The elbow extension test (whether the elbow can be fully extended) has been reported to be 96. 8% sensitive and 48. 5% specific for detection of an elbow fracture in a series of 1,740 patients with an acute elbow injury [129]. The negative predictive value was 98. 4%. A

fracture identified on x-rays, generally 2 to 3 views, confirms that diagnostic impression. The differential diagnosis prominently includes elbow sprain and dislocation. If x-rays are negative and clinical suspicion high, a CT is usually the next test.

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

X-RAYS

X-RAYS FOR ELBOW FRACTURE

Recommended

X-rays that include at least two to three views are recommended to diagnose elbow fractures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating x-rays for elbow fractures. However, x-rays have been used for decades to identify those fractures requiring surgical treatment, and evaluate for healing; thus, they are recommended to diagnose elbow fractures.

ULTRASOUND

DIAGNOSTIC ULTRASOUND FOR FRACTURES

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of diagnostic ultrasound for the evaluation and diagnosis of fratures.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

Ultrasound has been found to be helpful evaluating tendinopathies, including tendon ruptures. There is no clear indication for use of ultrasound for evaluation of osteoarthrosis and other disorders. Ultrasound is not invasive, has no adverse effects and is moderately costly. It is recommended for disorders with soft tissue pathology.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of diagnostic ultrasound.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW

Displaced fractures and fracture fragments are believed to require surgical treatment with fixation, but there are no quality studies of displaced fractures. Widely displaced fracture and/or comminuted fragments may require radial head excision and/or radial head implant.

Indications to surgically fix elbow fractures are not well defined, and there is a suggestion that some patients are better candidates than others (e.g., widely displaced fragments, or requirement for earlier recovery such as in professional athletes, terrible triad patients) [108,109]. Until sufficient quality evidence becomes available, the decision to surgically treat elbow fractures is a decision between the orthopedist and patient.

Casting has been long used to treat elbow and other fractures. Non-displaced radial head fractures have been treated with slings. Some patients with fractures have been treated with opioids for pain.

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR TREATMENT OF ELBOW FRACTURES

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended to control pain associated with elbow fractures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Pain due to fracture.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Scheduled dosage rather than as needed is generally preferable.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, lack of efficacy, or development of adverse effects particularly gastrointestinal.

Rationale

There is no quality evidence for or against the use of NSAIDs or acetaminophen. These medications have been found useful in other musculoskeletal injuries and by inference may be efficacious for control of swelling and pain in the initial stages of injury, although some concerns about healing of bones have been raised. Other studies have suggested no delayed bone healing (see Distal Forearm Fractures in Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline).

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of NSAIDs and acetaminophen for elbow fracture.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR TREATMENT OF ELBOW FRACTURES

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended to control pain associated with elbow fractures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Pain due to fracture.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Scheduled dosage rather than as needed is generally preferable.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, lack of efficacy, or development of adverse effects particularly gastrointestinal.

Rationale

There is no quality evidence for or against the use of NSAIDs or acetaminophen. These medications have been found useful in other musculoskeletal injuries and by inference may be efficacious for control of swelling and pain in the initial stages of injury, although some concerns about healing of bones have been raised. Other studies have suggested no delayed bone healing (see Distal Forearm Fractures in Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline).

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of NSAIDs and acetaminophen for elbow fracture.

OPIOIDS FOR SELECT PATIENTS WITH PAIN FROM ELBOW FRACTURES

Sometimes Recommended

Opioids are recommended for treatment of select patients with pain from elbow fractures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Select patients with severe pain from elbow fracture with insufficient control from other means, including acetaminophen and NSAIDs or with contraindications for NSAIDs. Patients with more severe fractures or in the immediate post-operative period may require opioids for pain management. Considerable cautions are recommended concerning opioids and

minimum numbers of doses should be prescribed as duration of treatment for elbow fractures is usually limited.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

As needed. For the few patients requiring opioids, the majority need at most a few days treatment and then generally have insufficient pain for further treatment with opioids.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain sufficiently to not require opioids, consumption that does not follow prescription instructions, adverse effects.

Rationale

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of opioids to control pain from elbow fractures. Most patients do not require opioids. Some patients, particularly with more severe fractures may require opioids briefly during the post-operative period after fixation. There is no quality evidence supporting the use of opioids for treating these patients, but they address pain management. There are major concerns regarding adverse effects of opioids including mortality. However, it is presumed that few doses combined with short-term use provides sufficient margin of safety for these medications. Opioids are not invasive, are low cost, but have high adverse effect profiles. They are recommended for limited-duration use in select patients with elbow fractures.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of opioids for patients with pain from elbow fractures.

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

DEVICES

ELBOW SLINGS FOR NON-DISPLACED AND OCCULT RADIAL HEAD FRACTURES

Recommended

Elbow slings are recommended for treatment of non-displaced and occult radial head fractures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Non-displaced radial head fractures and occult fractures. Occult fractures are not visible on x-rays but are suspected by including either the lack of full extension of the elbow or evidence of effusion on x-ray.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Sling (or splint) use for non-displaced radial head fractures is for 7 days. (A shorter complete immobilization period of as little as 3 days may be used for non-displaced fractures that are clinically present but not visible on an x-ray.) After 7 days, gentle range-of-motion exercises within pain tolerance should begin (Snider, 1997), followed by progressive mobilization. (One low-quality trial suggested superior results with immediate mobilization of non-displaced radial head fractures (Liow et al., 2002)).

Rationale

There are no quality trials evaluating splints or slings to treat radial head fractures. These fractures have excellent prognoses with short-term sling or splint use. Longer term sling or splint use may be necessary particularly where there is potential for high force use or exposure. Range-of-motion exercises should primarily involve the elbow, but should also include the shoulder (to prevent frozen shoulder), and the wrist. Limited mobility may be achieved with a sling, cast, or posterior elbow splint wrapped over the joint with a tensor at 90° flexion. A thermoplastic splint with Velcro straps may also be used. As pain diminishes, the unresisted active movement should be increased to pain tolerance to prevent or minimize contracture. Quality studies are not available on these treatment options and there is no evidence of their benefits. However, these options are low cost, have few adverse effects, and are not invasive. Thus, while there is insufficient evidence as to the benefits of these options, they are recommended.

CASTS FOR SELECT ELBOW FRACTURES

Recommended

Casts and cast bracing are recommended for treatment of non-displaced or occult radial head fractures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Minimally displaced fractures and other elbow fractures felt amenable to casting, cast bracing, or post-open reduction internal fixation fractures.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Casts are generally required for 6 weeks or until adequate healing is documented on x-ray. After successful healing, they should be followed by progressive mobilization.

Rationale

There are no quality trials regarding the use of casts or cast bracing to treat non-displaced or occult radial head fractures of the elbow. Many of these fractures require surgical fixation. Post-operatively they are usually casted. Select elbow fractures may be amenable

to casting, rather than surgical fixation. Casting is moderately costly, has some adverse effects, and is not invasive. While there is insufficient evidence of success compared with other treatments, they are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of immobilization for elbow fractures. There is 1 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

SURGICAL FIXATION OF DISPLACED ELBOW FRACTURES

Recommended

Surgical fixation is recommended for displaced elbow fractures.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials of fixation compared with casting or other treatment. Many of these fractures do not appear to do well without surgery, thus fixation is currently used for many of these fractures. There is one moderate quality trial comparing two types of fixation that suggested comparable results (Helling et al., 2006). Widely displaced fracture and/or comminuted fragments may require radial head excision and/or radial head implant. Some are treated with arthroplasty. Surgical fixation is invasive, has adverse effects and is costly, however benefits appear to outweigh risks and fixation is recommended for many of these patients.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis.

REHABILITATION

EDUCATION AFTER CAST REMOVAL FOR ELBOW FRACTURE

Recommended

Education is recommended for select patients needing education after cast removal for elbow fracture.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

PHYSICAL OR OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY OF PATIENTS AFTER CAST REMOVAL

Recommended

Physical or occupational therapy is recommended for select patients after cast removal for elbow fracture.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating physical or occupational therapy for rehabilitation of patients with elbow fractures. These therapies are generally unnecessary for many working-age patients. However, some patients may need formal therapy with exercises if there are considerable impairments or a failure to progress after removal of the cast or splint. A few appointments for educational purposes for select patients are recommended. The numbers of appointments are dependent on the degree of debility, with one or two educational appointments appropriate for mildly affected patients. Patients with severe debility or those unable to return to work may necessitate 8 to 12 appointments that particularly include progressive strengthening exercises. Additionally, while routine use may be of limited benefit, those patients who have muscle weakness or other debilities may also derive benefit from therapy including self-training exercises, particularly if unable to return to work. Therefore, occupational or physical therapy is recommended for select patients.

ROUTINE REFERRAL AFTER CAST REMOVAL

Not Recommended

Routine referral for physical or occupational therapy after cast removal for elbow fracture of otherwise healthy patients who are able to return to work is not recommended.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating physical or occupational therapy for rehabilitation of patients with elbow fractures. These therapies are generally unnecessary for many working-age patients. However, some patients may need formal therapy with exercises if there are considerable impairments or a failure to progress after removal of the cast or splint. A few appointments for educational purposes for select patients are recommended. The numbers of appointments are dependent on the degree of debility, with one or two educational appointments appropriate for mildly affected patients. Patients with severe debility or those unable to return to work may necessitate 8 to 12 appointments that particularly include progressive strengthening exercises. Additionally, while routine use may be of limited benefit, those patients who have muscle weakness or other debilities may also derive benefit from therapy including self-training exercises, particularly if unable to return to work. Therefore, occupational or physical therapy is recommended for select patients.

PROGNOSIS

Fractures require work limitations to avoid use of the fractured arm. Functional restrictions of the affected extremity are limited by an immobilization technique. Activities should be modified to allow for splinting and immobilization of the forearm. Return to work will likely be influenced by the patient and clinician's subjective assessment of disability and perception of job difficulty. It may be helpful to refer the patient to an occupational

therapist to address the appropriate activity modification, compensatory strategies, adaptive equipment, and environmental modification throughout the period of the patient's recovery and rehabilitation. The other injuries may or may not require work limitations depending on severity of the injury and the task demands. However, moderate to severe sprains and dislocations likely necessitate splinting and limitations.

JOB ANALYSIS

Job analyses may be beneficial to prevent future occurrences of these types of injuries (e.g., machine guarding, icy walkways, tool kickback). Some of these, particularly compartment syndrome and fractures should generally be analyzed for root cause and potential remediation, as these injuries are generally viewed as critical incident cases.

ELBOW OSTEOARTHROSIS

OVERVIEW

Elbow degenerative joint disease (DJD) is most commonly caused by osteoarthrosis (OA) and is relatively uncommon. While osteoarthritis is the more common name for this entity, osteoarthrosis is more technically precise as there is no classic inflammation. Other types of arthritic disorders that cause DJD include inflammatory autoimmune disorders (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythematosus, psoriasis) and crystal diseases (e.g., gout, pseudogout, apatites). As these latter disorders are non-occupational, they are not included in this discussion. The x-ray appearance in each disorder may be indistinguishable, although at times there are radiologic characteristics that may suggest a specific diagnosis. Thus, a technically correct interpretation of an x-ray may include DJD, but not OA. There is a predisposition for patients who already have OA in one or two joints to develop OA in other joint groups. Several genetic factors have been identified [(130)]. Occupational factors related to elbow arthrosis are poorly understood and quality occupational epidemiological studies are lacking. Unilateral cases arising in a joint that sustained a prior fracture is often considered to be work-related. OA is generally treated with acetaminophen, NSAIDs, topical NSAIDs, heat, ice, counterirritants (e.g., capsaicin), education, avoidance of aggravating activities, exercises, injections (glucocorticosteroid and viscosupplementation), and surgical joint replacement.

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

Elbow osteoarthrosis is not well investigated epidemiologically. By analogy to other joints, it would be expected that age [(131-136)], obesity [(137)], bone mineral density [(138)], rheumatoid arthritis, gout, other inflammatory arthropathies, reduced 25-hydroxyvitamin D [(136)], heredity [(133)], Heberden's nodes [(132-134,139,140)], and osteoarthrosis involving other joints in the body ("systemic or generalized osteoarthrosis") [(130,132,139-142)] are risks. Unilateral elbow osteoarthrosis as a consequence of a prior, discrete occupational traumatic event (e.g., humeral or radial head fracture) is considered work-related. There are no quality studies for other occupational activities. There are some remote reports of elevated odds ratios associated with vibratory tool use.

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

ULTRASOUND

DIAGNOSTIC ULTRASOUND FOR OSTEOARTHROSIS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of diagnostic ultrasound for the evaluation and diagnosis of osteoarthrosis.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

Ultrasound has been found to be helpful evaluating tendinopathies, including tendon ruptures. There is no clear indication for use of ultrasound for evaluation of osteoarthrosis and other disorders. Ultrasound is not invasive, has no adverse effects and is moderately costly. It is recommended for disorders with soft tissue pathology.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of diagnostic ultrasound.

ARTHROSCOPY

ELBOW ARTHROSCOPY FOR DIAGNOSIS OF OSTEOARTHROSIS

Not Recommended

Arthroscopy is not recommended for diagnosis for patients with acute, subacute, or chronic osteoarthrosis in the absence of a remediable mechanical defect such as symptomatic loose body.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of arthroscopy; however, arthroscopy has been widely used to diagnose and treat numerous joint abnormalities. Successful treatments have particularly included meniscal tears, removal of loose bodies, and rotator cuff repairs (see respective guidelines). By analogy, arthroscopy allows successful diagnosis and treatment of intra-articular elbow pathology. By analogy with the knee joint where quality evidence has demonstrated a lack of efficacy of chondroplasty (Moseley et al., 2002), chondroplasty of the elbow joint is not recommended. Arthroplasty is invasive, has some adverse effects and is costly. However, it is indicated particularly for patients with persistent mechanical elbow joint symptoms.

MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI)

MRI FOR ROUTINE EVALUATION OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, CHRONIC ELBOW JOINT PATHOLOGY

Not Recommended

MRI is not recommended for routine evaluation of acute, subacute, or chronic elbow joint pathology, including degenerative joint disease.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

MRI has not been evaluated in quality studies for elbow pathology. However, it is likely particularly helpful for soft tissue abnormalities. There are no quality studies evaluating the use of MRI for AVN, elbow joint pathology, or osteonecrosis. There is low-quality evidence MRI may be less sensitive for detection of subchondral fractures than helical CT or plain x-rays in patients with osteonecrosis (Stevens et al., 2003). MRI is not invasive, has no adverse effects, aside from issues of claustrophobia or complications of medication, but is costly. MRI is not recommended for routine elbow imaging, but is recommended for select elbow joint pathology particularly involving concerns regarding soft tissue pathology.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

MEDICATIONS

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

ELBOW ARTHROSCOPY FOR TREATMENT OF OSTEOARTHROSIS

Not Recommended

Arthroscopy is not recommended for treatment in acute, subacute, or chronic patients with osteoarthrosis in the absence of a remediable mechanical defect such as symptomatic loose body.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of arthroscopy; however, arthroscopy has been widely used to diagnose and treat numerous joint abnormalities. Successful treatments have particularly included meniscal tears, removal of loose bodies, and rotator cuff repairs (see respective guidelines). By analogy, arthroscopy allows successful diagnosis and treatment of intra-articular elbow pathology. By analogy with the knee joint where quality evidence has demonstrated a lack of efficacy of chondroplasty , chondroplasty of the elbow joint is not

recommended. Arthroplasty is invasive, has some adverse effects and is costly. However, it is indicated particularly for patients with persistent mechanical elbow joint symptoms.

ELBOW ARTHROSCOPY WITH CHONDROPLASTY FOR OSTEOARTHROSIS

Not Recommended

Arthroscopy with chondroplasty is not recommended for treatment of osteoarthrosis.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of arthroscopy; however, arthroscopy has been widely used to diagnose and treat numerous joint abnormalities. Successful treatments have particularly included meniscal tears, removal of loose bodies and rotator cuff repairs (see respective guidelines). By analogy, arthroscopy allows successful diagnosis and treatment of intraarticular elbow pathology. By analogy with the knee joint where quality evidence has demonstrated a lack of efficacy of chondroplasty (Moseley et al., 2002), chondroplasty of the elbow joint is not recommended. Arthroplasty is invasive, has some adverse effects and is costly. However, it is indicated particularly in those patients with persistent mechanical elbow joint symptoms.

REHABILIATION

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is

usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies)

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are

recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

PROGNOSIS

Elbow osteoarthrosis generally requires no work limitations. When the disease progresses to moderate or severe, work limitations may be required due to the impairment and/or pain.

JOB ANALYSIS

Job analysis is generally not indicated for most cases, although where there is potential to eliminate a hazard that precipitated an acute event (e.g., icy sidewalk, tripping hazards), it should be resolved. There have been no quality job analysis tools developed to analyze jobs for risk of elbow osteoarthrosis.

ELBOW OSTEONECROSIS

OVERVIEW

Osteonecrosis involves impairment of the blood supply to the bone and may evolve to subsequent degeneration and ultimately collapse of the bone. It is particularly likely to occur in areas of tenuous blood supply that lacks collateral blood flow – thus most prominently affecting the femoral and humeral heads. The elbow is rarely affected. The most prominent occupational risk factor is barotraumas ("the bends"), which may occur both in diving, as well as working in compressed air environments (e.g., tunneling projects through unstable sediments requiring compressed air to maintain the workspace). Significant, discrete trauma is thought to be a risk factor. However, the impact of non-traumatic job physical factors is controversial. Treatment is primarily based on reducing the implicated risk factor (e.g., alcohol, diabetes). A surgical coring procedure (vascularized and unvascularized bone grafting and osteotomy) are sometimes utilized. Severe cases may require arthroplasty.

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

Osteonecrosis rarely affects the elbow (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline for discussion of risks).

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

ULTRASOUND

DIAGNOSTIC ULTRASOUND FOR OSTEONECROSIS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of diagnostic ultrasound for the evaluation and diagnosis of osteonecrosis.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

Ultrasound has been found to be helpful evaluating tendinopathies, including tendon ruptures. There is no clear indication for use of ultrasound for evaluation of osteoarthrosis and other disorders. Ultrasound is not invasive, has no adverse effects and is moderately costly. It is recommended for disorders with soft tissue pathology.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of diagnostic ultrasound.

MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI)

MRI FOR DIAGNOSING OSTEONECROSIS (AVN)

Recommended

MRI is recommended for diagnosing osteonecrosis and ligamentous elbow injuries.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with subacute or chronic elbow pain thought to be related to osteonecrosis (AVN) or ligamentous elbow injuries, particularly in whom the diagnosis is unclear or who need additional diagnostic evaluation and staging.

Rationale

MRI has not been evaluated in quality studies for elbow pathology. However, it is likely particularly helpful for soft tissue abnormalities. There are no quality studies evaluating the use of MRI for AVN, elbow joint pathology, or osteonecrosis. There is low-quality evidence MRI may be less sensitive for detection of subchondral fractures than helical CT or plain x-rays in patients with osteonecrosis (Stevens et al., 2003). MRI is not invasive, has no adverse effects, aside from issues of claustrophobia or complications of medication, but is costly. MRI is not recommended for routine elbow imaging, but is recommended for select elbow joint pathology, particularly involving concerns regarding soft tissue pathology.

COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY (CT)

CT FOR EVALUATING PATIENTS WITH OSTEONECROSIS (AVN)

Recommended

CT is recommended for evaluating patients with osteonecrosis or following traumatic dislocations or arthroplasty-associated recurrent dislocations, or for patients who need advanced imaging but have contraindications for MRI.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with elbow pain from osteonecrosis with suspicion of subchondral fracture(s), increased polyosthotic bone metabolism. As MRI is generally preferable, patients should have a contraindication for MRI. Patients who have traumatic elbow dislocations, particularly if capitular or trochlear fracture fragments are sought.

Rationale

Computerized tomography is considered superior to MRI for imaging of most elbow abnormalities where advanced imaging of calcified structures is required. A contrast CT study is minimally invasive, has few if any, adverse effects but is costly. It is recommended for select use. Helical CT scan has been thought to be superior to MRI for evaluating subchondral fractures; however, a definitive study has not been reported (Stevens et al., 2003).

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

MEDICATIONS

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

REHABILITATION

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the

diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies)

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal

potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

PROGNOSIS

There is no evidence that work restrictions are helpful, yet as the condition often progresses, patients typically incur increasing degrees of disability with a progressive need for work limitations. Advanced cases generally require temporary removal from work and surgery, with return to work post-operatively. Post-operative limitations are generally based on a combination of the clinical results (i.e., severity of pain and symptoms) and work demands. Patients with light to medium work may require no limitations, while those with medium to heavy work, particularly with post-operative pain, may require significant limitations.

JOB ANALYSIS

Job analysis is generally not indicated for most cases, although where there are exposures such as decompression, job analysis to evaluate decompression protocols may be helpful.

ELBOW PAIN

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

ANTIBODY LEVELS

ANTIBODIES TO CONFIRM SPECIFIC DISORDERS

Recommended

Antibody levels are strongly recommended as a screen to confirm specific disorders (e.g., rheumatoid arthritis).

Strength of evidence Strongly Recommended, Evidence (A)

Indications

Patients with elbow pain and a presumptive diagnosis of a rheumatological disorder.

Rationale

Elevated antibody levels are highly useful for confirmation of clinical impressions of rheumatic diseases. However, routine use of these tests in patients with elbow pain – especially as wide-ranging, non-focused test batteries – are likely to result in inaccurate diagnoses due to false positives and low pre-test probabilities and are not recommended. Clinicians should also be aware that false negative results occur. Measurement of antibody levels is minimally invasive, unlikely to have substantial adverse effects and is low to moderately costly depending on the specific test ordered. They are recommended for focused testing of a limited number of diagnostic considerations.

ANTIBODIES FOR DIAGNOSING ELBOW PAIN WITH SUSPICION OF CHRONIC OR RECURRENT RHEUMATOLOGICAL DISORDER

Recommended

Antibody levels are recommended to evaluate and diagnose patients with elbow pain who have reasonable suspicion of rheumatological disorder.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with elbow pain with suspicion of rheumatological disorder.

Rationale

Elevated antibody levels are highly useful for confirmation of clinical impressions of rheumatic diseases. However, routine use of these tests in patients with elbow pain – especially as wide-ranging, non-focused test batteries – are likely to result in inaccurate diagnoses due to false positives and low pre-test probabilities and are not recommended. Clinicians should also be aware that false negative results occur. Measurement of antibody levels is minimally invasive, unlikely to have substantial adverse effects and is low to moderately costly depending on the specific test ordered. They are recommended for focused testing of a limited number of diagnostic considerations.

ARTHROSCOPY

ELBOW ARTHROSCOPY FOR DIAGNOSING ELBOW PAIN WITH SUSPICION OF INTRAARTICULAR BODY AND OTHER SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC MECHANICAL SYMPTOMS

Recommended

Arthroscopy is recommended to evaluate and diagnose patients with elbow pain that have suspicion of intraarticular body, and other subacute or chronic mechanical symptoms.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with elbow pain with suspicion of intraarticular body, or other subacute or chronic mechanical symptoms.

Rationale

There are no quality studies of arthroscopy; however, arthroscopy has been widely used to diagnose and treat numerous joint abnormalities. Successful treatments have particularly included meniscal tears, removal of loose bodies and rotator cuff repairs (see respective guidelines). By analogy, arthroscopy allows successful diagnosis and treatment of intraarticular elbow pathology. By analogy with the knee joint where quality evidence has

demonstrated a lack of efficacy of chondroplasty (Moseley et al., 2002), chondroplasty of the elbow joint is not recommended. Arthroplasty is invasive, has some adverse effects and is costly. However, it is indicated particularly in those patients with persistent mechanical elbow joint symptoms.

ARTHROSCOPY FOR DIAGNOSING ACUTE ELBOW PAIN

Not Recommended

Arthroscopy for diagnosing acute elbow pain is not recommended.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of arthroscopy; however, arthroscopy has been widely used to diagnose and treat numerous joint abnormalities. Successful treatments have particularly included meniscal tears, removal of loose bodies and rotator cuff repairs (see respective guidelines). By analogy, arthroscopy allows successful diagnosis and treatment of intraarticular elbow pathology. By analogy with the knee joint where quality evidence has demonstrated a lack of efficacy of chondroplasty (Moseley et al., 2002), chondroplasty of the elbow joint is not recommended. Arthroplasty is invasive, has some adverse effects and is costly. However, it is indicated particularly in those patients with persistent mechanical elbow joint symptoms.

BONE SCANS

BONE SCANNING FOR SELECT USE IN ACUTE, SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW PAIN

Recommended

Bone scanning is recommended for select use in acute, subacute or chronic elbow pain to assist in the diagnosis of osteonecrosis, neoplasms and other conditions with increased polyosthotic bone metabolism, particularly where there is more than one joint to be evaluated.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with elbow pain with suspicion of osteonecrosis, Paget's disease, neoplasm or other increased polyosthotic bone metabolism.

Rationale

Bone scanning may be a helpful diagnostic test to evaluate suspected metastases, primary bone tumors, infected bone (osteomyelitis), inflammatory arthropathies, and trauma (e.g., occult fractures). It may be helpful in those with suspected, early AVN but without x-ray changes. In those where the diagnosis is felt to be secure, there is not an indication for bone scanning as it does not alter the treatment or management. Bone scanning is minimally

invasive, has minimal potential for adverse effects (essentially equivalent to a blood test), but is high cost. It is generally thought to be inferior to MRI.

ROUTINE USE OF BONE SCANNING FOR ROUTINE ELBOW JOINT EVALUATIONS

Not Recommended

Bone scanning is not recommended for routine use in elbow joint evaluations.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

Bone scanning may be a helpful diagnostic test to evaluate suspected metastases, primary bone tumors, infected bone (osteomyelitis), inflammatory arthropathies, and trauma (e.g., occult fractures). It may be helpful in those with suspected, early AVN but without x-ray changes. In those where the diagnosis is felt to be secure, there is not an indication for bone scanning as it does not alter the treatment or management. Bone scanning is minimally invasive, has minimal potential for adverse effects (essentially equivalent to a blood test), but is high cost. It is generally thought to be inferior to MRI.

COMPUTED TOMOGRAPHY (CT)

ROUTINE CT FOR EVALUATING ACUTE, SUBACUTE, CHRONIC ELBOW PAIN

Not Recommended

Routine CT is not recommended for evaluation of acute, subacute, or chronic elbow pain.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

Computerized tomography is considered superior to MRI for imaging of most elbow abnormalities where advanced imaging of calcified structures is required. A contrast CT study is minimally invasive, has few if any, adverse effects but is costly. It is recommended for select use. Helical CT scan has been thought to be superior to MRI for evaluating subchondral fractures; however, a definitive study has not been reported (Stevens et al., 2003).

HELICAL CT FOR SELECT ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ELBOW PAIN

Recommended

Helical CT is recommended for select patients with acute, subacute, or chronic elbow pain in whom advanced imaging of bony structures is thought to be potentially helpful, and for patients with a need for advanced imaging but who have contraindications for MRI.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with acute, subacute, or chronic elbow pain who need advanced bony structure imaging. Patients needing advanced imaging, but with contraindications for MRI (e.g., implanted hardware) are also candidates.

Rationale

Computerized tomography is considered superior to MRI for imaging of most elbow abnormalities where advanced imaging of calcified structures is required. A contrast CT study is minimally invasive, has few if any, adverse effects but is costly. It is recommended for select use. Helical CT scan has been thought to be superior to MRI for evaluating subchondral fractures; however, a definitive study has not been reported (Stevens et al., 2003).

NONSPECIFIC INFLAMMATORY MARKERS

NON-SPECIFIC INFLAMMATORY MARKERS FOR SCREENING FOR INFLAMMATORY DISORDERS IN PATIENTS WITH SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW PAIN

Recommended

Erythrocyte sedimentation rate and other inflammatory markers are recommended for screening for inflammatory disorders or prosthetic sepsis with reasonable suspicion of inflammatory disorder in patients with subacute or chronic elbow pain.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with elbow pain with suspicion of rheumatological disorder.

Rationale

Erythrocyte sedimentation rate is the most commonly used systemic marker for non-specific inflammation and is elevated in numerous inflammatory conditions including rheumatological disorders, as well as with infectious diseases. C-reactive protein is a marker of systemic inflammation that has been associated with an increased risk of coronary artery disease. However, it is also a non-specific marker for other inflammation. Other non-specific markers of inflammation include ferritin, and an elevated protein-albumin gap, which have no known clinical roles. CRP and ESR measurements are minimally invasive, have low risk of adverse effects and are low cost. They are recommended as a reasonable screen for systemic inflammatory conditions especially if the elbow pain patient also has other pains without clear definition of a diagnosis or those with fibromyalgia or myofascial pain syndrome, although the specificity is not high. **However, ordering of a large, diverse array of anti-inflammatory markers without targeting a few specific disorders diagnostically is not recommended.**

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of C-reactive protein, erythrocyte sedimentation rate, and other non-specific inflammatory markers for elbow pain

SPECT/PET SCANS

SPECT OR PET FOR DIAGNOSING ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ELBOW PAIN

Not Recommended

SPECT and PET are not recommended for diagnosing acute, subacute, or chronic elbow pain.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Obtaining x-rays once is generally sufficient. For patients with chronic or progressive elbow pain, it may be reasonable to obtain a second set of x-rays months to years subsequently to re-evaluate the patient's condition, particularly if symptoms change.

Rationale

SPECT or PET scanning of the brain may be useful to assess the status of cerebrovascular perfusion, tumors, and neurodegenerative conditions, but aside from providing information for research, these scans have not been shown to be useful in influencing the management of patients with chronic pain states, including chronic elbow pain. There is no quality evidence to support the use of these scans to evaluate patients with elbow pain. PET scanning is expensive and SPECT scanning moderately so. Both are minimally invasive. SPECT scanning may be useful in detecting inflammatory disease in the spine or other areas that might not be amenable to evaluation by other studies.

Evidence

There are no quality studies of SPECT or PET relevant to their use in the management of elbow pain.

X-RAYS

X-RAYS FOR EVALUATION OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ELBOW PAIN

Recommended

X-rays are recommended for evaluation of acute, subacute, or chronic elbow pain.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

In the absence of red flags, patients with elbow pain lasting at least a few weeks, moderate to severe, and/or limited range of motion, or to evaluate for osteomyelitis in cases of significant septic olecranon bursitis.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Obtaining x-rays once is generally sufficient. For patients with chronic or progressive elbow pain, it may be reasonable to obtain a second set of x-rays months to years subsequently to re-evaluate the patient's condition, particularly if symptoms change.

Rationale

X-rays are helpful to evaluate most patients with elbow pain, both to diagnose and to assist with the differential diagnostic possibilities. There are no quality studies. X-rays are non-invasive, low to moderate cost, and have little risk of adverse effects and therefore, are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of x-rays for elbow pain.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

MEDICATIONS

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR TREATMENT OF ELBOW PAIN

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for treatment of elbow pain, particularly in patients with contraindications for NSAIDs.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

All patients with elbow pain, including acute, subacute, chronic, and post-operative.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Per manufacturer's recommendations; may be utilized on an as-needed basis. It has been suggested that 1gm doses are more effective than 650mg doses particularly in post-operative patients (McQuay et al., 2002); however, this level is now above the maximum dose recommended by an FDA advisory committee of 650mg and evidence of hepatic toxicity has been reported at 4 gm/day in a few days particularly among those consuming excessive alcohol. There is no quality evidence for superiority of 1gm dosing for treatment of osteoarthrosis (Medical Letter, 2009).

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, adverse effects or intolerance.

REHABILITATION

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are

recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies)

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

PROGNOSIS

Job limitations are generally thought to be not necessary for most cases of non-specific pain as they tend to be self-limited. However, in cases where symptoms persist and/or in settings with combined high force and high repetition, workplace limitations may be tried to assess if there is a significant impact of job physical factors.

JOB ANALYSIS

Job analysis is difficult for many of these conditions, particularly as the discrete entity to be evaluated and job analysis methods are unclear. However, job analyses may also be revealing particularly when there is a high exposure situation (i.e., high force or combinations of high force and other ergonomic risk factors). This may be especially indicated where other cases of MSDs are present in the workforce and may help with the treatment plan.

ELBOW SPRAIN

OVERVIEW

An isolated elbow sprain is relatively uncommon and is caused by a significant high-force trauma, resulting in a disruption of ligament(s) about the elbow. The most common mechanism is a fall. Generally, a sprain is accompanied by other problems such as fracture, dislocation, or contusion. These potential complications need to be evaluated including the motor, sensory, and vascular systems. For the medical management of dislocation of the elbow, an x-ray should be taken to assure that there is no fracture.

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

Elbow dislocations, fractures, and sprains are consequences of significant trauma. The mechanism of the trauma determines whether the condition is work-related.

DIAGNOSIS

INITIAL ASSESSMENT

There are no quality studies for evaluation or treatment of elbow sprains. An evaluation of the motor, sensory, and vascular system is required to rule-out accompanying injury(ies). Other than mild sprains, medical management of the sprained elbow should generally include an x-ray to assure that there is no fracture.

DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA

Sprains are diagnosed based on a combination of typical inciting event (usually fall or high-force trauma) combined with characteristic elbow pain and focal tenderness over ligament(s). In contrast with dislocations and fractures, sprains generally have normal, though painful range of motion.

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

X-RAYS FOR ELBOW SPRAIN

Recommended

X-rays that include at least two to three views are recommended to rule-out fractures. Repeat x-rays are also recommended if there is failure to improve as clinically expected over approximately a week.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating x-rays for elbow sprains. However, x-rays are used to rule-out fractures which are found in a minority of patients. Thus, they are recommended to eliminate concomitant diagnoses of elbow fractures.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR ELBOW SPRAINS

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for the treatment of pain from elbow sprains.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Most patients with elbow sprain requiring medication for pain control may be candidates. Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal bleeding may be better candidates for treatment with acetaminophen or a COX-2 inhibitor (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

As-needed dosing is often sufficient. Most patients require a short course of treatment and then generally have insufficient pain for further treatment.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, of development of adverse effects.

Rationale

There is no quality evidence for use of NSAIDs for treatment of patients with elbow sprains; however, they address pain management. NSAIDs are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low cost and are thus recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of NSAIDs and acetaminophen for patients with elbow sprains.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR ELBOW SPRAINS

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for the treatment of pain from elbow sprains.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Most patients with elbow sprain requiring medication for pain control may be candidates. Patients at high risk for gastrointestinal bleeding may be better candidates for treatment with acetaminophen or a COX-2 inhibitor (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

As-needed dosing is often sufficient. Most patients require a short course of treatment and then generally have insufficient pain for further treatment.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, of development of adverse effects.

Rationale

There is no quality evidence for use of NSAIDs for treatment of patients with elbow sprains; however, they address pain management. NSAIDs are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low cost and are thus recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of NSAIDs and acetaminophen for patients with elbow sprains.

OPIOIDS FOR SELECT PATIENTS WITH ELBOW SPRAINS

Sometimes Recommended

Opioids are recommended for the treatment of select patients with pain from severe elbow sprains.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Select patients with severe pain from severe elbow sprains with insufficient control from other means, including acetaminophen and NSAIDs or with contraindications for NSAIDs. Considerable cautions are recommended concerning opioids and minimum numbers of doses should be prescribed as duration of treatment for elbow sprains is usually limited.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

As-needed dosing. Among the few patients requiring opioids, most require at most a few days treatment and then generally have insufficient pain for further treatment with opioids.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain sufficiently to not require opioids, consumption that does not follow prescription instructions, adverse effects.

Rationale

Most patients do not require opioids. Some patients, particularly with more severe sprains may require opioids. There is no quality evidence for use of opioids for treatment of these patients, however they address pain management. There are major concerns regarding adverse effects of opioids including mortality. However, it is presumed that few doses combined with short term use provides sufficient margin of safety for these medications. Opioids are not invasive, are low cost, but have high adverse effect profiles. They are recommended for limited duration use in select patients with elbow sprains.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of opioids for patients with elbow sprains.

DEVICES

SLINGS FOR ELBOW SPRAINS

Recommended

Slings are recommended for the treatment of elbow sprains.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Generally should be used for less than 7 to 10 days with gradual reduction in use. Range of motion exercises of the elbow and shoulder are recommended several times daily while using a sling to prevent after complications from reduced ranges of motion.

Rationale

There are no quality trials. Slings have been used to treat elbow sprains. Prolonged sling use is believed to result in reduced ranges of motion and other complications such as adhesive capsulitis. Range-of-motion exercises are recommended while using a sling for a sprain. Slings are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low to moderate cost, and are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of slings for elbow sprains.

REHABILITATION

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are

recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies)

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

PROGNOSIS

Fractures require work limitations to avoid use of the fractured arm. Functional restrictions of the affected extremity are limited by an immobilization technique. Activities should be modified to allow for splinting and immobilization of the forearm. Return to work will likely be influenced by the patient and clinician's subjective assessment of disability and perception of job difficulty. It may be helpful to refer the patient to an occupational therapist to address the appropriate activity modification, compensatory strategies, adaptive equipment, and environmental modification throughout the period of the patient’s recovery and rehabilitation. The other injuries may or may not require work limitations depending on severity of the injury and the task demands. However, moderate to severe sprains and dislocations likely necessitate splinting and limitations.

FOLLOW-UP CARE

Patients should be re-evaluated 7 to 10 days after initial evaluation to assure there is progress. If there is a lack of progress, x-ray and re-evaluation is required.

Patients are usually instructed to perform gentle range-of-motion exercises a few times a day in order to maintain normal range of motion. In addition, interventions are provided to address modifications to performance of ADLs and IADLs.

JOB ANALYSIS

Job analyses may be beneficial to prevent future occurrences of these types of injuries (e.g., machine guarding, icy walkways, tool kickback). Some of these, particularly compartment syndrome and fractures should generally be analyzed for root cause and potential remediation, as these injuries are generally viewed as critical incident cases.

LATERAL AND MEDIAL EPICONDYLALGIA

OVERVIEW

Epicondylalgia is a painful disorder of either the lateral elbow (lateral epicondylitis or tennis elbow) or medial elbow (medial epicondylitis or golfer's elbow), that most commonly has a gradual onset. But the pain may also occur acutely, such as from striking the elbow on a hard object. Underlying chronic degenerative conditions have been widely described in pathological studies [5,143,144]. Treatment most commonly involves NSAIDs, ice or heat, and glucocorticosteroid injections. Physical or occupational therapy including exercises is often prescribed. Surgical release is performed in cases that respond insufficiently to other treatments.

Lateral epicondylalgia (lateral epicondylitis) causes soreness, or pain on the outside (lateral) side of the upper arm near the elbow. There may be a partial tear of the tendon fibers, which connect muscle to bone, at or near their point of origin on the outside of the elbow. However, the mechanism of injury and pathogenesis is controversial and conflicting with considerable evidence of underlying chronic degenerative conditions [5,6,7]. Medial epicondylitis is substantially less common, but is theorized to be analogous to lateral epicondylalgia but affected the muscle-tendon units originating at the medial elbow. As there is almost no quality literature on medial epicondylalgia (see evidence table for the few studies), treatment of that condition is by analogy to lateral epicondylalgia and should be considered "Insufficient Evidence" recommendations.

Medial epicondylalgia is much less common than lateral epicondylalgia, which is thought to be about seven times more common [99]. Medial epicondylalgia is sometimes thought to occur concomitantly with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow (see Ulnar Nerve Entrapment). While the evidence is somewhat unclear if treatment of medial epicondylalgia by analogy to lateral epicondylalgia is appropriate, it is assumed by the medical community that this is correct. The few quality trials of medial epicondylalgia also appear to suggest comparable results for the same treatments with lateral epicondylalgia [99,144-147]. **Thus, recommended treatment of medial epicondylalgia is inferred from treatment of lateral epicondylalgia**.

RISK AND CAUSATION

Lateral epicondylalgia is widely considered to have a relationship with job physical factors [21,22]; however, most epidemiological studies are cross sectional and/or lack quantification of job physical factors [20,148-156]. There are no robust prospective cohort studies with measured job physical factors, detailed standardized physical examinations and frequent follow-up of workers that have been reported to establish causal job physical factors. In addition, there are few epidemiological studies demonstrating moderate or strong

associations. This results in a limited evidence base for purposes of either prevention or determination of work-relatedness. It is currently assumed the risks will be demonstrated to be strongest in jobs that combine high force with high repetition, particularly with high duration of exertion. Nevertheless, that relationship(s) currently remain(s) unestablished. Some cases occur after discrete traumatic events (most commonly, bumping an elbow against equipment or machinery) and are considered work-related. Unaccustomed use is also thought to be a risk, but is not well demonstrated. Psychosocial factors have been reported as significant in a few trials with evidence of low social support at work associated with lateral epicondylitis [(150)]. A recent clinical trial reported the most important factors determining disability were depression and ineffective coping skills [(157)].

Medial epicondylalgia is theorized to be analogous to lateral epicondylalgia. However, this theory is unclear. There are no quality studies of medial epicondylalgia [(20,151,154,158)]. By analogy, stereotypical, forceful use is believed to be a risk.

DIAGNOSIS

INITIAL ASSESSMENT

Most patients require no special testing provided red flags are absent. For patients who have been treated for at least 4 weeks and symptoms have failed to improve, additional testing may be required. Some patients require testing to eliminate alternate diagnostic possibilities such as C-6 cervical radiculopathy (typically with MRI), fibromyalgia (requires a careful history and physical examination) or arthrosis (x-ray of the elbow). EMG may be used for cervical radiculopathy, but is recommended at least 6 weeks after symptom onset to allow sufficient time for EMG changes to be manifest (require 3 weeks minimum). While there are some studies utilizing ultrasound and MRI, there is no quality evidence that those tests alter the treatment plan and effect superior outcomes.

DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA

Lateral epicondylalgia is diagnosed based on a combination of lateral elbow pain plus tenderness to palpation over the lateral epicondyle or tenderness within a couple centimeters distal to the epicondyle. Whether a resisted maneuver, such as resisted wrist or resisted middle finger extension, should be required appears questionable, as it appears to considerably reduce sensitivity with the numbers of cases decreased by approximately 50% [(37)]. Patients should not have other potential explanatory conditions such as cervical radiculopathy (especially C-6), elbow arthrosis or fibromyalgia. Some patients will have onset after a traumatic event, usually a relatively mild accident such as bumping the elbow on a hard surface; however this is not required to make a diagnosis.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW

In employment settings where milder cases are more frequently seen, nonprescription analgesics may provide sufficient pain relief for most patients with acute or subacute elbow symptoms. In clinical settings, cases may be more severe and may require prescription analgesics as first-line treatments. If treatment response is inadequate, (i.e., symptoms and activity limitations continue), prescribed pharmaceuticals, orthotics, or physical methods can be added. Conservative care most often consists of activity modification using epicondylalgia supports (tennis elbow bands) and NSAIDs.

NSAIDs are widely used for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [145,159,160,161,162]. Acetaminophen is also widely used for this condition (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline for mechanisms of action and classes of these medications).

Topical NSAIDs have been utilized for epicondylalgia, both as a topical application [163-167], as well as by iontophoresis treatment (see Iontophoresis section below).

Opioids are rarely used for treatment of patients with epicondylalgia. They are more frequently used briefly in the immediate post-operative period.

There are a variety of physical methods which may be appropriate to use in the treatment of lateral epicondylalgia. However, as reviewed below, there is evidence of efficacy for certain methods, no evidence for several others, and evidence of a lack of efficacy for some. Some clinicians use a variety of procedures; yet conclusions regarding their effectiveness are not based on high-quality studies. Included among these interventions are epicondylalgia supports, exercise, heat/cold packs, manipulation, massage, friction massage, soft tissue mobilization, biofeedback, transcutaneous electrical neurostimulation (TENS), electrical stimulation (E-STIM), magnets, diathermy, and acupuncture. The clinician should document objective evidence of functional improvement in order to assist with management of the disorder as well as to support whether or not to continue current treatment plans. This can be demonstrated by a combination of clinical improvement in disability questionnaires (e.g., DASH or Upper Extremity Function Scale), improvement in pain-free grip strength, or improvement in lifting ability, or some other functional activity (i.e., evaluate the patient's performance of an activity found to be limited at the time of the initial evaluation). Instead of focusing on a specific number of visits/treatment duration, identifying trends in the treatment provided are likely to be more helpful:

- Visit frequency should usually decrease over the episode of care, with the patient performing exercises more independently and the therapist's role becoming more consultative and coaching, assisting in progression of exercise and encouraging the patient.
- The use of physical agents and manual procedures should be weaned from supervised treatment either entirely, or limited to home use.
- It is reasonable to expect that if a particular treatment is going to benefit a particular patient, beneficial effects should be evident within 2 to 3 visits. Continuing with a treatment that has not resulted in objective improvement beyond approximately 5 or 6 treatments is not reasonable. Treatment that has not resulted in improvement after a couple of visits should either be modified substantially or discontinued.
- It should be expected that most patients with more severe conditions receive 8 to 12 visits over 6 to 8 weeks as long as functional improvement and program progression are documented. Patients with mild symptoms may require no therapy appointments or only a few appointments. Those with moderate problems may require 5 to 6 visits.

Tennis elbow straps and braces have been used for treatment of lateral (and medial) epicondylalgia [89,168-193]. Home exercises and supervised exercise programs are frequently used for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia, although exercise is often combined with other treatments [172,180,181,183,194-204]. Heat and cryotherapy have been used for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [201,205]. Iontophoresis with administration of either glucocorticosteroids or NSAIDs has been used for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [144,206,207-210].

Ultrasound has been used for the treatment of epicondylalgia [180,197,198,200,211-,219]. Soft tissue mobilization has been administered to patients with lateral epicondylalgia [220,221]. Manipulation has also been utilized for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [195,222-229] including manipulation of the cervical spine [230]. Massage, particularly friction massage, has been utilized for treatment of epicondylalgia [172,173,180,194,197,198,224,231,232,233].

Extracorporeal shockwave therapy has been utilized for lateral epicondylalgia [181,234-251]. Phonophoresis has been used for the treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [208,214,231]. Low-level laser therapy has been used for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [146,180,212,252-264]. Acupuncture has been used for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [180,198,252,265-274].

Glucocorticosteroid injections have long been used to treat lateral epicondylalgia [160,161,194-198,204,218,222,275-286]. However, there are concerns that epicondylalgia is not an inflammatory condition, although the mechanism of action of glucocorticoids may not involve traditional anti-inflammatory properties. There also are concerns about worse long-term results with these injections [157,194,195,197,198,204]. Botulinum injections have been used for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [287-292].

Platelet-rich plasma has been increasingly used to treat lateral epicondylitis as well as other tendinopathies [293-299]. Autologous blood injections have been similarly used [251,299,300,301]. Efficacy is thought to be due to growth factors that are hoped will produce tissue regeneration including PD-EGF (platelet-derived epidermal growth factor), PDGF-A, PDGF-B (platelet-derived growth factor), TGF-β1 (transforming growth factor), IGF-I, IGF-II (insulin-like growth factor), VEGF (vascular endothelial growth factor), ECGF (endothelial cell growth factor), and bFGF (basic fibroblast growth factor) [293,296].

Polidocanol injections have been utilized for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia [302,303]. Sodium hyaluronate and glycosaminoglycan periarticular injections have been used for treatment of chronic lateral epicondylalgia [304,305]. Prolotherapy injections have been used for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia. Sonographically guided percutaneous tenotomy has also been attempted [306,307]. Surgery has been used to treat lateral epicondylalgia that does not respond to adequate trials of nonoperative care [89,308-320]. There are three main surgical approaches for lateral epicondylalgia – open [308,311,317,321-325], percutaneous [316,326], and arthroscopic [309,312,325,327-330]. One review found no evidence of the superiority of one approach over another, and concluded that the choice should be left to the individual surgeon until quality evidence of a superior approach or technique becomes available [312]. Decompression of the posterior interosseous nerve and lengthening of the tendon has also been reported [308] with a presumptive diagnosis of possible radial nerve entrapment presenting as “resistant tennis elbow. ” A radiofrequency procedure (microtenotomy) has also been developed [331].

ACTIVITY MODIFICATION AND EXERCISE

ERGONOMIC INTERVENTIONS FOR EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

In settings with combinations of risk factors (e.g., high force combined with high repetition), ergonomic interventions are recommended to reduce risk factors for epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of ergonomic interventions for epicondylalgia, although ergonomics interventions have been attempted in numerous occupational settings (Verhagen et al., 2006). However, a few RCTs have explored keyboard workstations (Rempel et al., 1999, Rempel et al., 2006, Tittiranonda et al., 1999, Gerr et al., 2005) (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline). There also have been quality studies reported regarding participatory ergonomics programs; however, those are mainly reports of patients with spine disorders in programs whose purpose is return to work (Arnetz et al., 2003) (see Low Back Disorders guideline). Despite the lack of quality evidence, reductions in job physical factors, particularly high force, are thought to be beneficial (Herbert et al., 2000) (see Work-Relatedness). There also are experimental studies of different equipment (Simmer-Beck et al., 2006); however, reports of linkage with MSDs are lacking.

There are no quality studies of ergonomic interventions for epicondylalgia or other elbow MSDs in physically demanding occupations. Interventions which reduce forceful, repeated pinching or alleviating localized compression by sharp objects may be theoretically helpful (Vogel et al., 1989, Ploetz, 1938, Hadji-Zavar, 1959, Compere, 1933, Hume et al., 1990, Hauck, 1923, Sperling, 1951, Zelle et al., 1936, Lapidus et al., 1952, Fahey et al., 1954, Lipscomb, 1959, Lenggenhager, 1969, Sairanan, 1957, Rayan, 1990, Moore, 2000, Gorsche et al., 1998). Quality evidence is not available for effectiveness of ergonomic interventions on MSD injury rates in typical manufacturing settings. However, given available evidence of risk factors, interventions are recommended where there are combinations of risk factors; particularly combined high force and high repetition (see Work-Relatedness). Management/supervisor and labor/employee support are often necessary for optimal success of these programs. While quality evidence is lacking for the use of ergonomics training, it is thought to be beneficial in high-risk settings and is recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of ergonomic interventions.

ERGONOMICS TRAINING IN MODERATE- OR HIGH-RISK MANUFACTURING SETTINGS

Recommended

Ergonomics training is recommended in moderate- or high-risk manufacturing settings.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of ergonomic interventions for epicondylalgia, although ergonomics interventions have been attempted in numerous occupational settings . However, a few RCTs have explored keyboard workstations (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline). There also have been quality studies reported regarding participatory ergonomics programs; however, those are mainly reports of patients with spine disorders in programs whose purpose is return to work (see Low Back Disorders guideline). Despite the

lack of quality evidence, reductions in job physical factors, particularly high force, are thought to be beneficial (see Work-Relatedness). There also are experimental studies of different equipment ; however, reports of linkage with MSDs are lacking. There are no quality studies of ergonomic interventions for epicondylalgia or other elbow MSDs in physically demanding occupations. Interventions which reduce forceful, repeated pinching or alleviating localized compression by sharp objects may be theoretically helpful . Quality evidence is not available for effectiveness of ergonomic interventions on MSD injury rates in typical manufacturing settings. However, given available evidence of risk factors, interventions are recommended where there are combinations of risk factors; particularly combined high force and high repetition (see Work-Relatedness). Management/supervisor and labor/employee support are often necessary for optimal success of these programs. While quality evidence is lacking for the use of ergonomics training, it is thought to be beneficial in high-risk settings and is recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of ergonomic interventions.

WORK RESTRICTIONS FOR TREATMENT OF EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

For patients with medial or lateral epicondylalgia, it is recommended that their work be restricted to those tasks that do not involve high-force stereotypical hand gripping or pinching or the use of high-amplitude vibrating hand-held tools

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Select patients with combined forceful and repeated stereotypical use of the hands.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution, lack of improvement, or desire of the patient to remove limitations.

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating workplace restrictions for treatment of epicondylalgia. One trial included “rest” as a treatment arm and failed to find efficacy of rest (Lundeberg et al., 1988). Thus, whether patients improve more quickly with activity limitations has not been proven. There are trials that have included ergonomic advice as a co-intervention, although the advice is usually simply avoiding aggravating activities (Smidt et al., 2002). However, based on available evidence associating combined forceful and repeated, stereotypical use of the hands with epicondylalgia, work restrictions are recommended to treat select patients. These types of jobs involve a minority of patients with epicondylalgia. Restrictions are not invasive, likely have few adverse effects, and may be moderate to high cost depending on length of time they are in place.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis

HOME EXERCISES FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, CHRONIC, OR POSTOPERATIVE EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Home exercises are recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, chronic, or postoperative lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

For acute, subacute, chronic and post-operative epicondylalgia patients.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Exercises are generally individualized and increased over time. Stretching exercises are frequently included and often are progressed to strengthening exercises. However, there is no quality evidence to recommend one exercise regimen in preference to another. There also is no quality evidence in favor or against any single type of exercise (e.g., stretching or strengthening; eccentric or concentric). Frequency ranges from daily to three times daily.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, intolerance or lack of efficacy.

Rationale

There are multiple randomized studies of exercise; however, there is no trial with a sham group. There also is no quality trial with only exercise as an isolated intervention. One high-quality trial suggested no long-term benefits of exercise for treatment of chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, resulting in downgrading of this recommendation and inclusion of more selective criteria (Coombes et al., 2013). One moderate-quality trial suggested no benefits from immediate compared with delayed physical therapy (Park et al., 2010). There is one trial comparing physiotherapy with wait and see and injection; however, the physiotherapy included multiple cointerventions that also included manipulation (Bisset et al., 2006, Bisset et al., 2009). This trial also found equivalency between the physiotherapy and wait-and-see groups at one year, although injection was superior in the short-term. The other moderate-quality trial with a noninterventional control group appears underpowered, as there were small sample sizes and trends in the data in support of exercise (Tonks et al., 2007). That trial also found no additive benefit of exercise in addition to glucocorticoid injection, although trends in support of a combined approach were also present in the data. One moderate-quality trial found an exercise group superior to ultrasound, potentially suggesting modest benefits from exercise (Pienimaki et al., 1996) and the follow-up study

also reported superior results with less need of surgery in the exercise group compared to ultrasound (6% vs. 36%) (Pienimaki et al., 1998). Most trials have unstructured physical therapy that precludes identification of the effects of a specific exercise program, although one trial failed to discern differences between eccentric and concentric exercises (Martinez-Silvestrini et al., 2005). Thus, there is no quality evidence of efficacy of exercise. Nevertheless, the large numbers of trials with exercise included as a co-intervention (Smidt et al., 2002, Bisset et al., 2006, Struijs et al., 2004, Bisset et al., 2005, Svernlov et al., 2001, Newcomer et al., 2001, Nimgade et al., 2005, Trudel et al., 2004, Stasinopoulos et al., 2006, Pienimaki et al., 1996, Martinez-Silvestrini et al., 2005, Finestone et al., 2008, Langen-Pieters et al., 2003) documents that exercise is thought to be important for treatment and recovery. Exercise is not invasive, has low adverse effects, is low to high cost depending on numbers of treatments and is recommended.

Evidence

There are 2 high- and 9 moderate-quality RCTs (one with 2 reports) incorporated into this analysis. There are 6 low-quality RCTs or pseudorandomized controlled trials in Appendix 1.

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, AND CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Moderately Recommended, Evidence (B)

Indications

For acute, subacute, chronic, or post-operative epicondylalgia, NSAIDs are recommended for treatment. Over-the-counter (OTC) agents may suffice and be tried first.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Per manufacturer's recommendations. Trials have utilized diclofenac SR 75mg BID (Labelle et al., 1997), Naproxen 500mg BID (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987), and Diflunisal 1000mg then 500mg BID (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, there is no quality evidence an NSAID is superior to another for these indications. As needed, use may be reasonable for many patients. However, trials used scheduled doses.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, lack of efficacy, or development of adverse effects that necessitate discontinuation.

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines).

One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month, although it did not report longer-term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of postoperative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline), successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the ACOEM Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the ACOEM Hip and Groin Disorders guideline.

For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older-generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines), including tramadol (Beaulieu et al., 2008, Pavelka et al., 1998),and dextropropoxyphene (Parr et al., 1989), although slightly less efficacious than codeine (Quiding et al., 1992, Kjaersgaard-Andersen et al., 1990).

These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects (particularly for short-term use in employed age groups), are low cost, and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

NSAIDS FOR TREATMENT OF POSTOPERATIVE EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for treatment of postoperative lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

For acute, subacute, chronic, or postoperative epicondylalgia, NSAIDs are recommended for treatment. Over-the-counter (OTC) agents may suffice and be tried first.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Per manufacturer's recommendations. Trials have utilized diclofenac SR 75mg BID (Labelle et al., 1997), Naproxen 500mg BID (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987), and Diflunisal 1000mg then 500mg BID (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, there is no quality evidence an NSAID is superior to another for these indications. As needed, use may be reasonable for many patients. However, trials used scheduled doses.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, lack of efficacy, or development of adverse effects that necessitate discontinuation.

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines).

One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month, although it did not report longer-term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of postoperative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline.

For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline).

There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guideline) including tramadol and dextropropoxyphene, although slightly less efficacious than codeine.

These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles (particularly for short-term use in employed age groups), are low cost, and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR TREATMENT OF EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for treatment of lateral or medial epicondylalgia, particularly in patients with contraindications for NSAIDs.

Strength of evidence Moderately Recommended, Evidence (B)

Indications

All patients with elbow pain, including acute, subacute, chronic, and postoperative.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Per manufacturer's recommendations; may be utilized on an as-needed basis. It has been suggested that 1gm doses are more effective than 650mg doses particularly in post-operative patients (The Medical Letter, 2009, McQuay et al., 2002); however, this level is now above the maximum dose recommended by an FDA advisory committee of 650mg and evidence of hepatic toxicity has been reported at 4 gm/day in a few days particularly among those consuming excessive alcohol. There is no quality evidence for superiority of 1gm dosing for treatment of osteoarthrosis (The Medical Letter, 2009).

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, lack of efficacy, or development of adverse effects that necessitate discontinuation.

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial

comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines). One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month although it did not report longer term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of post-operative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline. For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines) including tramadol , and dextropropoxyphene , although slightly less efficacious than codeine. These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles, particularly for short duration use in employed age groups, are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

PROTON PUMP INHIBITORS (NSAIDS) FOR PATIENTS AT RISK FOR GI ADVERSE EFFECTS

Recommended

Concomitant prescriptions of cytoprotective medications are recommended for patients at substantially increased risk for gastrointestinal bleeding. There are four commonly used cytoprotective classes of drugs: misoprostol, sucralfate, histamine Type 2 receptor blockers (famotidine, ranitidine, cimetidine, etc.), and proton pump inhibitors (esomeprazole, lansoprazole, omeprazole, pantoprazole, rabeprazole). There is not generally believed to be substantial differences in efficacy for prevention of gastrointestinal bleeding (Graham et al., 2002) although evidence suggests the histamine-2 blockers are less effective for protection of the gastric mucosa and evidence also suggests sucralfate is weaker than proton pump inhibitors (see NSAIDs/acetaminophen recommendation). There also are combination products of NSAIDs/misoprostol that have documented reductions in risk of endoscopic lesions (see NSAIDs/acetaminophen recommendation).

Strength of evidence Strongly Recommended, Evidence (A)

Indications

For patients with a high-risk factor profile who also have indications for NSAIDs, cytoprotective medications should be considered, particularly if longer term treatment is contemplated. At-risk patients include those with a history of prior gastrointestinal bleeding, elderly, diabetics, and cigarette smokers. Clinicians are cautioned that H2 blockers might not protect from gastric ulcers (Robinson et al., 1991, Robinson et al., 1989, Ehsanullah et al., 1988).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Proton pump inhibitors, misoprostol, sucralfate, H2 blockers recommended. Dose and frequency per manufacturer. Duration is either that of the NSAID therapy, or sometimes permanent for those with recurrent bleeds or other complications.

Indications for discontinuation

Intolerance, development of adverse effects, or discontinuation of NSAID.

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines). One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month although it did not report longer term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of post-operative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline. For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines) including tramadol , and dextropropoxyphene , although slightly less efficacious than codeine . These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles, particularly for short duration use in employed age groups, are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

MISOPROSTOL (NSAIDS) FOR PATIENTS AT RISK FOR GI ADVERSE EFFECTS

Recommended

Concomitant prescriptions of cytoprotective medications are recommended for patients at substantially increased risk for gastrointestinal bleeding. There are four commonly used cytoprotective classes of drugs: misoprostol, sucralfate, histamine Type 2 receptor blockers (famotidine, ranitidine, cimetidine, etc.), and proton pump inhibitors (esomeprazole, lansoprazole, omeprazole, pantoprazole, rabeprazole). There is not generally believed to be substantial differences in efficacy for prevention of gastrointestinal bleeding (Graham et al., 2002) although evidence suggests the histamine-2 blockers are less effective for protection of the gastric mucosa and evidence also suggests sucralfate is weaker than proton pump inhibitors (see NSAIDs/acetaminophen evidence table). There also are combination products of NSAIDs/misoprostol that have documented reductions in risk of endoscopic lesions (see NSAIDs/acetaminophen evidence table).

Strength of evidence Strongly Recommended, Evidence (A)

Indications

For patients with a high-risk factor profile who also have indications for NSAIDs, cytoprotective medications should be considered, particularly if longer term treatment is contemplated. At-risk patients include those with a history of prior gastrointestinal bleeding, elderly, diabetics, and cigarette smokers. Clinicians are cautioned that H2 blockers might not protect from gastric ulcers (Robinson et al., 1991, Robinson et al., 1989, Ehsanullah et al., 1988).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Proton pump inhibitors, misoprostol, sucralfate, H2 blockers recommended. Dose and frequency per manufacturer. Duration is either that of the NSAID therapy, or sometimes permanent for those with recurrent bleeds or other complications.

Indications for discontinuation

Intolerance, development of adverse effects, or discontinuation of NSAID.

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit

was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines). One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month although it did not report longer term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of post-operative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline. For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines) including tramadol , and dextropropoxyphene , although slightly less efficacious than codeine . These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles, particularly for short duration use in employed age groups, are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

SUCRALFATE (NSAIDS) FOR PATIENTS AT RISK FOR GI ADVERSE EFFECTS

Recommended

Concomitant prescriptions of cytoprotective medications are recommended for patients at substantially increased risk for gastrointestinal bleeding. There are four commonly used cytoprotective classes of drugs: misoprostol, sucralfate, histamine Type 2 receptor blockers (famotidine, ranitidine, cimetidine, etc.), and proton pump inhibitors (esomeprazole, lansoprazole, omeprazole, pantoprazole, rabeprazole). There is not generally believed to be substantial differences in efficacy for prevention of gastrointestinal bleeding (Graham et al., 2002) although evidence suggests the histamine-2 blockers are less effective for protection of the gastric mucosa and evidence also suggests sucralfate is weaker than proton pump inhibitors (see NSAIDs/acetaminophen evidence table). There also are combination products of NSAIDs/misoprostol that have documented reductions in risk of endoscopic lesions (see NSAIDs/acetaminophen evidence table).

Strength of evidence Moderately Recommended, Evidence (B)

Indications

For patients with a high-risk factor profile who also have indications for NSAIDs, cytoprotective medications should be considered, particularly if longer term treatment is contemplated. At-risk patients include those with a history of prior gastrointestinal bleeding, elderly, diabetics, and cigarette smokers. Clinicians are cautioned that H2 blockers might not protect from gastric ulcers (Robinson et al., 1991, Robinson et al., 1989, Ehsanullah et al., 1988).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Proton pump inhibitors, misoprostol, sucralfate, H2 blockers recommended. Dose and frequency per manufacturer. Duration is either that of the NSAID therapy, or sometimes permanent for those with recurrent bleeds or other complications.

Indications for discontinuation

Intolerance, development of adverse effects, or discontinuation of NSAID.

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines). One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month although it did not report longer term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of post-operative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline. For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines) including

tramadol , and dextropropoxyphene , although slightly less efficacious than codeine . These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles, particularly for short duration use in employed age groups, are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

H2 BLOCKERS (NSAIDS) FOR PATIENTS AT RISK FOR GI ADVERSE EFFECTS

Recommended

Concomitant prescriptions of cytoprotective medications are recommended for patients at substantially increased risk for gastrointestinal bleeding. There are four commonly used cytoprotective classes of drugs: misoprostol, sucralfate, histamine Type 2 receptor blockers (famotidine, ranitidine, cimetidine, etc.), and proton pump inhibitors (esomeprazole, lansoprazole, omeprazole, pantoprazole, rabeprazole). There is not generally believed to be substantial differences in efficacy for prevention of gastrointestinal bleeding (Graham et al., 2002) although evidence suggests the histamine-2 blockers are less effective for protection of the gastric mucosa and evidence also suggests sucralfate is weaker than proton pump inhibitors (see NSAIDs/acetaminophen evidence table). There also are combination products of NSAIDs/misoprostol that have documented reductions in risk of endoscopic lesions (see NSAIDs/acetaminophen evidence table).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Evidence (C)

Indications

For patients with a high-risk factor profile who also have indications for NSAIDs, cytoprotective medications should be considered, particularly if longer term treatment is contemplated. At-risk patients include those with a history of prior gastrointestinal bleeding, elderly, diabetics, and cigarette smokers. Clinicians are cautioned that H2 blockers might not protect from gastric ulcers (Robinson et al., 1991, Robinson et al., 1989, Ehsanullah et al., 1988).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Proton pump inhibitors, misoprostol, sucralfate, H2 blockers recommended. Dose and frequency per manufacturer. Duration is either that of the NSAID therapy, or sometimes permanent for those with recurrent bleeds or other complications.

Indications for discontinuation

Intolerance, development of adverse effects, or discontinuation of NSAID.

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines). One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month although it did not report longer term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of post-operative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline. For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines) including tramadol , and dextropropoxyphene , although slightly less efficacious than codeine . These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles, particularly for short duration use in employed age groups, are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

NSAIDS FOR PATIENTS AT RISK FOR CARDIOVASCULAR ADVERSE EFFECTS

Recommended

Patients with known cardiovascular disease or multiple risk factors for cardiovascular disease should have the risks and benefits of NSAID therapy for pain discussed. Acetaminophen or aspirin as the first-line therapy appear to be the safest regarding cardiovascular adverse effects to use for these patients with cardiovascular disease risk factors.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

If needed, NSAIDs that are non-selective are preferred over COX-2 specific drugs. In patients receiving low-dose aspirin for primary or secondary cardiovascular disease prevention, to minimize the potential for the NSAID to counteract the beneficial effects of aspirin, the NSAID should be taken at least 30 minutes after or 8 hours before the daily aspirin (Antman et al., 2007).

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines). One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month although it did not report longer term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of post-operative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline. For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines) including tramadol , and dextropropoxyphene , although slightly less efficacious than codeine . These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles, particularly for short duration use in employed age groups, are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR PATIENTS AT RISK FOR CARDIOVASCULAR ADVERSE EFFECTS

Recommended

Patients with known cardiovascular disease or multiple risk factors for cardiovascular disease should have the risks and benefits of NSAID therapy for pain discussed.

Acetaminophen or aspirin as the first-line therapy appear to be the safest regarding cardiovascular adverse effects to use for these patients with cardiovascular disease risk factors.

Strength of evidence Strongly Recommended, Evidence (A)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

If needed, NSAIDs that are non-selective are preferred over COX-2 specific drugs. In patients receiving low-dose aspirin for primary or secondary cardiovascular disease prevention, to minimize the potential for the NSAID to counteract the beneficial effects of aspirin, the NSAID should be taken at least 30 minutes after or 8 hours before the daily aspirin (Antman et al., 2007).

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guidelines). One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month although it did not report longer term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of post-operative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline. For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines) including tramadol , and dextropropoxyphene , although slightly less efficacious than codeine . These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles, particularly for short duration use in employed age groups, are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

ASPIRIN FOR PATIENTS AT RISK FOR CARDIOVASCULAR ADVERSE EFFECTS

Recommended

Patients with known cardiovascular disease or multiple risk factors for cardiovascular disease should have the risks and benefits of NSAID therapy for pain discussed. Acetaminophen or aspirin as the first-line therapy appear to be the safest regarding cardiovascular adverse effects to use for these patients with cardiovascular disease risk factors.

Strength of evidence Strongly Recommended, Evidence (A)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

If needed, NSAIDs that are non-selective are preferred over COX-2 specific drugs. In patients receiving low-dose aspirin for primary or secondary cardiovascular disease prevention, to minimize the potential for the NSAID to counteract the beneficial effects of aspirin, the NSAID should be taken at least 30 minutes after or 8 hours before the daily aspirin (Antman et al., 2007).

Rationale

There are a few quality trials for lateral epicondylalgia. The highest quality trial suggests diclofenac was effective compared with placebo for treatment of a mixture of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, although the magnitude of benefit was not large (Labelle et al., 1997). Another trial found naproxen superior to placebo for short-term duration (Lewis et al., 2005), although the same trial found a lack of benefit over a longer term compared with placebo (Hay et al., 1999). One moderate-quality trial comparing flurbiprofen to piroxicam suggested flurbiprofen was superior (Rosenthal, 1984), thus piroxicam appears inferior for this indication. Two low-quality trials found equivalency between diflunisal and naproxen (Stull et al., 1986, Adelaar et al., 1987). However, no other quality studies suggest superiority of one oral NSAID over another or of one class over another, or for other musculoskeletal disorders (see other guideline). One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID compared with NSAID alone at one month although it did not report longer term results (Toker et al., 2008). There are no quality studies of post-operative elbow pain; however, by analogy to other MSDs including hand surgeries (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline); successful treatment of elbow pain may be reasonably anticipated. While there are no quality trials for elbow disorders, COX-selective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders and Knee Disorders guidelines; cytoprotective agents are reviewed in the Hip and Groin Disorders guideline. For most patients, generic ibuprofen, naproxen, or other older generation NSAIDs are recommended as first-line medications. Second-line medications should include one of the other generic medications. Acetaminophen (or the analog paracetamol) may be a reasonable alternative for these patients, although most evidence suggests acetaminophen is modestly less effective for arthrosis patients (see Hip and Groin

Disorders guideline). There is evidence that NSAIDs are as effective for relief of pain as opioids and less impairing (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines) including tramadol , and dextropropoxyphene , although slightly less efficacious than codeine . These medications are not invasive, have relatively low adverse effects profiles, particularly for short duration use in employed age groups, are low cost and thus are recommended.

Evidence

There are 1 high- and 2 moderate- (one with 2 reports) quality RCTs incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

TOPICAL NSAIDS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, AND CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Topical NSAIDs are recommended for treatment of acute, subacute, and chronic lateral and medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Moderately Recommended, Evidence (B)

Indications

For acute, subacute, chronic, or post-operative epicondylalgia, topical NSAIDs are recommended for treatment. For most patients, oral medications are recommended. However for those with contraindications for oral NSAIDs or intolerance, topical NSAIDs may be a reasonable alternative.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Per manufacturer's recommendations. Quality trials have utilized DHEP lecithin 1. 3% gel (Spacca et al., 2005), Flurbiprofen local-action transcutaneous patch (40 mg BID) (Ritchie, 1996), piroxicam gel (3cm, 0. 5%, approximately 0. 9g QID) (Ritchie, 1996), 2% diclofenac sodium in a pluronic lecithin liposome organo-gel (PLO) (Burnham et al., 1998) and diclofenac sodium gel (Schapira et al., 1991). The one crossover trial suggests flurbiprofen was superior to piroxicam, which parallels the results of another RCT for the same two oral medications.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, lack of efficacy, or development of adverse effects that necessitate discontinuation.

Rationale

Three placebo-controlled trials address topical NSAIDS for epicondylalgia (Spacca et al., 2005, Burnham et al., 1998, Schapira et al., 1991). The highest quality trial was for patients with acute pain who had excellent prognoses with resolution of the symptoms in a few days and consequently did not demonstrate a difference with placebo (Spacca et al., 2005). The

other trials suggested superiority to placebo (Burnham et al., 1998, Schapira et al., 1991). The one randomized crossover trial found flurbiprofen superior to piroxicam (Ritchie, 1996), suggesting piroxicam should not be either a first- or second-line treatment with either oral or topical preparations. Evidence is moderate for treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic patients. Quality evidence is absent for post-operative patients. There are no studies comparing topical agents with oral NSAIDs. Quality studies are available on topical NSAIDs including acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients and there is evidence of benefits. This option is not invasive, has low adverse effects, and is low cost for short-term use, although of higher cost for prolonged applications. Topical NSAIDs are recommended as a treatment option.

Evidence

There are 4 moderate-quality RCTs and randomized crossover trials incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

TOPICAL NSAIDS FOR TREATMENT OF POSTOPERATIVE EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Topical NSAIDs are recommended for treatment of acute, subacute, chronic, or postoperative lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

For acute, subacute, chronic, or post-operative epicondylalgia, topical NSAIDs are recommended for treatment. For most patients, oral medications are recommended. However for those with contraindications for oral NSAIDs or intolerance, topical NSAIDs may be a reasonable alternative.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Per manufacturer's recommendations. Quality trials have utilized DHEP lecithin 1. 3% gel (Spacca et al., 2005), Flurbiprofen local-action transcutaneous patch (40 mg BID) (Ritchie, 1996), piroxicam gel (3cm, 0. 5%, approximately 0. 9g QID) (Ritchie, 1996), 2% diclofenac sodium in a pluronic lecithin liposome organo-gel (PLO) (Burnham et al., 1998) and diclofenac sodium gel (Schapira et al., 1991). The one crossover trial suggests flurbiprofen was superior to piroxicam, which parallels the results of another RCT for the same two oral medications.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, lack of efficacy, or development of adverse effects that necessitate discontinuation.

Rationale

Three placebo-controlled trials address topical NSAIDS for epicondylalgia (Spacca et al., 2005, Burnham et al., 1998, Schapira et al., 1991). The highest quality trial was for patients with acute pain who had excellent prognoses with resolution of the symptoms in a few days and consequently did not demonstrate a difference with placebo (Spacca et al., 2005). The other trials suggested superiority to placebo (Burnham et al., 1998, Schapira et al., 1991). The one randomized crossover trial found flurbiprofen superior to piroxicam (Ritchie, 1996), suggesting piroxicam should not be either a first- or second-line treatment with either oral or topical preparations. Evidence is moderate for treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic patients. Quality evidence is absent for post-operative patients. There are no studies comparing topical agents with oral NSAIDs. Quality studies are available on topical NSAIDs including acute, subacute, and chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients and there is evidence of benefits. This option is not invasive, has low adverse effects, and is low cost for short-term use, although of higher cost for prolonged applications. Topical NSAIDs are recommended as a treatment option.

Evidence

There are 4 moderate-quality RCTs and randomized crossover trials incorporated in this analysis. There are 3 low quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

OPIOIDS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Not Recommended

Opioids are not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating opioids for treating lateral epicondylalgia. Opioids cause significant adverse effects – poor tolerance, constipation, drowsiness, clouded judgment, memory loss, and potential misuse or dependence have been reported in up to 35% of patients. Quality trials report that approximately 20 to 75% of patients are unable to tolerate these medications (see Chronic Pain guideline). Before prescribing opioids, patients should be informed of these potential adverse effects and cautioned against operating motor vehicles or machinery. Opioids do not appear to be more effective than safer analgesics for managing most musculoskeletal symptoms; they should only be used if needed for severe pain or for a short time in the post-operative time. Opioids are not invasive, have a high adverse effect profile, and are low cost. They are not recommended for treatment of epicondylalgia patients, except as a brief postoperative course.

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of opioids for treatment of pain from lateral epicondylalgia.

OPIOIDS FOR SELECT PATIENTS WITH POSTOPERATIVE EPICONDYLALGIA

Sometimes Recommended

Opioids are recommended for select treatment of patients with postoperative lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

For post-operative epicondylalgia, a brief course of a few days to approximately a week of an opioid is recommended for treatment. Opioids may be helpful for brief nocturnal use after surgery. For other epicondylalgia patients, opioids are not recommended. Most patients should attempt pain control with NSAIDs prior to opioids. Wean from opioids as early as possible.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Per manufacturer's recommendations; generally patients require no more than a few days of treatment with opioids for most epicondylar surgeries.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, sufficient control with other medications, lack of efficacy, or development of adverse effects that necessitate discontinuation.

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating opioids for treating lateral epicondylalgia. Opioids cause significant adverse effects – poor tolerance, constipation, drowsiness, clouded judgment, memory loss, and potential misuse or dependence have been reported in up to 35% of patients. Quality trials report that approximately 20 to 75% of patients are unable to tolerate these medications (see Chronic Pain guideline). Before prescribing opioids, patients should be informed of these potential adverse effects and cautioned against operating motor vehicles or machinery. Opioids do not appear to be more effective than safer analgesics for managing most musculoskeletal symptoms; they should only be used if needed for severe pain or for a short time in the post-operative time. Opioids are not invasive, have a high adverse effect profile, and are low cost. They are not recommended for treatment of epicondylalgia patients, except as a brief post-operative course.

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating the use of opioids for treatment of pain from lateral epicondylalgia.

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

ALLIED HEALTH INTERVENTIONS

PHYSICAL OR OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, CHRONIC, OR POSTOPERATIVE EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Physical or occupational therapy is recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, chronic, or postoperative lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

For highly select acute, subacute, chronic and post-operative epicondylalgia patients. Generally moderately to severely affected patients are thought to be better candidates for supervised therapy sessions. Milder cases may benefit from no more than 2 or 3 appointments to help educate, prevent debility, and institute a home exercise program. One moderate-quality trial suggested no benefits from earlier physical therapy (Park et al., 2010).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Exercises are generally individualized and increased over time. Many therapists combine exercises with other treatment modalities. Stretching exercises are frequently included and progress to strengthening exercises. However, there is no quality evidence to recommend one exercise regimen in preference to another. There also is no quality evidence in favor or against any single type of exercise (e.g., stretching or strengthening). Frequency of appointments is usually individualized based on severity of the disorder, prior response to treatment, and job demands. Two to three appointments per week for two weeks are often used to initiate an exercise program for more severely affected patients. Total numbers of appointments may be as few as 2 to 3 for mild patients or up to 12 to 15 for more severely affected patients.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, intolerance, lack of efficacy or non-compliance including non-compliance with home exercises prescribed.

Rationale

There are multiple randomized studies of exercise; however, there is no trial with a sham group. There also is no quality trial with only exercise as an isolated intervention. One high-quality trial suggested no long-term benefits of exercise for treatment of chronic lateral epicondylalgia patients, resulting in downgrading of this recommendation and inclusion of

more selective criteria (Coombes et al., 2013). One moderate-quality trial suggested no benefits from immediate compared with delayed physical therapy (Park et al., 2010). There is one trial comparing physiotherapy with wait and see and injection; however, the physiotherapy included multiple cointerventions that also included manipulation (Bisset et al., 2006, Bisset et al., 2009). This trial also found equivalency between the physiotherapy and wait-and-see groups at one year, although injection was superior in the short-term. The other moderate-quality trial with a noninterventional control group appears underpowered, as there were small sample sizes and trends in the data in support of exercise (Tonks et al., 2007). That trial also found no additive benefit of exercise in addition to glucocorticoid injection, although trends in support of a combined approach were also present in the data. One moderate-quality trial found an exercise group superior to ultrasound, potentially suggesting modest benefits from exercise (Pienimaki et al., 1996) and the follow-up study also reported superior results with less need of surgery in the exercise group compared to ultrasound (6% vs. 36%) (Pienimaki et al., 1998). Most trials have unstructured physical therapy that precludes identification of the effects of a specific exercise program, although one trial failed to discern differences between eccentric and concentric exercises (Martinez-Silvestrini et al., 2005). Thus, there is no quality evidence of efficacy of exercise. Nevertheless, the large numbers of trials with exercise included as a co-intervention (Smidt et al., 2002, Bisset et al., 2006, Struijs et al., 2004, Bisset et al., 2005, Svernlov et al., 2001, Newcomer et al., 2001, Nimgade et al., 2005, Trudel et al., 2004, Stasinopoulos et al., 2006, Pienimaki et al., 1996, Martinez-Silvestrini et al., 2005, Finestone et al., 2008, Langen-Pieters et al., 2003) documents that exercise is thought to be important for treatment and recovery. Exercise is not invasive, has low adverse effects, is low to high cost depending on numbers of treatments and is recommended.

Evidence

There are 2 high- and 9 moderate-quality RCTs (one with 2 reports) incorporated into this analysis. There are 6 low-quality RCTs or pseudorandomized controlled trials in Appendix 1.

IONTOPHORESIS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Iontophoresis with administration of either glucocorticosteroids or NSAIDs is moderately recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Moderately Recommended, Evidence (B)

Indications

For acute, subacute, or chronic epicondylalgia patients; patients who cannot tolerate oral NSAIDs; or patients who fail other treatments (e.g., insufficient pain relief with elbow straps and activity modification) may be ideal candidates. Generally moderately to severely affected patients are thought to be better candidates.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Various medications have been used in the quality studies. These include dexamethasone (Nirschl et al., 2003, Runeson et al., 2002), naproxen (Baskurt et al., 2003), and ketorolac (Saggini et al., 1996). There are no quality comparative trials to suggest one regimen is superior to another with the exception that sodium salicylate was inferior to diclofenac (Demirtas et al., 1998). The highest quality study utilized a regimen of 6 treatments over 15 days (Nirschl et al., 2003). Thus, 6 treatments over 15 days are recommended. One additional set of up to 6 more treatments should be based on objective evidence of continuing functional improvements.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, intolerance, lack of efficacy or non-compliance.

Rationale

There are four moderate-quality trials. The highest quality trial suggested efficacy of dexamethasone compared with placebo (Nirschl et al., 2003). The other study comparing dexamethasone with placebo was lower quality, substantially smaller in size and found lack of efficacy, though may have been underpowered (Runeson et al., 2002). Two other placebo-controlled trials found efficacy, one with ketorolac (Saggini et al., 1996) and the other with diclofenac (Vecchini et al., 1984). All trials suggest no more than modest improvements. One trial compared two methods of administering naproxen and found equal efficacy (Baskurt et al., 2003). However, another moderate quality trial found diclofenac superior to sodium salicylate (Demirtas et al., 1998). Iontophoresis with glucocorticoids or NSAIDs are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are moderately costly and are recommended.

Evidence

There are 6 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis.

ULTRASOUND FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Ultrasound is recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Evidence (C)

Indications

For acute, subacute, or chronic epicondylalgia patients; patients who cannot tolerate oral NSAIDs and exercise; or patients who fail other treatments (e.g., insufficient pain relief with elbow straps and activity modification) may be ideal candidates. Generally moderately to severely affected patients are thought to be better candidates. Overall effect of ultrasound

appears modest; thus, other interventions are recommended first, particularly exercise (Pienimaki et al., 1996).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Various regimens have been utilized in the quality studies. The two trials showing the most benefit utilized 10 to 12 treatments (1. 0MHz, 1-2W/cm2 for 5 to 10 minutes per session) over 4 to 6 weeks (Lundeberg et al., 1988, Binder et al., 1985). There are no comparative trials for different regimens.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, intolerance, lack of efficacy or non-compliance.

Rationale

There are two high- and two moderate-quality sham-controlled trials that address ultrasound. The two high-quality trials (D'Vaz et al., 2006, Haker et al., 1991) both found ultrasound ineffective while the two moderate-quality trials found it effective (Lundeberg et al., 1988, Binder et al., 1985). However, the two moderate-quality trials both had larger sample sizes. (However, these are both older trials. Thus, the score may understate the true quality of the trials.) There is quality evidence that exercise is superior to ultrasound (Pienimaki et al., 1996). There also is evidence ultrasound is superior to chiropractic care (Langen-Pieters et al., 2003). Four moderate-quality trials included ultrasound as a co-intervention, thus utility of ultrasound is unable to be assessed from these studies (Smidt et al., 2002, Struijs et al., 2004, Struijs et al., 2003, Stratford et al., 1989). Thus, there is overall evidence of a modest benefit from ultrasound. Ultrasound is not invasive, has few adverse effects, but is moderately costly. As the overall evidence is for a modest benefit, it is recommended particularly for patients who fail other interventions.

Evidence

There are 2 high- and 10 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis. There are 2 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

SOFT TISSUE MOBILIZATION FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Not Recommended

Soft tissue mobilization is not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Evidence (C)

Evidence

There are no quality trials evaluating soft tissue mobilization for treatment of lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

MANIPULATION AND MOBILIZATION FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Not Recommended

Manipulation or mobilization is not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Evidence (C)

Rationale

One high-quality trial included manipulation in addition to exercises and found no long-term benefits (Coombes et al., 2013). There is 1 moderate-quality randomized controlled trial comparing the additive value of soft tissue mobilization to a combination of stretching exercises, computer workstation advice plus generic NSAID (Blanchette et al., 2011). As that trial also found no evidence of additive benefits of soft tissue mobilization, neither manipulation nor mobilization is recommended for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia.

While there are a few moderate-quality trials, there are no sham-controlled trials that address manipulation or for the treatment of lateral epicondylalgia. One moderate-quality trial utilized manipulation as a co-intervention, thus precluding use of the trial for evidence based guidance (Bisset et al., 2006, Bisset et al., 2009). Two other moderate-quality studies conflicted. One suggested manipulation (mostly of the wrist) was superior to a combination of friction massage, ultrasound and exercise (Struijs et al., 2003). The other suggested ultrasound was superior to chiropractic care (Langen-Pieters et al., 2003). Thus, the currently available evidence conflicts regarding whether manipulation is beneficial and there is no recommendation for or against use of manipulation.

Evidence

There is 1 high- and 5 moderate-quality RCTs or randomized crossover experimental studies (one with two reports) incorporated in this analysis. There are 5 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

MASSAGE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of massage, including friction massage, for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of massage for treatment of epicondylalgia. There are moderate-quality trials that included friction massage for lateral epicondylalgia, but none

utilized a no-treatment or sham-control group. All moderate-quality trials had co-interventions (Smidt et al., 2002, Struijs et al., 2004, Struijs et al., 2003, Stratford et al., 1989), effectively precluding evidence-based guidance. Thus, there is no recommendation for or against the use of either massage or friction massage.

Evidence

There are 4 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis. There is 1 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

ACUPUNCTURE FOR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Sometimes Recommended

Acupuncture is recommended for the treatment of select patients with chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Chronic epicondylalgia patients; patients who fail to sufficiently respond to treatment with NSAIDs (oral and/or topical), exercise, or patients who fail other treatments (e.g., insufficient pain relief with elbow straps and activity modification) may be ideal candidates. Glucocorticosteroid injections are also reasonable intervention(s) to attempt before acupuncture. Generally moderately to severely affected patients are thought to be better candidates. Overall benefits of acupuncture appear modest and efficacy appears to be transient, disappearing after a few weeks.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Various regimens have been utilized in the quality studies. The sites used were LI 4, 10, 11; L5, SJ5, Ah-Shi over muscle origin of lateral extensor group (Davidson et al., 2001) and the second used LI 4, 10, 11, 12, TW5 (Fink et al., 2002, Fink et al., 2002). Both manually stimulated needles (de qi) placed for 15 to 20 minutes. Regimens were 2 to 3 treatments a week for 8 to 10 treatments (Fink et al., 2002, Fink et al., 2002, Davidson et al., 2001). Patients should demonstrate benefit after 4 to 5 appointments otherwise either the technique should be altered or acupuncture discontinued. The two trials showing the most benefit utilized 10 to 12 treatments (1. 0MHz, 1-2W/cm2 for 5 to 10 minutes a session) over 4 to 6 weeks (Lundeberg et al., 1988, Binder et al., 1985). There are no comparative trials for different regimens.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, intolerance, lack of efficacy, or non-compliance.

Rationale

There are multiple moderate-quality trials of acupuncture for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia. There are 3 moderate-quality trials with 4 reports that attempted sham treatment. Two of those are potentially usable for purposes of developing guidance. One suggested potential modest short term benefit (Fink et al., 2002, Fink et al., 2002) and the other suggest benefit of deep needle insertion compared with superficial needle insertion (Haker et al., 1990). Another trial suggested comparable efficacy to ultrasound (Davidson et al., 2001). Thus, the overall quality of the literature is relatively weak, results are somewhat inconsistent. On average, they appear to suggest a modest, relatively short term benefit in mostly chronic patients. Acupuncture is minimally invasive, has few adverse effects in the extremities, and is moderately costly over several treatments. It is recommended for select patients with chronic epicondylalgia unresponsive to several other treatments

Evidence

There are 6 moderate-quality RCTs (one with two reports) incorporated into this analysis. There is 1 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

ACUPUNCTURE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR POSTOPERATIVE EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of acupuncture for the treatment of acute, subacute, or postoperative lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are multiple moderate-quality trials of acupuncture for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia. There are 3 moderate-quality trials with 4 reports that attempted sham treatment. Two of those are potentially usable for purposes of developing guidance. One suggested potential modest short term benefit (Fink et al., 2002, Fink et al., 2002) and the other suggest benefit of deep needle insertion compared with superficial needle insertion (Haker et al., 1990). Another trial suggested comparable efficacy to ultrasound (Davidson et al., 2001). Thus, the overall quality of the literature is relatively weak, results are somewhat inconsistent. On average, they appear to suggest a modest, relatively short term benefit in mostly chronic patients. Acupuncture is minimally invasive, has few adverse effects in the extremities, and is moderately costly over several treatments. It is recommended for select patients with chronic epicondylalgia unresponsive to several other treatments

Evidence

There are 6 moderate-quality RCTs (one with two reports) incorporated into this analysis. There is 1 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

BIOFEEDBACK FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of biofeedback for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one high-quality trial of an electrical stimulation device; however, it had a small sample size, used an electrical current not usually used in devices, and contained sparse results (Johannsen et al., 1993). There are no other quality studies for or against the use of these treatments, thus there is no recommendation for or against their use.

Evidence

There is 1 high-quality randomized crossover trial incorporated into this analysis for electrical stimulation. There is 1 low-quality RCT on electrical stimulation and 1 low-quality randomized crossover trial on TENS in Appendix 1. There are no quality trials evaluating biofeedback, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, or diathermy for the treatment of lateral epicondylalgia.

HOT AND COLD THERAPIES

SELF-APPLICATION OF HEAT OR COLD FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, CHRONIC, OR POSTOPERATIVE EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Self-application of heat is recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, chronic, or postoperative lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

For acute, subacute, chronic and postoperative epicondylalgia.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Heat or cold may be reasonable treatments as self-applications, approximately 3 to 5 times a day.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, intolerance or lack of efficacy.

Rationale

There are no quality trials of heat. There is one moderate-quality trial comparing ice after exercise vs. exercise alone and found no evidence ice improved pain relief (Manias et al., 2006). Another trial included ice massage as a co-intervention (Martinez-Silvestrini et al., 2005). Heat and cryotherapy are not invasive, have low adverse effects and may have no cost for at-home applications and are thus recommended. Lack of evidence of efficacy and cost considerations do not support in-therapy applications and thus these are not recommended.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality pseudorandomized pilot trial incorporated into this analysis.

SELF-APPLICATION OF COLD FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, CHRONIC, OR POSTOPERATIVE EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Self-application of cold is recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, chronic, or postoperative lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

For acute, subacute, chronic and postoperative epicondylalgia.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Heat or cold may be reasonable treatments as self-applications, approximately 3 to 5 times a day.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, intolerance or lack of efficacy.

Rationale

There are no quality trials of heat. There is one moderate-quality trial comparing ice after exercise vs. exercise alone and found no evidence ice improved pain relief (Manias et al., 2006). Another trial included ice massage as a co-intervention (Martinez-Silvestrini et al., 2005). Heat and cryotherapy are not invasive, have low adverse effects and may have no cost for at-home applications and are thus recommended. Lack of evidence of efficacy and cost considerations do not support in-therapy applications and thus these are not recommended.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality psuedorandomized pilot trial incorporated into this analysis.

DIATHERMY FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of diathermy for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one high-quality trial of an electrical stimulation device, however it had a small sample size, used an electrical current not usually used in devices, and contained sparse results (Johannsen et al., 1993). There are no other quality studies for or against the use of these treatments, thus there is no recommendation for or against their use.

Evidence

There is 1 high-quality randomized crossover trial incorporated into this analysis for electrical stimulation. There is 1 low-quality RCT on electrical stimulation and 1 low-quality randomized crossover trial on TENS in Appendix 1. There are no quality trials evaluating biofeedback, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, or diathermy for the treatment of lateral epicondylalgia.

DEVICES

TENNIS ELBOW BANDS, STRAPS, AND BRACES FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, AND CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Tennis elbow bands, straps, and braces are recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Acute, subacute and chronic epicondylalgia.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Devices generally worn daily, but not at night, or as-needed for more forceful exertions (discontinue for less forceful activities during daily routine).

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, intolerance, lack of efficacy, or pain radiating down the dorsum of the forearm into the hand and/or numbness of the dorsum of the hand.

Rationale

Three moderate-quality trials assessed utility of these devices for treatment of epicondylalgia – one compared a brace with no brace, but no sham-controlled trial. The trial comparing a brace to no brace used a brace that is not commonly used (an off-loader wrist brace). Additionally, this specific device was found to interfere with some workers' jobs (Faes et al., 2006). One moderate-quality trial compared a brace, ultrasound and laser with exercises as co-interventions for all patients, finding mostly non-significant differences (Oken et al., 2008). Another moderate-quality trial compared an elbow band with a combination of an elbow band and a wrist splint, suggesting the wrist splint provided no additive benefit while also interfering with work (Van De Streek et al., 2004). Another study evaluated physical therapy, a brace or both for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia; however, as the physical therapy regimen was not specified, the results are uninterpretable (Struijs et al., 2004). One low-quality trial found equal efficacy for wrist supports compared with elbow bands (see Appendix 1) (Altan et al., 2008). Braces, straps and bands are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low cost, and are recommended. There is no moderate or high quality evidence for use of wrist braces for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia. One low-quality trial has suggested efficacy (Garg et al., 2010), however, a randomized crossover experimental design with only immediate results and without followup found some evidence suggesting elbow straps and sleeves may be superior to wrist braces (Jafarian et al., 2009). Some believe these braces rest the wrist and thus the extensor mechanism. Considering the off-loader wrist brace appears successful, other wrist braces may be reasonable options. Since available evidence does not suggest that elbow straps and braces are clearly superior to wrist braces, it may be reasonable to employ a wrist brace first in select cases after discussion with the patient regarding comfort, job requirements, other functional requirements of hand and wrist, and patient tolerance.

Evidence

There are 5 moderate-quality RCTs or randomized crossover trials (one with two reports) incorporated into this analysis. There are 7 low-quality RCTs or psuedorandomized controlled trials and 2 experimental studies in Appendix 1.

COCK-UP WRIST BRACES FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Cock-up wrist braces are recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Acute, subacute, or chronic epicondylalgia. Generally, elbow bands and straps are recommended first, with wrist braces as possible adjunctive treatment for either more severe cases and/or suboptimal results with elbow bands and straps (Jafarian et al., 2009).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Devices generally worn daily (not at night), or as-needed for more forceful exertions (discontinue for less forceful activities during daily routine).

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of elbow pain, intolerance or lack of efficacy.

Rationale

Three moderate-quality trials assessed utility of these devices for treatment of epicondylalgia – one compared a brace with no brace, but no sham-controlled trial. The trial comparing a brace to no brace used a brace that is not commonly used (an off-loader wrist brace). Additionally, this specific device was found to interfere with some workers' jobs (Faes et al., 2006). One moderate-quality trial compared a brace, ultrasound and laser with exercises as co-interventions for all patients, finding mostly non-significant differences (Oken et al., 2008). Another moderate-quality trial compared an elbow band with a combination of an elbow band and a wrist splint, suggesting the wrist splint provided no additive benefit while also interfering with work (Van De Streek et al., 2004). Another study evaluated physical therapy, a brace or both for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia; however, as the physical therapy regimen was not specified, the results are uninterpretable (Struijs et al., 2004). One low-quality trial found equal efficacy for wrist supports compared with elbow bands (see Appendix 1) (Altan et al., 2008). Braces, straps and bands are not invasive, have low adverse effects, are low cost, and are recommended. There is no moderate or high quality evidence for use of wrist braces for treatment of lateral epicondylalgia. One low-quality trial has suggested efficacy (Garg et al., 2010), however, a randomized crossover experimental design with only immediate results and without followup found some evidence suggesting elbow straps and sleeves may be superior to wrist braces (Jafarian et al., 2009). Some believe these braces rest the wrist and thus the extensor mechanism. Considering the off-loader wrist brace appears successful, other wrist braces may be reasonable options. Since available evidence does not suggest that elbow straps and braces are clearly superior to wrist braces, it may be reasonable to employ a wrist brace first in select cases after discussion with the patient regarding comfort, job requirements, other functional requirements of hand and wrist, and patient tolerance.

Evidence

There are 5 moderate-quality RCTs or randomized crossover trials (one with two reports) incorporated into this analysis. There are 7 low-quality RCTs or pseudorandomized controlled trials and 2 experimental studies in Appendix 1.

MAGNETS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of magnets for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies using magnets to treat lateral epicondylalgia. The one moderate-quality trial comparing pulsed electromagnetic field with sham and glucocorticoid injection appears to have been a mostly negative study for PEMF (Uzunca et al., 2007). Quality studies suggest a lack of benefit for low back pain (see Low Back Disorders guideline). This option is low cost, has few adverse effects, and is not invasive. However, without quality evidence of efficacy, there is no recommendation for or against the use of magnets or pulsed electromagnetic field for epicondylalgia.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality pseudorandomized clinical trial incorporated into this analysis.

ELECTRICAL THERAPIES

PULSED ELECTROMAGNETIC FIELD FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of pulsed electromagnetic field for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies using magnets to treat lateral epicondylalgia. The one moderate-quality trial comparing pulsed electromagnetic field with sham and glucocorticoid injection appears to have been a mostly negative study for PEMF (Uzunca et al., 2007). Quality studies suggest a lack of benefit for low back pain (see Low Back Disorders guideline). This option is low cost, has few adverse effects, and is not invasive. However, without quality evidence of efficacy, there is no recommendation for or against the use of magnets or pulsed electromagnetic field for epicondylalgia.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality pseudorandomized clinical trial incorporated into this analysis.

EXTRACORPOREAL SHOCKWAVE THERAPY FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Not Recommended

Extracorporeal shockwave therapy is strongly not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Strongly Not Recommended, Evidence (A)

Rationale

There are 9 high- or moderate-quality, sham-controlled (or low dose-controlled) trials that address extracorporeal shockwave therapy for epicondylalgia. All three high-quality sham-controlled trials, which included the largest sized study, failed to find evidence of efficacy (Chung et al., 2004, Haake et al., 2002, Staples et al., 2008). Two moderate-quality trials suggested efficacy (Pettrone et al., 2005, Spacca et al., 2005), while another moderate-quality trial was negative (Speed et al., 2002). Three trials are of questionable quality due to methodological issues including one with mixed diagnoses (Rompe et al., 2004, Rompe et al., 1996, Mehra et al., 2003). The highest-quality evidence reports that extracorporeal shockwave therapy is not effective, not invasive, has some adverse effects, is moderately costly, and thus is not recommended.

Evidence

There are 3 high- and 8 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis. There are 4 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

PHONOPHORESIS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Not Recommended

Phonophoresis is not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Evidence (C)

Rationale

There are four moderate quality trials that used phonophoresis (Baskurt et al., 2003, Klaiman et al., 1998, Stratford et al., 1989, Nagrale et al., 2009). None of these trials documented efficacy of phonophoresis, thus phonophoresis is not recommended.

Evidence

There are 4 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis. There is 1low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

LOW-LEVEL LASER THERAPY FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Not Recommended

Low-level laser therapy is moderately not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Moderately Not Recommended, Evidence (B)

Rationale

There are 12 high- and moderate-quality trials. The one high-quality trial suggested some benefit (Vasseljen et al., 1992); however, all the moderate quality trials were either completely negative or demonstrated no long term benefits (Haker et al., 1990, Haker et al., 1991, Krasheninnikoff et al., 1994, Basford et al., 2000, Haker et al., 1991, Lundeberg et al., 1987, Papadopoulos et al., 1996). Thus, absent quality evidence of efficacy, low-level laser therapy is not recommended.

Evidence

There is 1 high- and 12 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis. There are 2 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

TRANSCUTANEOUS ELECTRICAL NERVE STIMULATION FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation (TENS) for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one high-quality trial of an electrical stimulation device, however it had a small sample size, used an electrical current not usually used in devices, and contained sparse results (Johannsen et al., 1993). There are no other quality studies for or against the use of these treatments, thus there is no recommendation for or against their use.

Evidence

There is 1 high-quality randomized crossover trial incorporated into this analysis for electrical stimulation. There is 1 low-quality RCT on electrical stimulation and 1 low-quality randomized crossover trial on TENS in Appendix 1. There are no quality trials evaluating biofeedback, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, or diathermy for the treatment of lateral epicondylalgia.

ELECTRICAL NERVE STIMULATION FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of electrical nerve stimulation for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one high-quality trial of an electrical stimulation device, however it had a small sample size, used an electrical current not usually used in devices, and contained sparse results (Johannsen et al., 1993). There are no other quality studies for or against the use of these treatments, thus there is no recommendation for or against their use.

Evidence

There is 1 high-quality randomized crossover trial incorporated into this analysis for electrical stimulation. There is 1 low-quality RCT on electrical stimulation and 1 low-quality randomized crossover trial on TENS in Appendix 1. There are no quality trials evaluating biofeedback, transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, or diathermy for the treatment of lateral epicondylalgia.

INJECTION THERAPIES

GLUCOCORTICOSTEROID INJECTIONS FOR SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Sometimes Recommended

Glucocorticosteroid ("steroid") injections are recommended for the treatment of highly selective subacute or chronic lateral epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Evidence (C)

Indications

Subacute or chronic epicondylalgia patients. Patients should have failed to respond sufficiently to treatment with multiple different NSAIDs (oral and/or topical), exercise, elbow straps and activity modification. Patients should be cautioned the symptoms frequently recur after injection. Moderately to severely affected patients are thought to be better candidates, particularly those thought to be surgical candidates who are attempting to delay surgery in the hopes that the pain subsides.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

All quality trials have performed 1 injection and assessed the results, rather than performing additional injections, unless the initial results were unsatisfactory. Most quality trials that described the injection techniques utilized the most tender point (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et

al., 2005, Verhaar et al., 1996), although two primarily targeted the tendon origin (Haker, 1993, Krogh et al., 2013). Medications in these trials varied and included methylprednisolone 20mg (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005); triamcinolone acetonide 10mg (Smidt et al., 2002, Bisset et al., 2006, Bisset et al., 2009, Price et al., 1991, Solveborn et al., 1995), 20mg (Price et al., 1991); triamcinolone acetate (Verhaar et al., 1996); hydrocortisone 25mg (Price et al., 1991); betamethasone 6mg (Newcomer et al., 2001); triamcinolone 0. 2mg (Haker, 1993); and triamcinolone 40mg (Krogh et al., 2013). The one comparative trial suggested triamcinolone 10mg was superior to hydrocortisone 25mg (Price et al., 1991). Trials have combined these injections with injectable anesthetics (e.g., 0. 5 to 2. 0 mL 1% lidocaine) (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Price et al., 1991, Verhaar et al., 1996); 1. 0mL 2% lidocaine; 1% lignocaine (Coombes et al., 2013); and 4mL 0. 25% bupivacaine (Newcomer et al., 2001). The one comparative trial suggested bupivacaine was superior to lidocaine, and far outlasted the expected duration of anesthesia (Solveborn et al., 1995). There also is some preliminary evidence that either dry needling or a multiple puncture technique ("peppering") may be effective, although none with a true control group for the technique (Stenhouse G, 2013, Uygur E, 2017, Krogh et al., 2013, Altay et al., 2002, Dogramaci et al., 2009).

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, intolerance, lack of efficacy or non-compliance. Lack of response should result in reassessment of the diagnosis. Generally, there is an inclination to not use more than approximately 3 glucocorticoid injections in any one location for one episode. However, there is no evidence that there is or is not a limit on the number of injections either for an episode or for a lifetime. Subsequent injections should be supported by either objective improvement or utilization of a different technique or location for the injection(s).

Rationale

One high-quality trial found superior results for glucocorticoid compared with saline at 4 weeks, but worse results at 1 year, including more recurrences (Coombes et al., 2013). Another high-quality trial found similar results over 3 months with the glucocorticoid outperforming both saline and platelet rich plasma injections (Krogh et al., 2013). Another high-quality trial found no difference with placebo injections at one month, though data appear to suggest a trend towards efficacy (Lindenhovius et al., 2008); however, all moderate-quality trials comparing glucocorticosteroid injection with placebo found short- to intermediate-term benefits of injection (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Price et al., 1991). Those results were essentially the same as the results that compared injection to no treatment ("wait and see") (Smidt et al., 2002, Bisset et al., 2006, Bisset et al., 2009, Tonks et al., 2007). Thus, there is moderate quality evidence of short to intermediate term efficacy. Studies with follow-up to one year mostly found worse outcomes in the injection group or tends towards worse outcomes than physical therapy or a "wait and see" approach (see Figure 7) (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Lindenhovius et al., 2008, Nimgade et al., 2005, Trudel et al., 2004). These longer-term results caused this recommendation to be downgraded to only "C," as well as for the indications to quite restrictive. Caution is warranted for performing these injections and multiple other treatments should be attempted first. This also provides rationale for no recommendation for or against these

injections in patients with acute lateral epicondylalgia. One moderate-quality trial reported glucocorticoid injection using a peppering technique superior to injection alone or anesthetic with peppering technique (Dogramaci et al., 2009). Studies comparing these injections with either platelet-rich plasma or autologous blood suggest the glucocorticosteroid was inferior (Peerbooms et al., 2010, Gosens et al., 2011, Kazemi et al., 2010, Ozturan et al., 2010). There are no quality trials of adjuvant treatment. One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID vs. NSAID alone at one month (Toker et al., 2008). Injections are invasive, have modest adverse effects and are low to moderate cost. They are recommended for highly select cases of lateral epicondylalgia. The one comparative trial of injectable anesthetics found bupivacaine was superior to lidocaine and persisted to one year, thus well outlasted the expected duration of anesthesia. Consequently, adjuvant injection with bupivacaine is recommended (Solveborn et al., 1995).

Evidence

There are 6 high- and 15 moderate-quality RCTs or pseudorandomized controlled trials (one with two reports) incorporated into this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

GLUCOCORTICOSTEROID INJECTIONS FOR ACUTE EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of glucocorticosteroid ("steroid") injections for the treatment of acute lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

One high-quality trial found superior results for glucocorticoid compared with saline at 4 weeks, but worse results at 1 year, including more recurrences (Coombes et al., 2013). Another high-quality trial found similar results over 3 months with the glucocorticoid outperforming both saline and platelet rich plasma injections (Krogh et al., 2013). Another high-quality trial found no difference with placebo injections at one month, though data appear to suggest a trend towards efficacy (Lindenhovius et al., 2008); however, all moderate-quality trials comparing glucocorticosteroid injection with placebo found short- to intermediate-term benefits of injection (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Price et al., 1991). Those results were essentially the same as the results that compared injection to no treatment ("wait and see") (Smidt et al., 2002, Bisset et al., 2006, Bisset et al., 2009, Tonks et al., 2007). Thus, there is moderate quality evidence of short to intermediate term efficacy. Studies with follow-up to one year mostly found worse outcomes in the injection group or tends towards worse outcomes than physical therapy or a "wait and see" approach (see Figure 7) (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Lindenhovius et al., 2008, Nimgade et al., 2005, Trudel et al., 2004). These longer-term results caused this recommendation to be downgraded to only "C," as well as for the indications to quite restrictive. Caution is warranted for performing these injections and multiple other treatments should be

attempted first. This also provides rationale for no recommendation for or against these injections in patients with acute lateral epicondylalgia. One moderate-quality trial reported glucocorticoid injection using a peppering technique superior to injection alone or anesthetic with peppering technique (Dogramaci et al., 2009). Studies comparing these injections with either platelet-rich plasma or autologous blood suggest the glucocorticosteroid was inferior (Peerbooms et al., 2010, Gosens et al., 2011, Kazemi et al., 2010, Ozturan et al., 2010). There are no quality trials of adjuvant treatment. One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID vs. NSAID alone at one month (Toker et al., 2008). Injections are invasive, have modest adverse effects and are low to moderate cost. They are recommended for highly select cases of lateral epicondylalgia. The one comparative trial of injectable anesthetics found bupivacaine was superior to lidocaine and persisted to one year, thus well outlasted the expected duration of anesthesia. Consequently, adjuvant injection with bupivacaine is recommended (Solveborn et al., 1995).

Evidence

There are 6 high- and 15 moderate-quality RCTs or pseudorandomized controlled trials (one with two reports) incorporated into this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

GLUCOCORTICOSTEROID INJECTIONS WITH BUPIVACAINE FOR SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Glucocorticosteroid ("steroid") injections using bupivacaine as an adjunct are recommended for the treatment of subacute or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Evidence (C)

Indications

Subacute or chronic epicondylalgia patients. Patients should have failed to respond sufficiently to treatment with multiple different NSAIDs (oral and/or topical), exercise, elbow straps and activity modification. Patients should be cautioned the symptoms frequently recur after injection. Moderately to severely affected patients are thought to be better candidates, particularly those thought to be surgical candidates who are attempting to delay surgery in the hopes that the pain subsides.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

All quality trials have performed 1 injection and assessed the results, rather than performing additional injections, unless the initial results were unsatisfactory. Most quality trials that described the injection techniques utilized the most tender point (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Verhaar et al., 1996), although two primarily targeted the tendon origin (Haker, 1993, Krogh et al., 2013). Medications in these trials varied and included methylprednisolone 20mg (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005); triamcinolone acetonide

10mg (Smidt et al., 2002, Bisset et al., 2006, Bisset et al., 2009, Price et al., 1991, Solveborn et al., 1995), 20mg (Price et al., 1991); triamcinolone acetate (Verhaar et al., 1996); hydrocortisone 25mg (Price et al., 1991); betamethasone 6mg (Newcomer et al., 2001); triamcinolone 0. 2mg (Haker, 1993); and triamcinolone 40mg (Krogh et al., 2013). The one comparative trial suggested triamcinolone 10mg was superior to hydrocortisone 25mg (Price et al., 1991). Trials have combined these injections with injectable anesthetics (e.g., 0. 5 to 2. 0 mL 1% lidocaine) (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Price et al., 1991, Verhaar et al., 1996); 1. 0mL 2% lidocaine; 1% lignocaine (Coombes et al., 2013); and 4mL 0. 25% bupivacaine (Newcomer et al., 2001). The one comparative trial suggested bupivacaine was superior to lidocaine, and far outlasted the expected duration of anesthesia (Solveborn et al., 1995). There also is some preliminary evidence that either dry needling or a multiple puncture technique ("peppering") may be effective, although none with a true control group for the technique (Stenhouse G, 2013, Uygur E, 2017, Krogh et al., 2013, Altay et al., 2002, Dogramaci et al., 2009).

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, intolerance, lack of efficacy or non-compliance. Lack of response should result in reassessment of the diagnosis. Generally, there is an inclination to not use more than approximately 3 glucocorticoid injections in any one location for one episode. However, there is no evidence that there is or is not a limit on the number of injections either for an episode or for a lifetime. Subsequent injections should be supported by either objective improvement or utilization of a different technique or location for the injection(s).

Rationale

One high-quality trial found superior results for glucocorticoid compared with saline at 4 weeks, but worse results at 1 year, including more recurrences (Coombes et al., 2013). Another high-quality trial found similar results over 3 months with the glucocorticoid outperforming both saline and platelet rich plasma injections (Krogh et al., 2013). Another high-quality trial found no difference with placebo injections at one month, though data appear to suggest a trend towards efficacy (Lindenhovius et al., 2008); however, all moderate-quality trials comparing glucocorticosteroid injection with placebo found short- to intermediate-term benefits of injection (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Price et al., 1991). Those results were essentially the same as the results that compared injection to no treatment ("wait and see") (Smidt et al., 2002, Bisset et al., 2006, Bisset et al., 2009, Tonks et al., 2007). Thus, there is moderate quality evidence of short to intermediate term efficacy. Studies with follow-up to one year mostly found worse outcomes in the injection group or tends towards worse outcomes than physical therapy or a "wait and see" approach (see Figure 7) (Hay et al., 1999, Lewis et al., 2005, Lindenhovius et al., 2008, Nimgade et al., 2005, Trudel et al., 2004). These longer-term results caused this recommendation to be downgraded to only "C," as well as for the indications to quite restrictive. Caution is warranted for performing these injections and multiple other treatments should be attempted first. This also provides rationale for no recommendation for or against these injections in patients with acute lateral epicondylalgia. One moderate-quality trial reported glucocorticoid injection using a peppering technique superior to injection alone or anesthetic with peppering technique (Dogramaci et al., 2009). Studies comparing these

injections with either platelet-rich plasma or autologous blood suggest the glucocorticosteroid was inferior (Peerbooms et al., 2010, Gosens et al., 2011, Kazemi et al., 2010, Ozturan et al., 2010). There are no quality trials of adjuvant treatment. One low-quality trial suggested superiority of combining glucocorticosteroid injection with NSAID vs. NSAID alone at one month (Toker et al., 2008). Injections are invasive, have modest adverse effects and are low to moderate cost. They are recommended for highly select cases of lateral epicondylalgia. The one comparative trial of injectable anesthetics found bupivacaine was superior to lidocaine and persisted to one year, thus well outlasted the expected duration of anesthesia. Consequently, adjuvant injection with bupivacaine is recommended (Solveborn et al., 1995).

Evidence

There are 6 high- and 15 moderate-quality RCTs or pseudorandomized controlled trials (one with two reports) incorporated into this analysis. There are 3 low-quality RCTs in Appendix 1.

BOTULINUM INJECTIONS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Not Recommended

Botulinum injections are not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are 4 high-quality trials comparing botulinum injections with placebo. Three of the studies suggest short to intermediate term benefits (Wong et al., 2005, Placzek et al., 2007, Espandar et al., 2010) and one does not (Hayton et al., 2005) while one moderate-quality trial suggested superiority of glucocorticosteroid injections (Lin et al., 2010). Additionally, no quality studies with longer term follow-ups are available. Botulinum injections are invasive and there are reports of fatalities as well as muscle weakness (Wong et al., 2005, Placzek et al., 2007, Lin et al., 2010, Espandar et al., 2010), thus this intervention has major adverse effects which would appear to require considerable evidence of longer term efficacy to warrant. Thus, these injections are not recommended.

Evidence

There are 4 high- and 1 moderate -quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis.

PLATELET-RICH PLASMA INJECTIONS FOR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Platelet-rich plasma injections are recommended for the treatment of chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Lateral epicondylalgia lasting at least 6 months, unresponsive or insufficiently responsive to other treatments including NSAID(s), straps, stretching and strengthening exercises, and at least one glucocorticosteroids injection (Peerbooms et al., 2010).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Injection of approximately 3mL of platelet-rich plasma buffered with NS plus 8. 4% sodium bicarbonate plus bupivacaine 0. 5% with epinephrine (1:200,000) and used peppering technique (Peerbooms et al., 2010).

Rationale

There is one high-quality trial that found a lack of efficacy of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) injections compared with saline over 3 months. However, its data does not extend to 12 months (Krogh et al., 2013) when other data suggest the greatest benefits are manifested (Krogh et al., 2013). There are no placebo controlled trials that address autologous blood (AB) injections for epicondylalgia. One moderate-quality comparative trial suggested comparable efficacy (Creaney et al., 2011), while another trial suggested modest superiority of PRP (Thanasas et al., 2011).

There is one high -quality trial comparing platelet-rich plasma with glucocorticosteroids (Peerbooms et al., 2010, Gosens et al., 2011) and suggested superiority of the PRP injection lasting at least 2 years (Gosens et al., 2011). One moderate-quality quasi-randomized trial suggested superiority of AB injections compared with glucocorticoid injections (Kazemi et al., 2010), and another moderate though lower quality trial suggested inferiority of AB to glucocorticoid injections at 4 weeks, but not over one year when AB was superior (Ozturan et al., 2010). These injections are invasive, have adverse effects, and are costly, but appear effective for select patients and are thus recommended for chronic epicondylalgia refractory to other treatments.

Evidence

There are 2 high (one with 2 reports) and 2 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis for platelet-rich plasma injections. There are 3 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis for autologous blood injections.

AUTOLOGOUS BLOOD INJECTIONS FOR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Autologous blood injections are recommended for the treatment of chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Lateral epicondylalgia lasting at least 6 months, unresponsive or insufficiently responsive to other treatments including NSAIDs, straps, stretching and strengthening exercises, and at least one glucocorticosteroids injection (Peerbooms et al., 2010).

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Injection of approximately 3mL of platelet-rich plasma buffered with NS plus 8. 4% sodium bicarbonate plus bupivacaine 0. 5% with epinephrine (1:200,000) and used peppering technique (Peerbooms et al., 2010).

Rationale

There is one high-quality trial that found a lack of efficacy of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) injections compared with saline over 3 months. However, its data does not extend to 12 months (Krogh et al., 2013) when other data suggest the greatest benefits are manifested (Krogh et al., 2013). There are no placebo controlled trials that address autologous blood (AB) injections for epicondylalgia. One moderate-quality comparative trial suggested comparable efficacy (Creaney et al., 2011), while another trial suggested modest superiority of PRP (Thanasas et al., 2011). There is one high -quality trial comparing platelet-rich plasma with glucocorticosteroids (Peerbooms et al., 2010, Gosens et al., 2011) and suggested superiority of the PRP injection lasting at least 2 years (Gosens et al., 2011). One moderate-quality quasi-randomized trial suggested superiority of AB injections compared with glucocorticoid injections (Kazemi et al., 2010), and another moderate though lower quality trial suggested inferiority of AB to glucocorticoid injections at 4 weeks, but not over one year when AB was superior (Ozturan et al., 2010). These injections are invasive, have adverse effects, and are costly, but appear effective for select patients and are thus recommended for chronic epicondylalgia refractory to other treatments.

Evidence

There are 2 high (one with 2 reports) and 2 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis for platelet-rich plasma injections. There are 3 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis for autologous blood injections.

PLATELET-RICH PLASMA FOR ACUTE OR SUBACUTE EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of platelet-rich plasma for the treatment of acute or subacute lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one high-quality trial that found a lack of efficacy of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) injections compared with saline over 3 months. However, its data does not extend to 12 months (Krogh et al., 2013) when other data suggest the greatest benefits are manifested (Krogh et al., 2013). There are no placebo controlled trials that address autologous blood (AB) injections for epicondylalgia. One moderate-quality comparative trial suggested comparable efficacy (Creaney et al., 2011), while another trial suggested modest superiority of PRP (Thanasas et al., 2011). There is one high -quality trial comparing platelet-rich plasma with glucocorticosteroids (Peerbooms et al., 2010, Gosens et al., 2011) and suggested superiority of the PRP injection lasting at least 2 years (Gosens et al., 2011). One moderate-quality quasi-randomized trial suggested superiority of AB injections compared with glucocorticoid injections (Kazemi et al., 2010), and another moderate though lower quality trial suggested inferiority of AB to glucocorticoid injections at 4 weeks, but not over one year when AB was superior (Ozturan et al., 2010). These injections are invasive, have adverse effects, and are costly, but appear effective for select patients and are thus recommended for chronic epicondylalgia refractory to other treatments.

Evidence

There are 2 high (one with 2 reports) and 2 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis for platelet-rich plasma injections. There are 3 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis for autologous blood injections.

AUTOLOGOUS BLOOD INJECTIONS FOR ACUTE OR SUBACUTE LATERAL EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of autologous blood injections for the treatment of acute or subacute lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one high-quality trial that found a lack of efficacy of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) injections compared with saline over 3 months. However, its data does not extend to 12 months (Krogh et al., 2013) when other data suggest the greatest benefits are manifested (Krogh et al., 2013). There are no placebo controlled trials that address autologous blood (AB) injections for epicondylalgia. One moderate-quality comparative trial suggested comparable efficacy (Creaney et al., 2011), while another trial suggested modest superiority of PRP (Thanasas et al., 2011). There is one high -quality trial comparing platelet-rich plasma with glucocorticosteroids (Peerbooms et al., 2010, Gosens et al., 2011) and suggested superiority of the PRP injection lasting at least 2 years (Gosens et al., 2011). One moderate-quality quasi-randomized trial suggested superiority of AB injections compared with glucocorticoid injections (Kazemi et al., 2010), and another moderate though lower quality trial suggested inferiority of AB to glucocorticoid injections at 4 weeks, but not over one year when AB was superior (Ozturan et al., 2010). These injections are invasive, have adverse effects, and are costly, but appear effective for select patients and are thus recommended for chronic epicondylalgia refractory to other treatments.

Evidence

There are 2 high (one with 2 reports) and 2 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis for platelet-rich plasma injections. There are 3 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis for autologous blood injections.

POLIDOCANOL INJECTIONS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Not Recommended

Polidocanol injections are not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Evidence (C)

Rationale

There is one moderate-quality, placebo-controlled trial of polidocanol injections (Zeisig et al., 2008). It found no evidence of short- or intermediate-term benefits; thus, polidocanol injections are not recommended.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis.

PERIARTICULAR LATERAL ELBOW HYALURONATE AND GLYCOSAMINOGLYCAN INJECTIONS FOR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of periarticular viscosupplementation (sodium hyaluronate and glycosaminoglycan) injections for the treatment of chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

One moderate-quality trial using glycosaminoglycan injections found conflicting results of efficacy for treating chronic lateral epicondylalgia between two participating centers that are not well explained (Akermark et al., 1995). Another moderate-quality trial suggested substantial efficacy of sodium hyaluronate in comparison with placebo (Petrella et al., 2010). These injections are invasive, have low risk of adverse effects, are at least moderately costly, and results need replicating with quality trials before a recommendation may be supported.

Evidence

There are 2 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis.

PROLOTHERAPY FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of prolotherapy injections for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one pilot study of prolotherapy injections, but the data conflict regarding benefit and a larger sample size is required (Scarpone et al., 2008). There are no quality studies for the use of percutaneous tenotomy, thus there is no recommendation for these injections.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality pilot study incorporated into this analysis.

SONOGRAPHICALLY GUIDED PERCUTANEOUS TENOTOMY INJECTIONS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of sonographically guided percutaneous tenotomy for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one pilot study of prolotherapy injections, but the data conflict regarding benefit and a larger sample size is required (Scarpone et al., 2008). There are no quality studies for the use of percutaneous tenotomy, thus there is no recommendation for these injections.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality pilot study incorporated into this analysis.

SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

EPICONDYLAR RELEASE FOR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Surgical epicondylar release is recommended for the treatment of chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

The timing of surgery should be consistent with the degree of functional impairment and the progression and severity of objective findings. In contrast with severe entrapment neuropathies, lateral epicondylalgia does not generally produce unequivocally objective evidence of impairment or severe dysfunction, thus documentation of adequate trials of non-operative management in spite of compliance with treatment is particularly important (Leppilahti et al., 2001, Keizer et al., 2002, Meknas et al., 2008).

Surgical indications require both a confirmed diagnosis and surgical considerations.

A confirmed diagnosis of **lateral epicondylalgia** requires all of the following:

- lateral elbow pain,
- tenderness over the lateral epicondyle or just distal to the epicondyle, and
- pain with resisted wrist extension or resisted middle finger extension.

Nonoperative treatments include (there is no requirement to utilize all of these):

- elbow straps,
- cock-up wrist braces,
- topical or oral (non-opioid) analgesics,
- home exercises and supervised exercise program,
- heat and/or ice,
- iontophoresis with either glucocorticosteroids or NSAIDs,
- ultrasound,
- glucocorticosteroid injection (Muhammed et al., 1995, Latinovic et al., 2006, Moss et al., 1983, Celiker et al., 2002)

A confirmed diagnosis of **medial epicondylalgia** requires all of the following:

- medial elbow pain,
- tenderness over the medial epicondyle or just distal to the epicondyle, and
- pain with resisted wrist flexion.

Nonoperative treatments include (there is no requirement to utilize all of these):

- elbow straps,
- topical or oral (non-opioid) analgesics,
- home exercises and supervised exercise program,
- heat and/or ice,
- iontophoresis with either glucocorticosteroids or NSAIDS,
- ultrasound,
- glucocorticosteroid injection (Muhammed et al., 1995, Latinovic et al., 2006, Moss et al., 1983, Celiker et al., 2002).

Surgical considerations include:

- pain generally for at least 6 months (Muhammed et al., 1995, Latinovic et al., 2006, Moss et al., 1983, Celiker et al., 2002), although some limited exceptions where as little as 3 months of nonoperative management may be sufficient, and
- insufficiently responsive to non-operative treatments including NSAIDs, elbow straps, stretching and strengthening exercises (Muhammed et al., 1995, Latinovic et al., 2006, Moss et al., 1983, Celiker et al., 2002).

Any of the three main surgical approaches are acceptable pending quality trials to further direct care (open, percutaneous and arthroscopic).

Benefits

Improvement and potential resolution of pain.

Harms

Infection, failure to substantially improve occurs in a minority of patients.

Rationale

There are no quality trials with sham surgical procedures, and no quality trials comparing surgery with a quality rehabilitation program, thus there is insufficient evidence for surgery. Nevertheless, carefully selected patients appear to do well with surgery. There is one moderate-quality trial suggesting superior results with a percutaneous release compared with an open release, including earlier return to work and patient satisfaction (Dunkow et al., 2004). A moderate-quality trial comparing tenotomy with shockwave therapy found no significant differences, but may have been underpowered with some trends in favor of surgery (Radwan et al., 2008). There also is a trial suggesting no differences between surgery and botulinum injections, although trends of modestly better results with surgery were present (Keizer et al., 2002). A third moderate-quality trial suggested relatively less promising results with either surgical procedure for resistant tennis elbow (Leppilahti et al., 2001). Another study suggested that those treated with open (Nirschl) release surgery without drilling did better than those who had adjunctive drilling (Khashaba, 2001). Thus, benefits of less invasive procedures are suggested in these studies. Lateral epicondylar surgery is invasive, has adverse effects, and is high cost, but lateral epicondylar release is recommended in select cases. One trial comparing lateral release with microtenotomy found the recovery to be modestly faster from microtenotomy, thus that procedure is recommended (Meknas et al., 2008).

Evidence

There are 6 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis.

RADIOFREQUENCY MICROTENOTOMY FOR CHRONIC EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

Radiofrequency microtenotomy is recommended for the treatment of chronic lateral or medial epicondylalgia (Meknas et al., 2008).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Evidence (C)

Rationale

There are no quality trials with sham surgical procedures, and no quality trials comparing surgery with a quality rehabilitation program, thus there is insufficient evidence for surgery. Nevertheless, carefully selected patients appear to do well with surgery. There is one

moderate-quality trial suggesting superior results with a percutaneous release compared with an open release, including earlier return to work and patient satisfaction (Dunkow et al., 2004). A moderate-quality trial comparing tenotomy with shockwave therapy found no significant differences, but may have been underpowered with some trends in favor of surgery (Radwan et al., 2008). There also is a trial suggesting no differences between surgery and botulinum injections, although trends of modestly better results with surgery were present (Keizer et al., 2002). A third moderate-quality trial suggested relatively less promising results with either surgical procedure for resistant tennis elbow (Leppilahti et al., 2001). Another study suggested that those treated with open (Nirschl) release surgery without drilling did better than those who had adjunctive drilling (Khashaba, 2001). Thus, benefits of less invasive procedures are suggested in these studies. Lateral epicondylar surgery is invasive, has adverse effects, and is high cost, but lateral epicondylar release is recommended in select cases. One trial comparing lateral release with microtenotomy found the recovery to be modestly faster from microtenotomy, thus that procedure is recommended (Meknas et al., 2008).

Evidence

There are 6 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis.

REHABILITATION PROGRAMS

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies)

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education.

Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

WORK RESTRICTIONS FOR TREATMENT OF EPICONDYLALGIA

Recommended

For patients with medial or lateral epicondylalgia, it is recommended that their work be restricted to those tasks that do not involve high-force stereotypical hand gripping or pinching or the use of high-amplitude vibrating hand-held tools

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Select patients with combined forceful and repeated stereotypical use of the hands.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution, lack of improvement, or desire of the patient to remove limitations.

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating workplace restrictions for treatment of epicondylalgia. One trial included “rest” as a treatment arm and failed to find efficacy of rest (Lundeberg et al., 1988). Thus, whether patients improve more quickly with activity limitations has not been proven. There are trials that have included ergonomic advice as a co-intervention, although the advice is usually simply avoiding aggravating activities (Smidt et al., 2002). However, based on available evidence associating combined forceful and repeated, stereotypical use of the hands with epicondylalgia, work restrictions are recommended to treat select patients. These types of jobs involve a minority of patients with epicondylalgia. Restrictions are not invasive, likely have few adverse effects, and may be moderate to high cost depending on length of time they are in place.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis

PROGNOSIS

Some physicians place work restrictions on patients with epicondylalgia while others do not. There is no quality evidence to suggest that restrictions are required, yet there are widely believed to be some activities that may prolong or perpetuate symptoms of lateral epicondylalgia. Careful advice regarding maximizing activities within the limits of symptoms

is believed to be important. Activities that increase stress on the wrist's extensor mechanism, which originates at the elbow, tend to aggravate symptoms. Consequently, consideration may be given to restrictions on forceful use, lifting, and repetitive flexion or extension following the onset of epicondylalgia. Workstation modifications to reduce the force on the elbow are believed to be important in resolving the problem in cases where the occupational tasks materially contribute. Understanding the worksite and the employer's willingness to and the feasibility of modifying the workstation may be important to maintain the employee at work and/or minimize disability time.

FOLLOW-UP CARE

Patients with epicondylalgia should generally have a follow-up visit in approximately 1 to 2 weeks to monitor medication use, splint use, activity modifications, and results of treatment to date. Less frequent follow-ups may be needed as patients improve, although more frequent follow-up is generally required if workplace limitations have been implemented.

JOB ANALYSIS

Analysis of jobs for risk of lateral epicondylalgia currently parallels that of carpal tunnel syndrome as the job evaluation methods are largely comparable if not identical in most cases and there is a lack of strong or moderate evidence the risks differ for these disorders. The sole exception, the potential for repeated pronation/supination cycles to produce lateral epicondylalgia, is an additional, theoretical ergonomic evaluation consideration. In certain cases, it may be desirable to conduct an ergonomic analysis of the activities that may be contributing to the symptoms. A broad range of ergonomic surveys and instruments is available for estimating duration of hand intensive activities, grasp repetition rates, pinch force, part or tool weights, reach distance, frequency of motion, wrist and hand postures, as well as psychological factors such as organizational relationships and job satisfaction [(332)] (e.g., the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists Threshold Limit Value for Hand Activity [(333)], Strain Index [(334)], Motion Time Measurement Analysis.) Such detailed measures may be necessary or useful for modifying activity, for redesigning the workstation, or for recommending organizational and management initiatives. These situations may call for referral to certified professional ergonomists or a human factors engineer either through the patient or the employer. Some occupational therapists, physical therapists, and other professionals also may have appropriate credentials and experiences to accomplish these evaluations. Evaluation of jobs for risk of medial epicondylalgia is currently believed to be essentially the same as for lateral epicondylalgia as quality evidence for medial epicondylalgia is lacking.

OLECRANON BURSITIS

OVERVIEW

Bursae are sacks with a small amount of fluid that are usually located between structures that move and provide a cushion to reduce friction between the two moving body parts (e.g., between muscle and bone or between bone and overlying skin). Bursitis occurs when the bursae become inflamed and irritated. Olecranon bursitis is a common condition involving an irritated bursa between the olecranon process and overlying dermis. Causal mechanisms are somewhat unclear, but thought to include direct trauma over the olecranon such as bumping or falling on the elbow or leaning on the olecranon, particularly if this is unaccustomed practice. Treatment of olecranon bursitis has most commonly

included avoidance of inciting events, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), drainage/aspiration, a glucocorticosteroid injection, or surgery. Surgical drainage and antibiotics are required if the bursa becomes infected.

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

Olecranon bursitis is considered work-related when there is a discrete traumatic event, including falls onto or bumps against the olecranon. Development of olecranon bursitis after unaccustomed leaning on the elbow is also thought to be work-related. There are no quality studies to associate routine work activities with the development of this bursitis.

DIAGNOSIS

INITIAL ASSESSMENT

There are no special studies for most cases of olecranon bursitis. If the bursa is thought to be potentially infected, aspiration of the fluid and analyses including Gram stain and culture and sensitivity are recommended.

DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA

Olecranon bursitis is a condition associated with a generally painless effusion of the olecranon bursa [335,336,337]. Acute olecranon bursitis may be slightly warm, but is generally non-tender or minimally tender. Septic (infected) olecranon bursitis is either a complication of aseptic olecranon bursitis or a direct consequence of trauma [335]. Generally, to be a complication of aseptic olecranon, bursitis also requires introduction of organisms through the skin, such as abraded skin or an injection, although systemic seeding may also occur. Signs include swelling, pain, tenderness, and pain on range of motion [335,336,337]. Bursitis due to crystal arthropathies also tend to present with findings similar to those of septic bursitis [336].

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

ASPIRATION

FLUID ASPIRATION AND ANALYSES FOR OLECRANON BURSITIS

Recommended

Aspiration of the fluid and analyses including Gram stain and culture and sensitivity are recommended to determine infection for olecranon bursitis.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

X-RAYS

X-RAYS FOR OLECRANON BURSITIS

Recommended

X-rays are recommended to rule out osteomyelitis or joint effusion in cases of significant septic olecranon bursitis.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

OVERVIEW

Most patients with olecranon bursitis are treated with soft elbow padding, support or an ace wrap, are instructed to avoid elbow pressure, and require no further care other than monitoring to assure resolution.

Some patients with olecranon bursitis have been treated with NSAIDs, particularly if there is some accompanying discomfort.

Aspiration of the swollen bursa has been used for diagnosing septic olecranon bursitis, or if it is thought to be potentially infected [336,337,338]. Aspiration has been reported in a low-quality study to have fewer complications than glucocorticosteroid injection [338].

Injection with a glucocorticosteroid (typically doses of methylprednisolone approximately 20 to 40mg or equivalent), often accompanied by aspiration, is widely used for aseptic olecranon bursitis [338,339].

Surgery has been widely used to treat olecranon bursitis that has not responded to activity modifications and injections [337].

ACTIVITY MODIFICATION AND EXERCISE

MODIFYING ACTIVITIES TO AVOID DIRECT PRESSURE OVER THE OLECRANON

Recommended

Modifying activities to avoid direct pressure over the olecranon and allowing time to reabsorb the fluid are recommended.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials. Most patients appear to resolve with non-invasive options including avoiding pressure on the olecranon. Activity modification is not invasive, has low or no adverse effects, is low cost and is recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of modifying activities for olecranon bursitis.

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR OLECRANON BURSITIS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of NSAIDs for the treatment of olecranon bursitis.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one moderate quality trial that included arms comparing naproxen with placebo and failed to show efficacy (Smith et al., 1989). However, the arms comparing glucocorticosteroid injection with naproxen or placebo trended towards better results with the NSAID. Thus, as there is no clear quality evidence that NSAIDs alter the clinical course, there is no recommendation for or against their use for olecranon bursitis. The threshold for a trial of these medications is likely generally low.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate -quality RCT incorporated into this analysis.

DEVICES

SOFT PADDING FOR OLECRANON BURSITIS

Recommended

Soft padding is recommended for olecranon bursitis.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials evaluating these modifications for treatment of olecranon bursitis. Most patients appear to resolve with non-invasive options. Soft padding, soft elbow supports, and ace wraps are not invasive, have few adverse effects, are low cost, and are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of soft padding, soft elbow supports, or ace wraps for olecranon bursitis.

SOFT ELBOW SUPPORTS FOR OLECRANON BURSITIS

Recommended

Soft elbow supports are recommended for olecranon bursitis.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials evaluating these modifications for treatment of olecranon bursitis. Most patients appear to resolve with non-invasive options. Soft padding, soft elbow

supports, and ace wraps are not invasive, have few adverse effects, are low cost, and are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of soft padding, soft elbow supports, or ace wraps for olecranon bursitis.

ACE WRAPS FOR OLECRANON BURSITIS

Recommended

Ace wraps are recommended for olecranon bursitis.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials evaluating these modifications for treatment of olecranon bursitis. Most patients appear to resolve with non-invasive options. Soft padding, soft elbow supports, and ace wraps are not invasive, have few adverse effects, are low cost, and are recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of soft padding, soft elbow supports, or ace wraps for olecranon bursitis.

INJECTION THERAPIES

GLUCOCORTICOSTEROID INJECTIONS FOR OLECRANON BURSITIS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of glucocorticosteroid injections for the treatment of olecranon bursitis. This may be a reasonable option for patients who are failing to resolve prior to consideration of surgery.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one moderate quality trial evaluating the use of glucocorticosteroid injections to treat olecranon bursitis (Smith et al., 1989). That study suggested injection with glucocorticosteroid sped resolution of the condition, and trended toward superior results if the injection was combined with oral naproxen rather than placebo. However, another study reported a 12% risk of septic complications and an RCT is generally underpowered to detect infectious complications. While the quality trial indicates faster resolution, the risk of infectious complications underscore caution about glucocorticoid injections as there is a potential to create a septic bursitis which then often requires surgical drainage. If

attempted, these injections appear to be reserved for those thought to not be infected and not resolving with activity modifications and observation. If attempted, generally only one aspiration/injection is performed followed by careful observation. Some physicians aspirate and then inject, while others only inject the steroid. If the bursitis is not satisfactorily resolved, a second aspiration/injection is often attempted usually not sooner than 3 to 4 weeks later. The single quality trial used methylprednisolone acetate 20 mg (Smith et al., 1989). Aspirated fluid should be sent at least once for studies including crystals (light polarizing microscopy), Gram stain, culture and sensitivity and complete cell count of the aspirated fluid are performed. Glucocorticosteroid injection is invasive, has relatively low adverse effects although it can introduce an infection if one is not present, and is moderately costly, and is recommended in those cases not trending towards resolution.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis.

SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

SURGICAL DRAINAGE FOR OLECRANON BURSITIS

Recommended

Surgical drainage is recommended for treatment of olecranon bursitis.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Olecranon bursitis that is either infected, clinically thought to be infected, or not infected but present for at least approximately 6 to 8 weeks without trending towards resolution while being treated with soft padding and activity modifications above.

Rationale

There are no quality trials. Surgical drainage of a swollen olecranon bursa has been successfully used for treatment of olecranon bursitis. As it is not without potential complications, however, it is recommended to be reserved for select cases either involving infection or failure to respond to an adequate trial of non-operative measures. Surgical drainage is invasive, has modest adverse effects for this particular surgery, is moderate to high cost, but is recommended in those cases not trending towards resolution or which are thought to be infected.

SURGICAL RESECTION FOR CHRONIC OLECRANON BURSITIS

Recommended

Surgical resection of the bursa is recommended for chronic olecranon bursitis with recurrent drainage.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Olecranon bursitis with recurrent drainage.

Rationale

There are no quality trials. Surgical drainage of a swollen olecranon bursa has been successfully used for treatment of olecranon bursitis. As it is not without potential complications, however, it is recommended to be reserved for select cases either involving infection or failure to respond to an adequate trial of non-operative measures. Surgical drainage is invasive, has modest adverse effects for this particular surgery, is moderate to high cost, but is recommended in those cases not trending towards resolution or which are thought to be infected.

ASPIRATION FOR INFECTED BURSA

Recommended

Aspiration is recommended for a clinically infected or questionably infected bursa.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

Aspiration has been used for diagnosis, particularly when combined with Gram stain, culture and sensitivity, and complete cell count of the aspirated fluid are performed. Crystal examination (light polarizing microscopy) should also be performed at least once on the aspirated fluid. Aspiration of a bursa is invasive, has relatively low adverse effects although it can introduce an infection if one is not present, and is low to moderate cost, but is recommended for diagnosis and planning of treatment.

Evidence

There is 1 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

REHABILITATION

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-

up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies).

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

PROGNOSIS

Fractures require work limitations to avoid use of the fractured arm. Functional restrictions of the affected extremity are limited by an immobilization technique. Activities should be modified to allow for splinting and immobilization of the forearm. Return to work will likely be influenced by the patient and clinician's subjective assessment of disability and perception of job difficulty. It may be helpful to refer the patient to an occupational therapist to address the appropriate activity modification, compensatory strategies, adaptive equipment, and environmental modification throughout the period of the patient’s recovery and rehabilitation. The other injuries may or may not require work limitations depending on severity of the injury and the task demands. However, moderate to severe sprains and dislocations likely necessitate splinting and limitations.

JOB ANALYSIS

Job analyses may be beneficial to prevent future occurrences of these types of injuries (e.g., machine guarding, icy walkways, tool kickback). Some of these, particularly compartment syndrome and fractures should generally be analyzed for root cause and potential remediation, as these injuries are generally viewed as critical incident cases.

PRONATOR SYNDROME

OVERVIEW

Pronator syndrome involves entrapment of the median nerve as it traverses the pronator muscle in the proximal forearm. The most common causes are fibrotic/fascial bands* generally within the muscle or muscle hypertrophy. Symptoms include paresthesias in the median nerve distribution (typically digits 1-3 and radial half of the 4th digit). Pain

may be present. Nerve conduction studies are normal at the wrist, but abnormal proximally, as demonstrated by inching technique and/or segmental analysis. Patients are commonly treated for presumptive CTS. Treatment failure should suggest the possibility of pronator syndrome. Activity modification and splinting is the initial approach. Surgical release may be necessary in refractory cases.

Surgical release of the median nerve for pronator syndrome has been performed [340,341,342]. Referral for surgery may be indicated for patients who have red flags of a serious nature (e.g., compressive neuropathy secondary to acute fracture), or have failed to respond to non-surgical management including wrist splints. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting symptoms. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks, and benefits, and especially expectations is important. It is also important to set pre-operative expectations that there is a necessity to adhere to the rehabilitative exercise regimen and work through post-operative pain. In the post-operative phase, range-of-motion exercises should involve the elbow, as well as the wrist and shoulder to avoid frozen shoulder ("adhesive capsulitis"). If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a clinician experienced in non-operative treatment may aid in formulating a treatment plan.

*Fibrotic tissue is generally considered analogous to scar tissue. It is often a consequence of penetrating trauma. Fascial bands are a similar type of firm connective tissue; however, they may occur without trauma. Either may compress a nerve and cause a peripheral neuropathy.

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

There are no quality studies of pronator syndrome. Cases are poorly understood and work-relatedness is speculative. Cases occurring secondary to fibrotic bands that are secondary to work-related trauma are considered work-related. Cases occurring due to pronator hypertrophy related to high force activities are also typically considered work-related.

DIAGNOSIS

INITIAL ASSESSMENT

Pronator syndrome involves median nerve entrapment under or within the pronator teres muscle in the proximal forearm [343-347]. It causes pain in the flexor forearm and paresthesias similar to carpal tunnel syndrome, which is the main consideration in the differential diagnosis. Pronator syndrome is believed to cause nocturnal awakening less frequently than carpal tunnel syndrome. A confirmatory electrodiagnostic study is helpful and is recommended [**Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)**].

There are no quality trials for non-surgical treatments [345]. Some of the reported treatments have included avoiding aggravating activities [343], rest [340,341,348], NSAIDs, and glucocorticosteroid injections [340,341,343,348]. In the absence of quality evidence for treatment of these radiculopathies, it is recommended that the treatments for ulnar neuropathy at the elbow be used to infer treatment for median neuropathies (pronator syndrome).

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

ACTIVITY MODIFICATION AND EXERCISE

EXERCISES, MOST PATIENTS WITH PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for exercise for most patients.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

EXERCISES, POSTOPERATIVE PRONATOR SYNDROME OR PATIENTS WITH SIGNIFICANT DEFICITS

Recommended

Exercise is recommended postoperatively or for patients with significant deficits.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

Not Recommended

NSAIDs are not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

Not Recommended

Acetaminophen is not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

NSAIDS FOR POSTOPERATIVE PRONATOR SYNDROME

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for postoperative pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR POSTOPERATIVE PRONATOR SYNDROME

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for postoperative pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

OPIOIDS (ORAL, TRANSDERMAL, AND PARENTERAL, INCLUDING TRAMADOL) FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

Not Recommended

Opioids are not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

OPIOIDS (ORAL, TRANSDERMAL, AND PARENTERAL, INCLUDING TRAMADOL) FOR POSTOPERATIVE PRONATOR SYNDROME

Recommended

Opioids are recommended for postoperative pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

GLUCOCORTICOSTEROIDS (ORAL OR INJECTIONS) FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against glucocorticosteroids (oral or injections) for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

PYRIDOXINE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

Not Recommended

Pyridoxine is not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

VITAMINS (OTHER) FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against other vitamins for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

LIDOCAINE PATCHES FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against lidocaine patches for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

KETAMINE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against ketamine for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

DEVICES

ELBOW SPLINTING FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

Recommended

Elbow splinting is recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

MAGNETS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

Not Recommended

Magnets are not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ALLIED HEALTH INTERVENTIONS

ACUPUNCTURE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against acupuncture for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

BIOFEEDBACK FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against biofeedback for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

MANIPULATION AND MOBILIZATION FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against manipulation and mobilization for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

MASSAGE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against massage for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

SOFT TISSUE MASSAGE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against soft-tissue massage for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

IONTOPHORESIS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against iontophoresis for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

PHONOPHORESIS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against phonophoresis for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

LOW-LEVEL LASER THERAPY FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

Not Recommended

Low-level laser therapy is not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ULTRASOUND FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC PRONATOR SYNDROME

Recommended

Ultrasound is recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic pronator syndrome.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

SURGICAL INTERVENTIONS

SURGICAL RELEASE FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC FOREARM MEDIAN NEUROPATHIES, INCLUDING PRONATOR SYNDROME

Recommended

Surgical release is recommended for patients who fail non-operative treatment for subacute or chronic median neuropathies in the forearm. It is also recommended for patients who have emergent or urgent indications (e.g., acute compression due to fracture, or compartment syndrome with unrelenting symptoms of nerve impairment).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Symptoms of median neuropathy in the forearm, and a significant loss of function, as reflected in significant activity limitations due to the nerve entrapment and that the patient has failed non-operative care usually for at least 3 to 6 months. Patients should generally have failed wrist splints, avoidance of aggravating exposures, and full compliance in therapy. Patients with severe symptoms such as continuous tingling and numbness, progression of symptoms or functional impairment may be earlier surgical candidates. Many surgeons will not operate on a patient without a positive electrodiagnostic study. Ideally, the EDS should include inching technique. The type of surgical procedure selected is dependent on factors that include the preoperative electrodiagnostic studies, surgeon's comfort and experience and surgical anatomy.

Rationale

Quality studies are not available on surgical treatment for median nerve entrapment in the forearm including pronator syndrome, and there is not evidence of its benefits. If, after at least 3 to 6 months of conservative treatment, the patient fails to show signs of improvement, surgery may be a reasonable option if there is unequivocal evidence of median neuropathy that includes positive electrodiagnostic studies and objective evidence of loss of function as outlined above. Surgical options for this problem are invasive, have adverse effects and are high cost. Surgery is recommended for carefully selected patients.

REHABILITATION

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments is dependent on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies)

JOB ANALYSIS

Job analysis methods are unclear. Cases occurring due to pronator hypertrophy related to high force activities may theoretically benefit from job analyses.

RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT

OVERVIEW

Radial neuropathies occur secondary to entrapments at any point along the nerve. There are three segments in the area of the elbow prone to radial nerve entrapments, including the radial tunnel. Symptoms are based on the location of the entrapment, but in general include sensory and/or motor findings according to the fibers present in the nerve at that particular location. If the entrapment is sufficiently distal, there will only be sensory findings and no motor weakness. The most noteworthy sensory location is the dorsum of the first webspace. The most common motor findings involve wrist and digit extensor weakness. Pain may be present. Nerve conduction studies demonstrate slowing of nerve conduction as demonstrated by segmental analysis, with inching technique required for precise electrodiagnostic localization. Activity modification and wrist splinting are the initial approach. Surgical release may be necessary in refractory cases.

Radial nerve entrapment, particularly of the posterior interosseous branch of the radial nerve, causes proximal forearm aching and pain that persists despite presumably effective treatment [343,344,349-352]. It is clinically somewhat difficult to distinguish from non-specific

forearm and elbow pain, is considered controversial [353,354], and it is sometimes referred to as “resistant tennis elbow” or “supinator syndrome. ” A relatively rare condition, radial nerve entrapment is estimated to be approximately 30 to 100 fold less common than carpal tunnel syndrome [355]. There are multiple sites for potential entrapment. Most commonly, these sites include the extensor carpi radialis brevis origin, fibrous bands overlying the radial head, radial recurrent arterial fan, and the arcade of Frohse at the entrance to the supinator muscle [356,357].

A confirmatory electrodiagnostic motor study is helpful (often difficult to obtain) and is recommended [**Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)]**. There are no quality studies on which to rely for the treatment of radial neuropathies and there is not evidence of benefits of the following treatment options. However, these options are low cost, have few adverse effects, and are not invasive. Thus, while there is insufficient evidence to support their use, they are recommended.

There are no quality trials for non-surgical treatments. Some of the reported treatments have included physical therapy and exercise [343,358], and glucocorticosteroid injections [343]. In the absence of quality evidence for treatment of these radiculopathies, it is recommended that the treatments for ulnar neuropathy at the elbow (summarized below) be used to infer treatment for radial neuropathies.

Surgical release of the radial nerve has been performed [351,359,360,361]. Referral for surgery may be indicated for patients who have red flags of a serious nature (e.g., compressive neuropathy secondary to acute fracture), or have failed to respond to non-surgical management including wrist splints. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting symptoms. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks, and benefits, and especially expectations is important. It is also important to set pre-operative expectations that there is a necessity to adhere to the rehabilitative exercise regimen and work through post-operative pain. In the post-operative phase, range-of-motion exercises should involve the elbow, as well as the wrist and shoulder to avoid frozen shoulder (“adhesive capsulitis”). If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a clinician experienced in non-operative treatment may aid in formulating a treatment plan.

RISK AND CAUSATION

WORK RELATEDNESS

There are no quality epidemiological studies of radial tunnel syndrome [362]. Some cases occur due to sequalae of trauma (e.g., scar tissue), thus the mechanism of the trauma determines whether the radial nerve entrapment is occupational. Other cases are poorly understood and work-relatedness is speculative.

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

ELECTROMYOGRAPHY

ELECTROMYOGRAPHY FOR DIAGNOSING SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC PERIPHERAL NERVE ENTRAPMENTS

Recommended

Electrodiagnostic studies are recommended to assist in the diagnosis of subacute or chronic peripheral nerve entrapments, including ulnar neuropathies, radial neuropathies and median neuropathies.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with subacute or chronic paresthesias with or without pain, particularly with unclear diagnosis. In addition to segmental analysis (e.g., above- versus below-elbow conduction), patients with peripheral neuropathies in the elbow region should generally have inching technique performed to localize the entrapment which assists with clinical management.

Rationale

ED studies are the only unequivocally objective measures of nerve function (Jablecki et al., 2002, Rempel et al., 1998). However, there are both false-positive and false-negative test results that demand that the physician understand the pre-test probabilities and be capable of interpreting the results and placing them in an appropriate clinical context. For example, ED studies should not be ordered in settings where the clinical history suggests a low likelihood of nerve entrapment because the probability of a false-positive test result may be well above 50%. ED studies are primarily of assistance in: 1) identifying an anatomic location of nerve conduction slowing; 2) identifying objective evidence for alternate diagnostic considerations (e.g., cervical radiculopathy); and 3) quantifying nerve function to assure the physician that an operative state such as CTS is present. A survey of 350 records of electrodiagnostic studies found only 34% compliance with the AAEM guideline (see Table 7) (Thibault et al., 2005). ED studies are not invasive or minimally invasive (depending on whether the EMG component is required), have minimal adverse effects, and are high cost. They are recommended for evaluation of select cases to assist in confirming peripheral nerve entrapments such as pronator syndrome, ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and radial neuropathies.

ELECTRODIAGNOSTIC STUDIES

ELECTRODIAGNOSTIC STUDIES FOR DIAGNOSIS AND PRE-OPERATIVE ASSESSMENT OF PERIPHERAL NERVE ENTRAPMENTS

Recommended

Quality electrodiagnostic studies (see above) are recommended to assist in securing a firm diagnosis for those patients without a clear diagnosis. ED studies are also recommended as one of two methods to attempt to objectively secure a diagnosis prior to surgical release.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

ED studies are the only unequivocally objective measures of nerve function (Jablecki et al., 2002, Rempel et al., 1998). However, there are both false-positive and false-negative test results that demand that the physician understand the pre-test probabilities and be capable of interpreting the results and placing them in an appropriate clinical context. For example, ED studies should not be ordered in settings where the clinical history suggests a low likelihood of nerve entrapment because the probability of a false-positive test result may be well above 50%. ED studies are primarily of assistance in: 1) identifying an anatomic location of nerve conduction slowing; 2) identifying objective evidence for alternate diagnostic considerations (e.g., cervical radiculopathy); and 3) quantifying nerve function to assure the physician that an operative state such as CTS is present. A survey of 350 records of electrodiagnostic studies found only 34% compliance with the AAEM guideline (see Table 7) (Thibault et al., 2005). ED studies are not invasive or minimally invasive (depending on whether the EMG component is required), have minimal adverse effects, and are high cost. They are recommended for evaluation of select cases to assist in confirming peripheral nerve entrapments such as pronator syndrome, ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and radial neuropathies.

ELECTRODIAGNOSTIC STUDIES FOR INITIAL EVALUATION OF PATIENTS SUSPECTED OF HAVING A PERIPHERAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT

Not Recommended

Electrodiagnostic studies are not recommended for initial evaluation of most patients as it does not change the management of the condition.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

ED studies are the only unequivocally objective measures of nerve function (Jablecki et al., 2002, Rempel et al., 1998). However, there are both false-positive and false-negative test results that demand that the physician understand the pre-test probabilities and be capable of interpreting the results and placing them in an appropriate clinical context. For example, ED studies should not be ordered in settings where the clinical history suggests a low likelihood of nerve entrapment because the probability of a false-positive test result may be well above 50%. ED studies are primarily of assistance in: 1) identifying an anatomic location of nerve conduction slowing; 2) identifying objective evidence for alternate diagnostic considerations (e.g., cervical radiculopathy); and 3) quantifying nerve function to assure the physician that an operative state such as CTS is present. A survey of 350 records of electrodiagnostic studies found only 34% compliance with the AAEM guideline (see Table 7) (Thibault et al., 2005). ED studies are not invasive or minimally invasive (depending on whether the EMG component is required), have minimal adverse effects, and are high cost. They are recommended for evaluation of select cases to assist in confirming peripheral nerve entrapments such as pronator syndrome, ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and radial neuropathies.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

ACTIVITY MODIFICATION AND EXERCISE

EXERCISE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Not Recommended

Exercise is not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

EXERCISE FOR POSTOPERATIVE RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME) OR PATIENTS WITH SIGNIFICANT DEFICITS

Recommended

Exercise is recommended for postoperative radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome), as well as for patients with significant deficits.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Not Recommended

NSAIDs are not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Not Recommended

Acetaminophen is not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

NSAIDS FOR POSTOPERATIVE RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for postoperative radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR POSTOPERATIVE RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for postoperative radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

GLUCOCORTICOSTEROIDS (ORAL OR INJECTIONS) FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against glucocorticosteroids (oral or injections) for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

PYRIDOXINE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Not Recommended

Pyridoxine is not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

VITAMINS (OTHER) FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against other vitamins for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

LIDOCAINE PATCHES FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against lidocaine patches for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

KETAMINE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against ketamine for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

DEVICES

MAGNETS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Not Recommended

Magnets are not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ELBOW AND WRIST SPLINTING FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Recommended

Elbow and wrist splinting are recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Evidence (C)

ALLIED HEALTH INTERVENTIONS

ACUPUNCTURE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against acupuncture for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

BIOFEEDBACK FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against biofeedback for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

MANIPULATION AND MOBILIZATION FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against manipulation or mobilization for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

MASSAGE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against massage for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

SOFT TISSUE MASSAGE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against soft-tissue massage for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

IONTOPHORESIS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against iontophoresis for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

PHONOPHORESIS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against photophoresis (oral or injections) for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

LOW-LEVEL LASER THERAPY FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Not Recommended

Low-level laser therapy is not recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ULTRASOUND FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC RADIAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT (INCLUDING RADIAL TUNNEL SYNDROME)

Recommended

Ultrasound is recommended for acute, subacute, or chronic radial nerve entrapment (including radial tunnel syndrome).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

SURGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Surgical release of the radial nerve has been performed [351,359,360,361]. Referral for surgery may be indicated for patients who have red flags of a serious nature (e.g., compressive neuropathy secondary to acute fracture), or have failed to respond to non-surgical management including wrist splints. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting symptoms. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks, and benefits, and especially expectations is important. It is also important to set pre-operative expectations that there is a necessity to adhere to the rehabilitative exercise regimen and work through post-operative pain. In the post-operative phase, range-of-motion exercises should involve the elbow, as well as the wrist and shoulder to avoid frozen shoulder ("adhesive capsulitis"). If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a clinician experienced in non-operative treatment may aid in formulating a treatment plan.

SURGICAL RELEASE FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC RADIAL NEUROPATHIES

Recommended

Surgical release is recommended for patients who fail non-operative treatment for subacute or chronic radial neuropathies or patients who have emergent or urgent indications (e.g., acute compression due to fracture, or compartment syndrome with unrelenting symptoms of nerve impairment).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Surgical indications require all of the following:

- confirmed clinical diagnosis,

- nonoperative treatment, and
- surgical considerations.

A presumptive diagnosis requires pain and tenderness in the proximal lateral forearm, distal to the lateral epicondyle which may or may not be accompanied by paresthesias depending on the location of the neurological compression.

A confirmed diagnosis also includes at least one of:

- confirmatory electrodiagnostic testing interpreted as consistent with radial neuropathy that generally includes segmental analysis, aka "inching technique; or
- injection into the radial tunnel along the nerve with near/total resolution of pain with the anesthetic, and/or
- wrist and/or digital extensor muscles weakness and/or atrophy.

Non-operative treatments include:

- elbow and wrist splinting.

Surgical considerations include either:

- severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic findings, continuous paresthesias, extensor muscle atrophy) or
- lack of improvement or resolution following nonoperative treatment trialed for at least 3 months.

Rationale

Quality studies are not available on surgical treatment for radial nerve entrapment and there is not evidence of its benefits. If, after at least 3 to 6 months of conservative treatment, the patient fails to show signs of improvement, surgery may be a reasonable option if there is unequivocal evidence of radial neuropathy that includes positive electrodiagnostic studies and objective evidence of loss of function as outlined above. Surgical options are invasive, have adverse effects, and are high cost. Surgery is recommended for carefully selected patients.

ULNAR NERVE ENTRAPMENT

OVERVIEW

Ulnar neuropathies at the elbow are the second most common peripheral nerve entrapment after carpal tunnel syndrome (CTS). They involve entrapment of the ulnar nerve as it courses past the condylar groove into the cubital tunnel. Entrapment can occur in both the condylar groove and the cubital tunnel. The purported risk factors for entrapment differ between the two locations. "Tardy ulnar palsy" is a specific entity of ulnar neuropathy following medial supracondylar fracture.

Although it is possible to entrap a nerve at any point along its course, there are two common areas for entrapment of the ulnar nerve at the elbow [(363)]. The first is in the condylar groove, and the second begins immediately distal to the elbow joint in the true, anatomic cubital tunnel (see Figure 10) [(363,364)]. This tunnel commences as the ulnar nerve begins to traverse distally beneath the aponeurosis [(364,365,366)]. Most of the published literature does not distinguish between these types of ulnar neuropathy despite the improbability that the risk factors and treatments are the same (e.g., arthrosis would appear more likely to affect the condylar groove segment; muscle contraction could theoretically

affect the cubital tunnel segment but not the condylar groove). This produces a substantial lack of clarity in the available evidence.

RISK AND CAUSATION

RISK FACTORS

Entrapment can occur in both the condylar groove and the cubital tunnel. The purported risk factors for entrapment differ between the two locations.

Risk factors for condylar groove ulnar neuropathies are thought to include flexed elbow position due to sleep posture, arthritic disorders, joint abnormalities, ganglia, diabetes mellitus, excessive alcohol consumption, repeated pressure on the condylar groove, and sequelae of discrete trauma. Risk factors for cubital tunnel syndrome are thought to include fascial bands in the muscle, muscle hypertrophy, and sleep posture. Cubital tunnel syndrome is thought to potentially occur with sustained, repeated, forceful use, particularly with activities involving elbow hyperflexion, although quality studies supporting this theory are lacking.

WORK RELATEDNESS

There are no quality epidemiological studies of ulnar neuropathies at the elbow, including either condylar groove or cubital tunnel syndrome. Unfortunately, in common practice, these disorders are frequently not distinguished, yet the risk factors for these two different neuropathies are believed to be quite different. Many use analogies to CTS, yet those analogies are largely inappropriate since the theoretical mechanisms to cause CTS are anatomically impossible at the elbow due to lack of tendons and tendon sheaths accompanying the ulnar nerve.

Condylar groove ulnar neuropathies are thought to have risks associated with the nerve as it traverses the elbow joint that include flexed elbow posture including sleep posture, arthritic disorders, joint abnormalities, ganglia, diabetes mellitus [(367)], excessive alcohol consumption, repeated pressure on the condylar groove, and sequalae of discrete trauma. Cubital tunnel syndrome is thought to occur due to ulnar nerve insults distal to the elbow joint including fascial bands in the muscle, muscle hypertrophy, and sleep posture. Cubital tunnel syndrome is thought to potentially occur with sustained, repeated, stereotypical forceful use. There is a study reported of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow in association with “holding a tool in position. ” However, the study follow-up was a single occasion 3 years later, thus a serial cross sectional study design, the dropout rate was 58%, and the case definition was unclear. The case definition for “cubital tunnel syndrome” included Tinel’s at the elbow; however, the Tinel’s was performed at the condylar groove and not the cubital tunnel [(368)] and there were no electrodiagnostic studies. The study found only one of approximately 10 occupation-related exposures associated with “cubital tunnel syndrome,” thus also potentially a chance association [(369)].

Quality occupational epidemiological studies on the etiology of ulnar and radial neuropathies have not been reported, thus causation of those disorders is speculative. There are multiple theories of causation for these disorders. Olecranon bursitis can be associated with work-related trauma. This condition is thought to arise from either acute trauma to the olecranon bursa or unaccustomed pressure to the bursa.

SIGNS AND SYMPTOMS

- Paresthesias in an ulnar nerve distribution (typically the ulnar half of the fourth and fifth digits)
- Nocturnal symptoms or exacerbations
- Pain, generally involving the medial elbow

DIAGNOSIS

INITIAL ASSESSMENT

Diagnosis of an entrapment neuropathy can generally be made on the basis of a careful history and physical examination. Nerve conduction studies can help to localize the problem when inching techniques are used. Because most electrodiagnostic studies omit inching technique, the most precise diagnosis possible in such circumstances is ulnar neuropathy at the elbow. Treating ulnar neuropathy at the elbow empirically as described below can often prevent the need to more precisely define the location of the nerve entrapment. Consideration should be given to avoiding discomfort to the patient and the cost of electrodiagnostic studies until after the failure of empiric treatment.

Proper testing to localize the abnormality involves a nerve conduction study that includes at least stimulation above and below the elbow [(64)]. The role for the "inching technique" to isolate the location of the nerve conduction velocity decrement and infer the precise location of the entrapment, while recommended by the American Academy of Electrodiagnostic Medicine [(64)] and logical for its importance to treatment has not been delineated in quality interventional studies. (Cubital tunnel syndrome should theoretically be amenable to treatment with simple decompression. Ulnar neuropathies in the condylar groove should theoretically be less amenable to simple (aka "in situ") decompression.) Aside from surgical studies, there are no quality studies on which to rely for treatment of ulnar neuropathies, and there is little quality evidence of benefits of treatment options.

Ultrasound and MRI have been used for evaluation of the ulnar nerve [(370)].

DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA

The differential diagnosis for ulnar neuropathy at the elbow particularly includes ulnar neuropathy at the wrist, C8 cervical radiculopathies, and other neurological entrapments located between the spinal cord and ulnar nerve in the carpal canal including thoracic outlet syndrome, diabetic neuropathy, neuropathy from alcohol, other systemic neuropathies, stroke, other cerebrovascular events, and central nervous system tumors. Most other causes may be eliminated or the probability reduced by conducting a careful history, physical exam, or focused testing. Some have reported the vast majority of these patients have no apparent cause [(371)].

Patients with a presumptive diagnosis of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow should have: 1) tingling or numbness in an ulnar nerve distribution, generally involving the small digit and ulnar half of the ring finger; and often have 2) symptoms that are provoked either nocturnally or with sustained elbow flexion. Patients with a confirmed diagnosis of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow should have both symptoms as with a presumptive diagnosis above, and a confirmatory electrodiagnostic study (EDS) interpreted as consistent with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow. To make a diagnosis of cubital tunnel syndrome requires inching

technique to define the abnormality to the cubital tunnel (rather than in the condylar groove, or “funny bone”).

DIAGNOSTIC RECOMMENDATIONS

ELECTROMYOGRAPHY

ELECTROMYOGRAPHY FOR DIAGNOSING SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC PERIPHERAL NERVE ENTRAPMENTS

Recommended

Electrodiagnostic studies are recommended to assist in the diagnosis of subacute or chronic peripheral nerve entrapments, including ulnar neuropathies, radial neuropathies and median neuropathies.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with subacute or chronic paresthesias with or without pain, particularly with unclear diagnosis. In addition to segmental analysis (e.g., above- versus below-elbow conduction), patients with peripheral neuropathies in the elbow region should generally have inching technique performed to localize the entrapment which assists with clinical management (American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine, 1999). It has been stated that most of these patients do not require these tests, rather initially require non-operative treatment (Svernlov et al., 2009).

ELECTRODIAGNOSTIC STUDIES

ELECTRODIAGNOSTIC STUDIES FOR DIAGNOSIS AND PRE-OPERATIVE ASSESSMENT OF PERIPHERAL NERVE ENTRAPMENTS

Recommended

Quality electrodiagnostic studies (see above) are recommended to assist in securing a firm diagnosis for those patients without a clear diagnosis. ED studies are also recommended as one of two methods to attempt to objectively secure a diagnosis prior to surgical release.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

ELECTRODIAGNOSTIC STUDIES FOR INITIAL EVALUATION OF PATIENTS SUSPECTED OF HAVING A PERIPHERAL NERVE ENTRAPMENT

Not Recommended

Electrodiagnostic studies are not recommended for initial evaluation of most patients as it does not change the management of the condition and other interventions are believed to be efficacious.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

ED studies are the only unequivocally objective measures of nerve function (Jablecki et al., 2002, Rempel et al., 1998). However, there are both false-positive and false-negative test results that demand that the physician understand the pre-test probabilities and be capable of interpreting the results and placing them in an appropriate clinical context. For example, ED studies should not be ordered in settings where the clinical history suggests a low likelihood of nerve entrapment because the probability of a false-positive test result may be well above 50%. ED studies are primarily of assistance in: 1) identifying an anatomic location of nerve conduction slowing; 2) identifying objective evidence for alternate diagnostic considerations (e.g., cervical radiculopathy); and 3) quantifying nerve function to assure the physician that an operative state such as CTS is present. A survey of 350 records of electrodiagnostic studies found only 34% compliance with the AAEM guideline (see Table 7) (Thibault et al., 2005). ED studies are not invasive or minimally invasive (depending on whether the EMG component is required), have minimal adverse effects, and are high cost. They are recommended for evaluation of select cases to assist in confirming peripheral nerve entrapments such as pronator syndrome, ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and radial neuropathies.

MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING (MRI)

MRI FOR EVALUATION AND DIAGNOSIS OF ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of MRI for the evaluation and diagnosis of ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies available demonstrating superiority of ultrasound or MRI over other available tests to evaluate and diagnose. Therefore, there is no recommendation for or against the use of ultrasound and MRI.

ULTRASOUND

DIAGNOSTIC ULTRASOUND FOR EVALUATION AND DIAGNOSIS OF ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of diagnostic ultrasound for the evaluation and diagnosis of ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies available demonstrating superiority of ultrasound or MRI over other available tests to evaluate and diagnose. Therefore, there is no recommendation for or against the use of ultrasound and MRI.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

ANTIEMETICS

See the ACOEM Antiemetics Guideline.

OVERVIEW

Initial care involves seeking potential causal factors that can be changed. This is believed to include hyperflexion of the elbow during sleep, work or avocational activities [343,372], as well as avoiding leaning on the elbow/nerve (see elbow splinting section below).

Initial treatment should be non-surgical. Patients are most commonly treated with elbow splinting, especially nocturnally to prevent hyperflexion. Activity modification to avoid hyperflexion is usually also prescribed. Surgical release, either simple (aka “in situ”) decompression or transposition may be necessary if non-operative measures fail.

Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) have been used for treatment of ulnar neuropathies to address beliefs in inflammatory mechanisms or to manage associated pain. NSAIDs have also been used for treatment of CTS [373,374,375,376,377]. Acetaminophen and paracetamol are sometimes utilized to treat neuropathies, although their effects on cyclooxygenase activity are minimal, and they are not anti-inflammatory.

Glucocorticosteroids have been used for treatment of peripheral neuropathies, particularly CTS through both oral and injection routes [378,379,380,381,382,383,384]. Although these medications are considered to be anti-inflammatory corticosteroids, absent an inflammatory arthropathy or infection, CTS also does not typically evidence inflammation. Thus, the exact mechanism of action is uncertain. Evidence indicates that carpal tunnel injections are superior to oral steroids for treatment of CTS [382].

Opioids have occasionally been used to treat pain for patients with ulnar neuropathies at the elbow. These medications have primarily been used for a few nights in the post-surgical timeframe (see Chronic Pain guideline for a detailed discussion of opioids and their management).

Treatment of neuropathies, especially CTS, with pyridoxine (Vitamin B_6) has been attempted [373,385,386,387,388] as there has been some association between pyridoxine deficiencies and peripheral neuropathies, as well as reports of associations of deficiencies with CTS in some [389], but not all studies [390]. Vitamin B_{12} has been reported as a successful treatment for stroke patients with CTS [391].

Topical lidocaine patches have been increasingly used to treat numerous pain conditions through transdermal application of topical anesthetic [392,393,394].

Topically administered ketamine has been used in experimental models for hyperalgesia [395]. It has also been used to treat neuropathic pain [396].

Treatment of hand, wrist and forearm MSDs and CTS with magnets [397] and pulsed magnetic field therapy [398] has been attempted to manage pain.

Elbow splinting has been used for treatment of ulnar neuropathies at the elbow, particularly nocturnal splinting or bracing [343,364,372,399].

Acupuncture, biofeedback, manipulation and mobilization, massage, soft tissue massage, iontophoresis, and phonophoresis have been used to treat many patients. There is evidence of its efficacy for several of these for treatment of chronic spine disorders (see Chronic Pain and Low Back Disorders guidelines).

Low level laser therapy has not been reported in a quality trial for treatment of ulnar neuropathy patients. Low-level laser treatment (LLLT) has been used to treat MSDs including CTS [400,401]. It usually involves laser energy that does not induce significant heating (the theory is that the mechanism of action is through photoactivation of the oxidative chain) [402]. Ultrasound has been used to treat many MSDs including CTS [403,404,405].

There are several surgical procedures for treatment of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow. Transposition of the ulnar nerve has been utilized for treatment of ulnar neuropathies at the elbow for more than 100 years [406,407]. Various modifications of the surgical technique have been subsequently described [408-421]. Subsequently, a simple decompression procedure has been developed for true cubital tunnel syndrome [366,422-426]. Other procedures include medial epicondylectomy [427], anterior submuscular transposition [428] and endoscopic approaches [429].

The most common locations for compression of the ulnar nerve are reportedly [430]:

- Presence of epitrochleo-anconeus muscle 9 (14%)
- Adhesion to the medial epicondyle 25 (38%)
- Presence of a ligament of Struthers 4 (6%)
- Medical intermuscular septum 20 (30%)
- Other (scar, pannus, adhesion, lipoma, synovial cyst) 8 (12%)

Referral for surgery may be indicated for patients who have red flags of a serious nature (e.g., compressive neuropathy secondary to acute fracture), or have failed to respond to non-surgical management including elbow posture modifications. Surgical considerations depend on the confirmed diagnosis of the presenting symptoms. If surgery is a consideration, counseling regarding likely outcomes, risks, and benefits, and especially expectations is important. It is also important to set pre-operative expectations that there is a necessity to adhere to the rehabilitative exercise regimen and work through post-operative pain. In the post-operative phase, range-of-motion exercises should involve the elbow, as well as the wrist and shoulder to avoid frozen shoulder ("adhesive capsulitis"). If there is no clear indication for surgery, referring the patient to a clinician experienced in non-operative treatment may aid in formulating a treatment plan [431,432,433,434].

ACTIVITY MODIFICATION AND EXERCISE

ERGONOMIC INTERVENTIONS FOR ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

Recommended

In settings with sustained or repeated hyperflexion of the elbow (> 90 degrees), ergonomic interventions are recommended to reduce elbow flexion.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Evidence (C)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of ergonomic interventions for epicondylalgia, although ergonomics interventions have been attempted in numerous occupational settings (Verhagen et al., 2006). However, a few RCTs have explored keyboard workstations (Rempel et al., 1999, Rempel et al., 2006, Tittiranonda et al., 1999, Gerr et al., 2005) (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline). There also have been quality studies reported regarding participatory ergonomics programs; however, those are mainly reports of patients with spine disorders in programs whose purpose is return to work (Arnetz et al., 2003) (see Low Back Disorders guideline). Despite the lack of quality evidence, reductions in job physical factors, particularly high force, are thought to be beneficial (Herbert et al., 2000) (see Work-Relatedness). There also are experimental studies of different equipment (Simmer-Beck et al., 2006); however, reports of linkage with MSDs are lacking.

There are no quality studies of ergonomic interventions for epicondylalgia or other elbow MSDs in physically demanding occupations. Interventions which reduce forceful, repeated pinching or alleviating localized compression by sharp objects may be theoretically helpful (Vogel et al., 1989, Ploetz, 1938, Hadji-Zavar, 1959, Compere, 1933, Hume et al., 1990, Hauck, 1923, Sperling, 1951, Zelle et al., 1936, Lapidus et al., 1952, Fahey et al., 1954, Lipscomb, 1959, Lenggenhager, 1969, Sairanan, 1957, Rayan, 1990, Moore, 2000, Gorsche et al., 1998). Quality evidence is not available for effectiveness of ergonomic interventions on MSD injury rates in typical manufacturing settings. However, given available evidence of risk factors, interventions are recommended where there are combinations of risk factors; particularly combined high force and high repetition (see Work-Relatedness). Management/supervisor and labor/employee support are often necessary for optimal success of these programs. While quality evidence is lacking for the use of ergonomics training, it is thought to be beneficial in high-risk settings and is recommended.

ERGONOMICS TRAINING IN MODERATE- OR HIGH-RISK MANUFACTURING SETTINGS

Recommended

Ergonomics training is recommended in moderate- or high-risk manufacturing settings.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of ergonomic interventions for epicondylalgia, although ergonomics interventions have been attempted in numerous occupational settings . However, a few RCTs have explored keyboard workstations (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline). There also have been quality studies reported regarding participatory ergonomics programs; however, those are mainly reports of patients with spine disorders in programs whose purpose is return to work (see Low Back Disorders guideline). Despite the lack of quality evidence, reductions in job physical factors, particularly high force, are thought to be beneficial (see Work-Relatedness). There also are experimental studies of different equipment ; however, reports of linkage with MSDs are lacking. There are no

quality studies of ergonomic interventions for epicondylalgia or other elbow MSDs in physically demanding occupations. Interventions which reduce forceful, repeated pinching or alleviating localized compression by sharp objects may be theoretically helpful . Quality evidence is not available for effectiveness of ergonomic interventions on MSD injury rates in typical manufacturing settings. However, given available evidence of risk factors, interventions are recommended where there are combinations of risk factors; particularly combined high force and high repetition (see Work-Relatedness). Management/supervisor and labor/employee support are often necessary for optimal success of these programs. While quality evidence is lacking for the use of ergonomics training, it is thought to be beneficial in high-risk settings and is recommended.

Evidence

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of ergonomic interventions.

POSITION OF ELBOWS DURING SLEEP

Recommended

It is recommended that patients be taught to sleep with their elbows extended, rather than flexed.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is no quality evidence evaluating the use of sleep postures to treat elbow nerve entrapment. However, hyperflexed elbow postures appear to prominently produce the symptoms and theoretically compress the ulnar nerve at the elbow (condylar groove or cubital tunnel segments), thus avoidance of these postures appears important. Teaching patients to change sleep posture requires some efforts and time for the patient to adjust. This intervention is not invasive, has low or no adverse effects, is not costly and is recommended.

ELBOW POSTURE DURING WORK OR AVOCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Recommended

Patients are recommended to avoid hyperflexed (>90º) elbow postures at work (or during avocational activities) (Elhassan et al., 2007, Dawson, 1993).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is no quality evidence. However, hyperflexed elbow postures appear to prominently produce the symptoms, thus avoidance of these postures appears important at both work or during hobbies or other activities. It is noteworthy that this appears to affect few patients as few jobs require hyperflexed elbow postures. This intervention may require application of workplace limitations. This intervention is not invasive, has low or no adverse effects, but

could be costly if there is no accommodation for the workplace limitations available. Nevertheless, this intervention is recommended.

EXERCISES FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHY AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of exercises for acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathy at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one moderate-quality trial (Svernlov et al., 2009), however, it had methodological problems that may have resulted in a lack of clear evidence in favor of one treatment or another. By analogy, there also is not evidence of efficacy of exercises for treatment of CTS. Thus, it is unclear if there is an independent benefit from tendon-gliding exercises. However, exercise programs are not invasive, have few if any adverse effects, and are low cost if performed independently after receiving initial instructions. Exercise programs are thought to be highly helpful for rehabilitation of post-operative patients with significant deficits.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis. There is 1 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1

EXERCISES FOR REHABILITATION OF POST-OPERATIVE ULNAR NEUROPATHY AT THE ELBOW PATIENTS WITH SIGNIFICANT DEFICITS

Recommended

Exercise is recommended for rehabilitation of patients with post-operative ulnar neuropathy at the elbow with significant deficits.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is one moderate-quality trial (Svernlov et al., 2009), however, it had methodological problems that may have resulted in a lack of clear evidence in favor of one treatment or another. By analogy, there also is not evidence of efficacy of exercises for treatment of CTS. Thus, it is unclear if there is an independent benefit from tendon-gliding exercises. However, exercise programs are not invasive, have few if any adverse effects, and are low cost if performed independently after receiving initial instructions. Exercise programs are thought to be highly helpful for rehabilitation of post-operative patients with significant deficits.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis. There is 1 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

MEDICATIONS

NSAIDS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

Not Recommended

NSAIDs are not recommended as a primary treatment for acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials that address treatment for ulnar neuropathies. However, there are quality trials for treatment of CTS. A moderate-quality trial found an NSAID ineffective for treatment of CTS (Chang et al., 1998) and other studies appear to also suggest lack of efficacy (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline), thus by analogy, NSAIDs for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow are generally not recommended. However, in patients thought to have an inflammatory mechanism, they may be indicated. NSAIDs are not invasive and have low adverse effects profiles, particularly when used for short courses in occupational populations. Generic or over-the-counter formulations are low cost. A short course of an over-the-counter NSAID may be reasonable for select patients; however, routine use of NSAIDs for treatment of ulnar neuropathies is not recommended. There is one high-quality study in post-operative CTS patients indicating that for post-operative pain management, naproxen is superior to acetaminophen, which in turn is superior to placebo (Husby et al., 2001). NSAIDs and acetaminophen may also facilitate the rehabilitation process without the impairments associated with opioids. Thus, by analogy, NSAIDs and acetaminophen are recommended for post-operative pain management of patients with ulnar neuropathy.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

Not Recommended

Acetaminophen is not recommended as a primary treatment for acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials that address treatment for ulnar neuropathies. However, there are quality trials for treatment of CTS. A moderate-quality trial found an NSAID ineffective for treatment of CTS (Chang et al., 1998) and other studies appear to also suggest lack of efficacy (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline), thus by analogy, NSAIDs for

ulnar neuropathies at the elbow are generally not recommended. However, in patients thought to have an inflammatory mechanism, they may be indicated. NSAIDs are not invasive and have low adverse effects profiles, particularly when used for short courses in occupational populations. Generic or over-the-counter formulations are low cost. A short course of an over-the-counter NSAID may be reasonable for select patients; however, routine use of NSAIDs for treatment of ulnar neuropathies is not recommended. There is one high-quality study in post-operative CTS patients indicating that for post-operative pain management, naproxen is superior to acetaminophen, which in turn is superior to placebo (Husby et al., 2001). NSAIDs and acetaminophen may also facilitate the rehabilitation process without the impairments associated with opioids. Thus, by analogy, NSAIDs and acetaminophen are recommended for post-operative pain management of patients with ulnar neuropathy.

NSAIDS FOR POST-OPERATIVE MANAGEMENT OF ULNAR NEUROPATHY-RELATED PAIN

Recommended

NSAIDs are recommended for post-operative pain management of ulnar neuropathy-related pain.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients having recently undergone ulnar neuropathy surgical release. Generally, treat for 2 to 6 weeks post-op unless complications occur.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

See manufacturer's recommendations.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, adverse effects, intolerance.

Rationale

There are no quality trials that address treatment for ulnar neuropathies. However, there are quality trials for treatment of CTS. A moderate-quality trial found an NSAID ineffective for treatment of CTS (Chang et al., 1998) and other studies appear to also suggest lack of efficacy (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline), thus by analogy, NSAIDs for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow are generally not recommended. However, in patients thought to have an inflammatory mechanism, they may be indicated. NSAIDs are not invasive and have low adverse effects profiles, particularly when used for short courses in occupational populations. Generic or over-the-counter formulations are low cost. A short course of an over-the-counter NSAID may be reasonable for select patients; however, routine use of NSAIDs for treatment of ulnar neuropathies is not recommended. There is one high-quality study in post-operative CTS patients indicating that for post-operative pain

management, naproxen is superior to acetaminophen, which in turn is superior to placebo (Husby et al., 2001). NSAIDs and acetaminophen may also facilitate the rehabilitation process without the impairments associated with opioids. Thus, by analogy, NSAIDs and acetaminophen are recommended for post-operative pain management of patients with ulnar neuropathy.

ACETAMINOPHEN FOR POST-OPERATIVE MANAGEMENT OF ULNAR NEUROPATHY-RELATED PAIN

Recommended

Acetaminophen is recommended for post-operative pain management of ulnar neuropathy-related pain.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients having recently undergone ulnar neuropathy surgical release. Generally, treat for 2 to 6 weeks post-op unless complications occur.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

See manufacturer's recommendations.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution of pain, adverse effects, intolerance.

Rationale

There are no quality trials that address treatment for ulnar neuropathies. However, there are quality trials for treatment of CTS. A moderate-quality trial found an NSAID ineffective for treatment of CTS (Chang et al., 1998) and other studies appear to also suggest lack of efficacy (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline), thus by analogy, NSAIDs for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow are generally not recommended. However, in patients thought to have an inflammatory mechanism, they may be indicated. NSAIDs are not invasive and have low adverse effects profiles, particularly when used for short courses in occupational populations. Generic or over-the-counter formulations are low cost. A short course of an over-the-counter NSAID may be reasonable for select patients; however, routine use of NSAIDs for treatment of ulnar neuropathies is not recommended. There is one high-quality study in post-operative CTS patients indicating that for post-operative pain management, naproxen is superior to acetaminophen, which in turn is superior to placebo (Husby et al., 2001). NSAIDs and acetaminophen may also facilitate the rehabilitation process without the impairments associated with opioids. Thus, by analogy, NSAIDs and acetaminophen are recommended for post-operative pain management of patients with ulnar neuropathy.

GLUCOCORTICOSTEROIDS (ORAL OR INJECTIONS) FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of oral or injections (condylar groove or cubital tunnel) of glucocorticosteroids for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow. There is no indication for injecting steroids into the cubital tunnel as is done for the carpal tunnel as there is no other structure than the ulnar nerve in the tunnel and steroid injection into the nerve may cause damage.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials for treatment of patients with ulnar neuropathies at the elbow. Glucocorticosteroid injections combined with splinting have been used for treatment of "cubital tunnel syndrome" in a small trial of low quality that also did not appear to precisely define the location of the ulnar neuropathy and did not show additive benefit (Hong et al., 1996). The mechanisms for development of CTS are not analogous to the ulnar nerve at the elbow, thus there is no recommendation. Among patients thought to have an inflammatory mechanism, these are reasonable treatment options.

Evidence

There is 1 low-quality RCT in Appendix 1.

ROUTINE USE OF OPIOIDS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

Not Recommended

The routine use of opioids is not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of opioids for treatment of ulnar neuropathy patients. Transposition patients have larger incisions and frequently require post-operative opioids for at least a few days, usually in addition to NSAIDs. Some require these medications for a longer time. Opioids are not invasive, but have very high dropout rates and otherwise high rates of adverse effects. They are moderate to high cost depending on duration of treatment (see Chronic Pain guideline) and are not recommended for routine use. Quality evidence for treatment of post-operative patients with opioids to control pain is absent, although moderate-quality evidence documents benefits of NSAIDs for that purpose in CTS patients. Some patients have insufficient pain relief with NSAIDs, thus judicious use of opioids may be helpful, particularly for nocturnal use. Opioids are recommended for brief,

select use in post-operative patients with primary use at night to achieve sleep post-operatively.

USE OF OPIOIDS FOR TREATMENT OF SELECT POST-OPERATIVE ULNAR NEUROPATHY PATIENTS

Recommended

Limited use of opioids for a few days to a couple weeks is recommended for select patients who have undergone recent ulnar neuropathy surgery, particularly if complications have occurred.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Select patients who have recently undergone ulnar nerve surgeries, usually transpositions and have intense pain (especially having insufficient pain relief with NSAIDs), or have encountered complications.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Limit use to a few days up to a few weeks; primary use nocturnal to achieve post-operative sleep. Longer term use is occasionally required for those with more significant complications.

Rationale

There are no quality studies of opioids for treatment of ulnar neuropathy patients. Transposition patients have larger incisions and frequently require post-operative opioids for at least a few days, usually in addition to NSAIDs. Some require these medications for a longer time. Opioids are not invasive, but have very high dropout rates and otherwise high rates of adverse effects. They are moderate to high cost depending on duration of treatment (see Chronic Pain guideline) and are not recommended for routine use. Quality evidence for treatment of post-operative patients with opioids to control pain is absent, although moderate-quality evidence documents benefits of NSAIDs for that purpose in CTS patients. Some patients have insufficient pain relief with NSAIDs, thus judicious use of opioids may be helpful, particularly for nocturnal use. Opioids are recommended for brief, select use in post-operative patients with primary use at night to achieve sleep post-operatively.

USE OF PYRIDOXINE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

Not Recommended

Pyridoxine is not recommended for routine treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies in patients without vitamin deficiencies.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials for treatment of ulnar neuropathy patients, thus treatment of CTS is used by analogy. There are two quality studies that reviewed pyridoxine to treat CTS patients (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline). However, benefits have not been shown in the highest quality study (Spooner et al., 1993). The moderate-quality crossover trial reported improvements in symptoms in 7 patients; however, 3 patients did not receive the placebo although their symptoms scores on pyridoxine were lower than in a control period (Ellis et al., 1982). While vitamin B6 is relatively low risk and patients may use it without prescription, available evidence does not support its use for the routine treatment of CTS, thus it is not recommended for other neuropathies including ulnar neuropathies. However, it may be a reasonable treatment option among patients with presumptive pyridoxine deficiency (e.g., malnutrition, alcoholism, malabsorption, especially jejunal disorders such as sprue, etc.).

USE OF OTHER VITAMINS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of other vitamins for treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials for treatment of ulnar neuropathy patients, thus treatment of CTS is used by analogy. There are two quality studies that reviewed pyridoxine to treat CTS patients (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline). However, benefits have not been shown in the highest quality study (Spooner et al., 1993). The moderate-quality crossover trial reported improvements in symptoms in 7 patients; however, 3 patients did not receive the placebo although their symptoms scores on pyridoxine were lower than in a control period (Ellis et al., 1982). While vitamin B6 is relatively low risk and patients may use it without prescription, available evidence does not support its use for the routine treatment of CTS, thus it is not recommended for other neuropathies including ulnar neuropathies. However, it may be a reasonable treatment option among patients with presumptive pyridoxine deficiency (e.g., malnutrition, alcoholism, malabsorption, especially jejunal disorders such as sprue, etc.).

LIDOCAINE PATCHES FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of lidocaine patches for treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies with pain.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

Topical lidocaine has not been evaluated for treatment of ulnar neuropathy patients. It has been suggested to improve pain associated with CTS although the case diagnoses do not appear well substantiated in the available study as pain complaints as an overriding symptom among CTS patients raise concerns about alternate explanations for the symptoms (Nalamachu et al., 2006). In one moderate-quality study, lidocaine patches were suggested to be somewhat more effective than naproxen (Nalamachu et al., 2006); however, naproxen does not appear particularly effective for treatment of a peripheral neuropathy and the study had a number of weaknesses. In the other study, injection was comparable to the patch, yet injections are likely a more effective strategy than naproxen, thus this body of evidence somewhat conflicts. Lidocaine patches are not invasive and have low adverse effects although some patients may experience local reactions such as skin irritation, redness, pain, or sores. These patches are also moderately or even high cost over time. The neuropathy is at the elbow although symptoms are usually distant, resulting in problems with theoretical use of these patches and there is an absence of quality evidence for this treatment of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow, thus there is no recommendation.

KETAMINE FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of topically administered ketamine for treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies with pain.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There is no evidence supporting efficacy of ketamine for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and therefore, there is no recommendation for or against its use.

DEVICES

MAGNETS FOR MANAGEMENT OF PAIN FROM OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

Not Recommended

The use of magnets is not recommended for the management of pain for acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies of ulnar neuropathies. Quality evidence suggests magnets are not efficacious for treating pain associated with CTS (Carter et al., 2002). Magnets are not invasive, have no adverse effects, and are low cost, but other interventions have been shown effective. Thus, magnets are not recommended for treatment of ulnar neuropathies.

NOCTURNAL ELBOW SPLINTING FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

Recommended

Nocturnal elbow splinting or bracing is recommended for treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow (Dawson, 1993, Svernlov et al., 2009, Neal et al., 2010, Szabo et al., 2007).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Symptoms consistent with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow, either condylar groove or cubital tunnel.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

Elbow splints or braces are recommended to be worn while sleeping (range of 45-70 degrees used) (Elhassan et al., 2007, Svernlov et al., 2009).

Indications for discontinuation

Splints should be re-evaluated and potentially re-adjusted if no response within 2 weeks of starting treatment, particularly to assure that the patient is wearing them properly as well as to assess fit. If there is no improvement, splints should be discontinued and the accuracy of the diagnosis re-evaluated.

Rationale

Nocturnal elbow splints have been evaluated in one quality trial (Svernlov et al., 2009); however, it had methodological problems that may have resulted in a lack of clear evidence in favor of one treatment or another. Nocturnal splints and braces are thought to be effective. They are not invasive, have minimal adverse effects, are low cost and are recommended.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis.

ALLIED HEALTH INTERVENTIONS

LOW-LEVEL LASER THERAPY FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

Not Recommended

Low-level laser therapy is not recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality trials for treatment of ulnar neuropathy patients. Trials for treatment of CTS suggest a lack of efficacy (Bakhtiary et al., 2004, Irvine et al., 2004, Naeser et al., 2002) (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline). Thus, low-level laser is not recommended for treatment of ulnar neuropathies.

ULTRASOUND FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES

Recommended

Ultrasound is recommended for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Ulnar neuropathies that are sufficiently symptomatic to warrant treatment. Patients should generally be given nocturnal splints and had an inadequate response.

Frequency/Dose/Duration

The regimen in the highest quality study of CTS patients consisted of daily 15-minute sessions, 5 a week for 2 weeks, then twice a week for 5 more weeks; 1MHz with intensity 1. 0W/cm2, pulsed mode duty cycle of 1:4 and transducer area of 5cm2 (Ebenbichler et al., 1998). Another successful regimen consisted of 15-minute sessions, 5 times a week for 3 weeks (Bakhtiary et al., 2004).

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution, failure to objectively improve or intolerance.

Rationale

There are no quality trials for treatment of patients with ulnar neuropathies. However, there are trials for treatment of CTS that suggest modest benefit (Bakhtiary et al., 2004, Oztas et al., 1998, Ebenbichler et al., 1998, Baysal et al., 2006, Davis et al., 1998) (see Hand, Wrist, and Forearm Disorders guideline). Thus, by analogy, ultrasound is recommended for select patients who have failed treatment with a nocturnal brace/splint or obtained insufficient benefits.

ACUPUNCTURE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of acupuncture for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of this treatment for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and therefore, there is no recommendation for or against use of this treatment.

BIOFEEDBACK FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of biofeedback for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of this treatment for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and therefore, there is no recommendation for or against use of this treatment.

MANIPULATION AND MOBILIZATION FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of manipulation and mobilization for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of this treatment for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and therefore, there is no recommendation for or against use of this treatment.

MASSAGE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of massage for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of this treatment for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and therefore, there is no recommendation for or against use of this treatment.

SOFT TISSUE MASSAGE FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of soft tissue massage for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of this treatment for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and therefore, there is no recommendation for or against use of this treatment.

IONTOPHORESIS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of iontophoresis for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of this treatment for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and therefore, there is no recommendation for or against use of this treatment.

PHONOPHORESIS FOR ACUTE, SUBACUTE, OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against the use of phonophoresis for the treatment of acute, subacute, or chronic ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating the use of this treatment for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow and therefore, there is no recommendation for or against use of this treatment.

SURGICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

SURGICAL RELEASE FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES (IN SITU DECOMPRESSION)

Recommended

Simple ("in situ") decompression is recommended for patients who fail nonoperative treatment for subacute or chronic ulnar neuropathies or patients who have emergent or urgent indications (e.g., acute compression due to fracture, arthritides or compartment syndrome with unrelenting symptoms of nerve impairment).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Evidence (C)

Indications

A presumptive diagnosis of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow requires both:

- tingling and/or numbness in an ulnar nerve distribution (i.e., small digit, typically the ulnar aspect of the ring finger and the ulnar border of the hand) and
- symptoms that are provoked either nocturnally or with sustained elbow flexion.

A confirmed diagnosis additionally requires either:

- electrodiagnostic testing consistent with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow, ideally including segmental analysis/inching technique which should be done to identify the affected ulnar nerve segment (American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine, 1999), or
- weakness or atrophy in the ulnar nerve innervated muscles.

Nonoperative treatments include ergonomic interventions, such as:

- avoiding elbow hyperflexion,
- avoiding leaning on the ulnar nerve in the condylar groove during work and/or avocational activities, and
- sleeping with the elbow(s) in an extended position which may include nocturnal elbow splinting.

Surgical considerations for in-situ decompression/release are either:

- severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic findings, continuous paresthesias, weakness or ulnar nerve-innervated muscle atrophy, and including acute compression due to trauma such as fracture, or
- lack of improvement or resolution following both non-operative treatments above (elbow and wrist splinting) trialed for at least 3 months.

Generally, a simple decompression is preferred over other procedures for true cubital tunnel syndrome (Nabhan et al., 2005, Bartels et al., 2005).

Surgical considerations for ulnar nerve transposition include one of the following:

- nerve conduction study localization by segmental analysis to the condylar groove segment plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe EDS, continuous tingling/numbness, hypothenar atrophy) including compression due to penetrating trauma, or

- nerve conduction study showing delayed ulnar nerve conduction velocity without localization to the affected ulnar nerve segment plus evidence of ulnar nerve subluxation at the elbow plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe EDS, continuous tingling/numbness, hypothenar atrophy), or
- lack of improvement or resolution after at least 3 months after in-situ decompression/local release without transposition.

Rationale

Surgical indications for in-situ decompression/local release without transposition require both a confirmed diagnosis and surgical considerations.

A presumptive diagnosis requires both (1) paresthesias in an ulnar nerve distribution and (2) symptoms that are provoked either nocturnally or with sustained elbow flexion. A confirmed diagnosis requires at least one of: (1) confirmatory electrodiagnostic study interpreted as consistent with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow; and segmental analyses, aka "inching technique" should also be done to localize the conduction delay; and/or (2) weakness or atrophy in the ulnar nerve innervated muscles.

Surgical considerations include at least one of (1) severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic study findings, continuous paresthesias, weakness or atrophy in the ulnar nerve innervated muscles, including acute compression due to fracture; or (2) lack of improvement or resolution after both of the following non-operative treatments trialed for at least 3 months: (a) ergonomic interventions including avoiding elbow hyperflexion and leaning on the ulnar nerve in the condylar groove during work and/or avocational activities; and (b) elbow(s) in an extended position during sleep, which may include nocturnal elbow splinting.

Surgical indications for subcutaneous transposition of the ulnar nerve include at least one of: (1) nerve conduction study localization by segmental analysis to the condylar groove segment plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic study, continuous paresthesias, or hypothenar atrophy), including compression due to penetrating trauma; (2) nerve conduction study showing delayed ulnar nerve conduction velocity without localization to the affected ulnar nerve segment plus evidence of ulnar nerve subluxation at the elbow plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic study, continuous paresthesias, hypothenar atrophy; and/or (3) lack of improvement or resolution after at least 3 months after in-siu decompression/local release without transposition.

There are no sham-controlled trials, trials with no treatment arms or a quality non-operative program. However, there are six moderate-quality trials, five of which compare surgical procedures and one of which compares surgery with botulinum injections (Keizer et al., 2002). Also, none of the studies distinguished between the different types of ulnar neuropathies at the elbow. Two studies (Nabhan et al., 2005, Bartels et al., 2005) compared simple decompression procedure with anterior subcutaneous transposition of the ulnar nerve; two studies (Biggs et al., 2006, Gervasio et al., 2005) compared simple decompression with submuscular transposition; and one study (Geutjens et al., 1996) compared medial epicondylectomy with anterior transposition. The simple ulnar nerve

release does have some evidence of benefits over more complicated surgical procedures such as transposition, particularly concerning complications. Surgical options for this problem are invasive, have adverse effects and are high cost. Yet, in well-defined cases as outlined above that include positive electrodiagnostic studies with objective evidence of loss of function, lack of improvement may necessitate surgery and surgery for this condition is recommended.

Evidence

There are 5 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis.

SURGICAL RELEASE FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES (ANTERIOR SUBCUTANEOUS TRANSPOSITION)

Recommended

Anterior subcutaneous transposition, medial epicondylectomy is recommended for patients who fail non-operative treatment for subacute or chronic ulnar neuropathies or patients who have emergent or urgent indications (e.g., acute compression due to fracture, arthritides or compartment syndrome with unrelenting symptoms of nerve impairment).

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

A presumptive diagnosis of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow requires both:

- tingling and/or numbness in an ulnar nerve distribution (i.e., small digit, typically the ulnar aspect of the ring finger and the ulnar border of the hand) and
- symptoms that are provoked either nocturnally or with sustained elbow flexion.

A confirmed diagnosis additionally requires either:

- electrodiagnostic testing consistent with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow, ideally including segmental analysis/inching technique which should be done to identify the affected ulnar nerve segment (American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine, 1999), or
- weakness or atrophy in the ulnar nerve innervated muscles.

Non-operative treatments include ergonomic interventions including:

- avoiding elbow hyperflexion,
- avoiding leaning on the ulnar nerve in the condylar groove during work and/or avocational activities, and
- sleeping with the elbow(s) in an extended position which may include nocturnal elbow splinting.

Surgical considerations for in-situ decompression/release are either:

- severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic findings, continuous paresthesias, weakness or ulnar nerve-innervated muscle atrophy, and including acute compression due to trauma such as fracture, or
- lack of improvement or resolution following both non-operative treatments above (elbow and wrist splinting) trialed for at least 3 months.

Generally, a simple decompression is preferred over other procedures for true cubital tunnel syndrome (Nabhan et al., 2005, Bartels et al., 2005). Surgical considerations for ulnar nerve transposition include one of the following:

- nerve conduction study localization by segmental analysis to the condylar groove segment plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe EDS, continuous tingling/numbness, hypothenar atrophy) including compression due to penetrating trauma, or
- nerve conduction study showing delayed ulnar nerve conduction velocity without localization to the affected ulnar nerve sgemnt plus evidence of ulnar nerve subluxation at the elebow plus severe symptos and signs (e.g., severe EDS, continuous tingling/numbness, hypothenar atrophy) or
- lack of improvement or resolution after at least 3 months after in-situ decompression/local release without transposition.

Rationale

Surgical indications for in-situ decompression/local release without transposition require both a confirmed diagnosis and surgical considerations.

A presumptive diagnosis requires both (1) paresthesias in an ulnar nerve distribution and (2) symptoms that are provoked either nocturnally or with sustained elbow flexion. A confirmed diagnosis requires at least one of: (1) confirmatory electrodiagnostic study interpreted as consistent with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow; and segmental analyses, aka “inching technique” should also be done to localize the conduction delay; and/or (2) weakness or atrophy in the ulnar nerve innervated muscles. Surgical Considerations include at least one of (1) severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic study findings, continuous paresthesias, weakness or atrophy in the ulnar nerve innervated muscles, including acute compression due to fracture; or (2) lack of improvement or resolution after both of the following non-operative treatments trialed for at least 3 months: (a) ergonomic interventions including avoiding elbow hyperflexion and leaning on the ulnar nerve in the condylar groove during work and/or avocational activities; and (b) elbow(s) in an extended position during sleep, which may include nocturnal elbow splinting.

Surgical indications for subcutaneous transposition of the ulnar nerve include at least one of: (1) nerve conduction study localization by segmental analysis to the condylar groove segment plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic study, continuous paresthesias, or hypothenar atrophy), including compression due to penetrating trauma; (2) nerve conduction study showing delayed ulnar nerve conduction velocity without localization to the affected ulnar nerve segment plus evidence of ulnar nerve subluxation at the elbow plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic study, continuous paresthesias, hypothenar atrophy; and/or (3) lack of improvement or resolution after at least 3 months after in-siu decompression/local release without transposition. Similar to the indications for simple decompression, the presumptive diagnosis of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow requires both: (1) tingling and/or numbness in an ulnar nerve distribution (i.e., small digit, typically the ulnar aspect of the ring finger and the ulnar border of the hand) and (2) symptoms that are provoked either nocturnally or with sustained elbow flexion. A confirmed diagnosis additionally requires either: (1) confirmatory electrodiagnostic testing consistent with ulnar neuropathy at the elbow, ideally including segmental analysis/inching technique showing conduction delay in the condylar groove (American Association of

Electrodiagnostic Medicine, 1999), or (2) weakness or atrophy in the ulnar nerve innervated muscles. Generally, a simple decompression is preferred over other procedures for true cubital tunnel syndrome (Nabhan et al., 2005, Bartels et al., 2005). Surgical considerations for anterior subcutaneous decompression are any of: (1) nerve conduction study localizing the delay to the condylar groove segment of the ulnar nerve plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic study findings, continuous numbness/tingling, hypothenar atrophy), including compression due to penetrating trauma; (2) nerve conduction study showing delayed ulnar nerve conduction velocity without localization to the affected ulnar nerve segment plus evidence of ulnar nerve subluxation at the elbow plus severe symptoms and signs (e.g., severe electrodiagnostic study findings, continuous numbness/tingling, hypothenar atrophy; or (3) lack of improvement or resolution after at least 3 months after in-situ decompression/local release without transposition.

There are no sham-controlled trials, trials with no treatment arms or a quality non-operative program. However, there are six moderate-quality trials, five of which compare surgical procedures and one of which compares surgery with botulinum injections (Keizer et al., 2002). Also, none of the studies distinguished between the different types of ulnar neuropathies at the elbow. Two studies (Nabhan et al., 2005, Bartels et al., 2005) compared simple decompression procedure with anterior subcutaneous transposition of the ulnar nerve; two studies (Biggs et al., 2006, Gervasio et al., 2005) compared simple decompression with submuscular transposition; and one study (Geutjens et al., 1996) compared medial epicondylectomy with anterior transposition. The simple ulnar nerve release does have some evidence of benefits over more complicated surgical procedures such as transposition, particularly concerning complications. Surgical options for this problem are invasive, have adverse effects and are high cost. Yet, in well-defined cases as outlined above that include positive electrodiagnostic studies with objective evidence of loss of function, lack of improvement may necessitate surgery and surgery for this condition is recommended.

Evidence

There are 5 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis.

SURGICAL RELEASE FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ULNAR NEUROPATHIES (ANTERIOR SUBMUSCULAR TRANSPOSITION)

Not Recommended

Anterior submuscular transposition is not recommended for the treatment of subacute or chronic ulnar neuropathies.

Strength of evidence Not Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no sham-controlled trials, trials with no treatment arms or a quality non-operative program. However, there are six moderate-quality trials, five of which compare surgical procedures and one of which compares surgery with botulinum injections (Keizer et al.,

2002). Also, none of the studies distinguished between the different types of ulnar neuropathies at the elbow. Two studies (Nabhan et al., 2005, Bartels et al., 2005) compared simple decompression procedure with anterior subcutaneous transposition of the ulnar nerve; two studies (Biggs et al., 2006, Gervasio et al., 2005) compared simple decompression with submuscular transposition; and one study (Geutjens et al., 1996) compared medial epicondylectomy with anterior transposition. The simple ulnar nerve release does have some evidence of benefits over more complicated surgical procedures such as transposition, particularly concerning complications. Surgical options for this problem are invasive, have adverse effects and are high cost. Yet, in well defined cases as outlined above that include positive electrodiagnostic studies with objective evidence of loss of function, lack of improvement may necessitate surgery and surgery for this condition is recommended.

Evidence

There are 5 moderate-quality RCTs incorporated into this analysis.

REHABILITATION

MODIFICATION OF WORK ACTIVITIES FOR ULNAR NEUROPATHIES AT THE ELBOW

Recommended

Removal from job tasks with repeated or sustained elbow hyperflexion is recommended for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Indications

Patients with sustained or repeated flexion of the elbow beyond 90 degrees.

Indications for discontinuation

Resolution, lack of improvement, or desire of the patient to remove limitations.

Rationale

There are no quality studies evaluating the modification of work activities for ulnar neuropathies at the elbow. However, where occupational factors are significant, especially for patients with hyperflexion of the elbow, a trial of removal from that type of work may be indicated.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF SUBACUTE OR CHRONIC ELBOW MSDS

Recommended

Return-to-work programs are recommended for treatment of subacute or chronic elbow MSDs, particularly patients with significant lost time.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

RETURN-TO-WORK PROGRAMS FOR TREATMENT OF ACUTE, SEVERE ELBOW MSDS

No Recommendation

There is no recommendation for or against return-to-work programs for acute, severe elbow MSDs.

Strength of evidence No Recommendation, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Rationale

There are no quality studies that review the types of return-to work programs typically found in the U. S. There is one quality study from Spain (Abasolo et al., 2007); however, most patients had spine disorders and the program otherwise may have limited applicability due to longstanding, early active management of these issues in the U. S. These programs are thought to reduce morbidity and improve function. They are not invasive, have minimal potential for adverse effects, and are not costly. Return-to-work programs are recommended for management of select patients with elbow MSDs with lost time, and may be helpful for proactive emphases on functional recovery. There is no recommendation for those with acute, severe elbow MSDs, although early return to work is thought to improve earlier, functional recovery.

Evidence

There is 1 moderate-quality RCT incorporated into this analysis (see Low Back Disorders and Chronic Pain guidelines for additional studies).

EDUCATION FOR ELBOW DISORDERS

Recommended

Education is recommended for patients with elbow disorders.

Strength of evidence Recommended, Insufficient Evidence (I)

Frequency/Dose/Duration

One or two appointments for educational purposes. Additional appointments may be needed if education is combined with occupational or physical therapy treatments. Follow-up educational visit(s) for more severe disorders as part of a progression towards normal functional use is sometimes helpful.

Rationale

There are no quality studies specifically evaluating efficacy of patient education for utility or necessity in treatment of elbow disorders. Yet, for many disorders (e.g., relationship between elbow hyperflexion and ulnar neuropathies, cast management) education appears essential. Some clinicians accomplish this in the course of extended patient visits, while others routinely refer patients to an occupational or physical therapist for education. Regardless of the approach, a few appointments for educational purposes are recommended for select patients. The number of appointments depends on the diagnosis, severity of the condition, and co-existing conditions. Although education is usually incorporated as part of the overall treatment plan, an additional 1 or 2 appointments for purely educational purposes may be helpful midway through a treatment course for the more severely affected patient. In addition, education is low cost and this is recommended.

PROGNOSIS

Job modifications are thought to be needed in some cases to facilitate recovery.

FOLLOW-UP CARE

The clinical evaluation and progress of patients is most commonly monitored qualitatively from appointment to appointment. Particularly, it is desirable to seek information regarding the degree to which symptoms are present and whether the patient believes there has been improvement. However, there are several instruments that may be utilized for monitoring the progress of workers. These include the DASH. VAS symptoms and pain scores may also be used. Functional status scores and Global Symptom Scores are also used, particularly in some research studies. Grip and pinch strength measures may be utilized; however, patients who have mild symptoms generally have normal grip strength. All of these questionnaires are subjective and strength measures are effort-dependent, although they attempt to provide a semi-quantitative measure that may help to gauge improvement over time.

Various exercise regimens have been utilized to treat patients with ulnar neuropathies at the elbow, most commonly tendon-gliding and nerve-gliding exercises. In addition, interventions are provided to address modifications to performance of ADLs and IADLs.

JOB ANALYSIS

Cases of ulnar neuropathy in the condylar groove may benefit from job analyses to identify tasks involving pressure on the condylar groove that include leaning on the nerve or avoiding opportunities to bump the nerve. Sustained or repeated hyperflexion of the elbow beyond 90° also may be identified and ameliorated. Cases of ulnar neuropathy in the cubital tunnel are thought to potentially be related to sustained or repeated high force activities or hyperflexion of the elbow. Avoidance of high force activities may be of assistance. Avoidance of hyperflexion is thought to also be helpful.

TABLES

TABLE 1. RED FLAGS FOR POTENTIALLY SERIOUS ELBOW DISORDERS

Disorder	Medical History	Physical Examination
Fracture	History of significant trauma Fall on outstretched hand Fall onto lateral elbow	Deformity consistent with fracture Reduced range(s) of motion Pain with range of motion Disturbance in the triangular relationship between the olecranon and the epicondyles Significant bruising, if subacute (unusual)
Dislocation	History of fall/trauma as above History of deformity with or without spontaneous reduction	Deformity consistent with dislocation Hemarthrosis
Infection	Pain, swelling, redness Diabetes mellitus History of immunosuppression (e.g., transplant, chemotherapy, HIV) History of systemic symptoms	Localized heat, swelling, erythema Purulence Erythematous streaks, especially from a portal of entry Systemic signs of infection
Tumor	History of cancer Unintentional weight loss Continuous pain, especially at night and not improved with rest	Palpable mass not consistent with usual diagnoses
Inflammation	History of gout or pseudogout History of rheumatoid arthritis History of other inflammatory arthritides	Effusion Localized heat, swelling, erythema, tenderness
Rapidly Progressive Neurologic Deficit	History of neurologic disease Trauma	Abnormal neurologic examination Focal or global motor weakness distal to the elbow Weakness may be limited to one nerve, such as hand intrinsic muscles
Vascular Compromise	History of diabetes mellitus Tobacco use History of fracture or dislocation History of vascular disease of any kind	Decreased or absent peripheral pulses and delayed capillary refill Edema
Compartment Syndrome	History of trauma, surgery or extreme unaccustomed forceful activity Persistent forearm pain and "tightness" Tingling, burning, or numbness	Palpable tenderness and tension of involved compartment Pain intensified with stretch to involved muscles Paresthesia, paresis, and sensory deficits Diminished pulse and prolonged capillary refill

TABLE 2. DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA FOR NON-RED-FLAG CONDITIONS

Probable Diagnosis or Injury	Mechanism	Symptoms	Signs	Test and Results
Contusion	Direct blow Fall	Local pain	Range of motion usually normal Soft tissue swelling Ecchymosis	None
Nondisplaced Radial Head Fracture	Fall onto outstretched hand Fall onto lateral elbow	Lateral elbow pain Pain on pronation and supination of forearm	Maximal tenderness over radial head Reduced elbow extension when compared with unaffected side	Radiograph evidence of fracture or effusion
Lateral Epicondylalgia/ Epicondylitis/ Tendinosis	Possibly related to forceful use of elbow or wrist, repetition and postural factors Some cases related to acute trauma	Pain in lateral elbow. [Absence of tingling/numbness.] [Absence of neck pain or stiffness.]	Tenderness over epicondyle and 2-3 centimeters distal to it over the extensor carpi radialis brevis and extensor digitorum tendons Pain in lateral elbow with resisted extension of wrist or middle finger Pain in the lateral elbow with forceful grasp Normal elbow range of motion Diffuse lateral elbow pain with repeated wrist dorsiflexion	Positive resistance test results: lateral epicondylar area pain with resisted extension of the wrist, middle finger, index finger, and/or supination
Medial Epicondylalgia/ Epicondylitis/ Tendinosis	Etiology is unknown Theorized to parallel that of lateral epicondylalgia	Pain in medial elbow [Absence of tingling/numbness in most cases unless accompanied by ulnar neuropathy] [Absence of neck pain or stiffness]	Tenderness over medial epicondyle or 2 to 3 centimeters distal to it Pain in medial elbow with resisted wrist or phalangeal flexion Normal elbow range of motion	Positive resistance test results: pain with resisted flexion of the wrist, fingers, and pronation
Ulnar Nerve Entrapment (including Cubital Tunnel Syndrome)	Two main categories involving cubital tunnel and condylar groove Etiologies are unclear; there are no quality epidemiological studies Theorized mechanisms include hyperflexion of the	Paresthesias in the ring and 5th digits; generally spares dorsal surfaces Pain may or may not be present	Paresthesias in ring and small fingers on 60-second elbow flexion test Subluxation of the ulnar nerve in the condylar groove sometimes present Weakness/atrophy of ulnar hand intrinsics and	Nerve conduction study with above vs. below elbow conduction assessment "Inching technique" may be helpful to document a focal decrement in a specific ulnar nerve location although it has not been rigorously examined regarding if it affects outcomes. A problem is most typically in condylar

	elbow or prolonged leaning on the elbows for condylar groove segment neuropathies		interosseous muscles (unusual/late) Hoffman-Tinel's test over the condylar groove segment is thought to not be helpful as it is often abnormal in the absence of symptoms.	groove or cubital tunnel segments of the nerve. Abnormalities on EMG are later findings typical of more advanced cases.
Radial Nerve Entrapment (including Radial Tunnel Syndrome)	Etiology is unknown; there are no quality epidemiological studies.	Studies of the clinical presentation of this disorder are not well performed. Thought to involve aching pain in extensor/supinator area of forearm.	Physical exam findings are not well characterized for this disorder. Pain on stressing extended middle finger Maximum tenderness 4 finger breadths anterior and inferior to lateral epicondyle Utility of Hoffman-Tinel's test undetermined	High-quality studies do not exist. Some believe nerve conduction velocity decrements are uniformly present and others believe abnormal nerve conduction findings are variably present.
Olecranon Bursitis (noninfectious)	Prolonged leaning on elbow/chronic pressure Acute trauma Chronic pressure	Swelling of bursa Pain in bursa generally absent or minor	Effusion/mass effect in bursa Tenderness over bursa generally not present or minor Tenderness more likely with complications of inflammatory arthropathy	Monosodium urate or uric acid crystals if gout Calcium pyrophosphate crystals if pseudogout
Olecranon Bursitis (infectious)	Trauma with non-intact dermis Introduced infections from injection(s) Systemic infection	Progressive painful swelling of bursa Systemic signs of infection	Erythema, warmth and/or surrounding cellulitis Marked tenderness over bursa	Purulent tap, positive gram-stain results, positive culture results Portal of entry for infection
Biceps Tendinosis	Forceful flexion, particularly near maximal or repeated high force Unaccustomed forceful use	Pain in anterior elbow joint or antecubital fossa	Tenderness on palpation of biceps myotendinous junction	Pain in the biceps insertion area with resisted elbow flexion
Pronator Syndrome	Etiology unclear	Pain in proximal fore-arm with paraesthesias in median nerve distribution of hand	May be tender over pronator muscle	Resisted pronation augments symptoms
Non-specific Elbow Pain	Unknown	None	None	None

TABLE 3. GUIDELINES FOR MODIFICATION OF WORK ACTIVITIES AND DISABILITY DURATION

Disorder	Activity Modifications and Accommodation	Recommended Target for Disability Duration*	
		With Modified Duty**	Without Modified Duty
Biceps Strain	Modification of activities involving the muscle-tendon unit, i.e., those that cause significant symptoms. Workstation assessment to insure optimal ergonomics, as appropriate.	0-3 days	7-14 days
Biceps Rupture	One-handed work while recovering from surgery for approximately initial 2 weeks. Graded increase in activity over approximately 6-12 weeks.	3-7 days	9-12months‡
Epicondylalgia (both Lateral and Medial)	Avoid activities that cause significant symptoms or require excessive force on repeated basis.	0 days	3-14 days€
Elbow Sprain	Avoid activities that cause significant symptoms or apply excessive force of elbow	0-3 days	7-14 days
Olecranon Bursitis (Non-infectious)	Avoid leaning on or bumping elbow. Consider elbow/olecranon soft padding.	0 days	0 days
Pronator Syndrome	None known to be beneficial. Consider avoiding repeated high force use.	0 days	0-14 days†
Radial Neuropathies at the Elbow	None known to be beneficial	0 days	0-14 days†
Ulnar Neuropathy at the Elbow	Consider workstation adjustments to avoid hyperflexion. If true cubital tunnel syndrome, consider avoiding repeated high force use.	0 days	0-14 days†
Elbow Fractures	No use of fractured elbow	0-3 days	Depending on treatment (i.e., cast vs. screw), generally up to 8 weeks if unable to accommodate and forceful use of hand is required. May be longer in cases of delayed healing.

These are general guidelines based on consensus or population sources and are never meant to be applied to an individual case without consideration of workplace factors, concurrent disease or other social or medical factors that can affect recovery.

*These parameters for disability duration are consensus optimal targets as determined by a panel of ACOEM members in 1996, reaffirmed by a panel in 2002 and 2010. In most cases, persons with one non-severe extremity injury can return to modified duty immediately. Additional limitations of the frequency or pressure of keyboard use or pinch grasp may be warranted.

**If the workplace has the ability to accommodate one handed use, then there is no time loss that is generally justifiable. Situations of severe injuries with considerable pain may be limited exceptions.

†Many of these cases require no lost time.

‡These cases are particularly challenging and longer periods of time loss are not unusual, particularly where there is no accommodation for limitations.

€Severe cases may take 30 days or longer for disability duration, although full recovery may take several weeks to months for some patients.

CONTRIBUTORS

Editor-in-Chief:
Kurt T. Hegmann, MD, MPH, FACOEM, FACP

Evidence-based Practice Elbow Panel Chair:
Harold E. Hoffman, MD, FACOEM, FRCPC

Evidence-based Practice Elbow Panel Members:
Roger M. Belcourt, MD, MPH, FACOEM
Kevin Byrne, MD, MPH, FACOEM
Jed Downs, MD, MPH
Lee Glass, MD, JD
J. Mark Melhorn, MD, FAAOS, FACOEM, FAADEP, FACS, FASSH, FAAHS
Jack Richman, MD, CCBOM, FACOEM, FAADEP, CIME
Phillip Zinni, III, DO, FAOASM, CMRO

Methodology Committee Consultant:
Kurt T. Hegmann, MD, MPH, FACOEM, FACP

Managing Editors:
Production: Marianne Dreger, MA
Research: Julie A. Ording, MPH

Editorial Assistant:
Debra M. Paddack

Research Conducted By:
Kurt T. Hegmann, MD, MPH, FACOEM, FACP
Matthew S. Thiese, PhD, MSPH
Ulrike Ott, MSPH
Kylee Tokita
Jessica Melendez
Deborah Gwenevere
Passey Atim
Cecelia Effiong, BS
Riann Bree Robbins, BS
William Gilbert Caughey
Holly Uphold, BS

Specialty Society and Society Representative Listing:
ACOEM acknowledges the following organizations and their representatives who served as reviewers of the Elbow Disorders guideline. Their contributions are greatly appreciated. By listing the following individuals or organizations, it does not infer that these individuals or organizations support or endorse the elbow treatment guidelines developed by ACOEM.

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

The American Occupational Therapy Association
Marian Arbesman, PhD, OTR/L
Paula Bohr, PhD, OTR/L, FAOTA

American Physical Therapy Association
Paul LaStayo, PT, PhD, CHT

Other External Reviewers:
Robert M. Szabo, MD, MPH

DISCLOSURES OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Kurt T. Hegmann, MD, MPH, FACOEM, FACP (Editor-in-Chief and Methodology Committee Consultant)

Professor and Center Director, Dr. Paul S. Richards Endowed Chair in Occupational Safety and Health, Rocky Mountain Center for Occupational and Environmental Health, University of Utah

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Member, Ergonomics Committee (Chair 2001-05), ACOEM; Board of Trustees (2003-12) and Chair (2010-12), American Board of Preventive Medicine; and Chair, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration's Medical Review Board (2006-2010)

Other Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Chair, Evidence-based Practice Committee, ACOEM (2006-present); Member, Council on Scientific Affairs (2001-05), ACOEM

Research Grants/Other Support—NIOSH (CDC) Training grants and research grants primarily on the epidemiology of musculoskeletal disorders (e.g., CTS, shoulder tendinosis, LBP) and truck driver safety.

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—Honoraria: Teaching honoraria from various courses, mostly ACOEM-related; Consultations: Reed Group (consulting fee for ACOEM Guidelines Editor-in-Chief); Consulting with companies regarding how to reduce work-related injuries, causation and apportionment of injuries and consultations with unions regarding return to work, work restrictions and work-relatedness injuries; Clinical: Primary, secondary and tertiary clinical management of occupational injuries and diseases

Jeffrey S. Harris, MD, MPH, MBA, FACOEM (Methodology Committee Consultant)

President, J. Harris Associates Inc; Clinical Associate Professor, University of California at San Francisco, University of Utah and Medical College of Wisconsin; Former Senior Physician, The Permanente Medical Group

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—President and Member, Board of Directors for the Collaborative for Excellence in Occupational Medicine (CEOM); Past Secretary/Treasurer, ACOEM

Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Member, Guidelines Methodology Committee, ACOEM; Member, Evidence-Based Practice Committee, ACOEM; Editor, *ACOEM Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, 1st Edition* and Associate Editor, *2nd Edition*; Past

Chair, Practice Guidelines Committee, ACOEM (1994-98); Cochrane Adverse Effects Methods Group; Member, Pain, Palliative and Supportive Care Review Group; Cochrane Effective Practice and Organization of Care Group; Past Guideline Quality Review Committee and Guideline Medical Editor, The Permanente Federation/Care Management Institute; Reviewer, the Cochrane Collaboration, Musculoskeletal and Low Back Groups and Occupational Medicine Field; Past Reviewer for the American College of Physicians/American Pain Society Low Back Guideline; GRADE Working Group; Performance Measures Reporting Standards Working Group, Guidelines International Network; Member, Kaiser Guideline Quality Committee

Research Grants/Other Support— Principal Investigator for a Community Benefits research grant from Kaiser Permanente (2012); Principal Investigator for a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation grant looking at guideline implementation (awarded to ACOEM in 1996-1997); Principal Investigator for a Robert Wood Johnson Grant (awarded to URAC) to develop workers' compensation performance measures; Contributor for a Robert Wood Johnson Grant (awarded to the University of Colorado) to develop workers' compensation performance measures.

John P. Holland, MD, MPH (Methodology Committee Consultant)

Principal, Holland Associates, Inc., Seattle, Washington; Clinical Assistant Professor, Department of Environmental and Occupational Health Sciences and Department of Orthopaedics, University of Washington, Seattle

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Board of Directors (1994-2005), ACOEM; President (2003-04), ACOEM; Chair, Council on External Affairs (2005-06), ACOEM

Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Chair, Practice Guidelines Committee (1998-2000), ACOEM; Chair, Practice Guidelines Steering Committee (2003-06), ACOEM; Methodology Advisory Group and Peer Reviewer (2001-04), Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition, ACOEM; Head, Research Team (1991-94), Clinical Practice Guidelines on Low Back in Adults, AHCPR; Head, Research Team (1998-2002), Clinical Practice Guidelines for Young Children with Developmental Disabilities, New York State Department of Health

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

Patricia Sinnott, PT, PhD, MPH (Methodology Committee Consultant)

Health Economist, Health Economics Resource Center, VA Palo Alto Health Care System; Assistant Clinical Professor (without salary), Graduate Program in Physical Therapy, University of California, San

Francisco/San Francisco State University

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Reviewer, *Physical Therapy, Pain*; *Topics in Spinal Cord Injury Rehabilitation*; *Journal of Rehabilitation Research and Development*; Member, Task Force on Workforce Issues, American Physical Therapy Association

Guidelines Related Professional Activities— Work Hardening Guideline Committee, California Chapter, American Physical Therapy Association

Research Grants/Other Support—On-going research on spine care, PTSD, spinal cord injury, health economics and health care administration, funded by VA Health Services Research and Development Service and VA Rehabilitation Research and Development Service

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

Michael S. Weiss, MD, MPH, FACOEM, FAAPMR, FAANEM (Methodology Committee Consultant)

St. Lukes Occupational Health Services; Assistant Clinical Professor, Department of Rehabilitation Medicine/Department of Environmental and Occupational Medicine, University of Washington School of Medicine; Consultant, Paradigm Health, Inc.

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Corporate Health Achievement Award reviewer, ACOEM; Board, Northwest Occupational and Environmental Medical Association; Resident Advisory Committee, University of Washington, Department of Environmental and Occupational Medicine

Other Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Member, ACOEM Evidence-based Practice Spine Panel; Member, ACOEM Evidence-based Practice Disability Panel; Chair, ACOEM Evidence-based Practice Opioids Panel; Chair, ACOEM Guidelines Methodology Committee

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

Evidence-based Practice Elbow Panel Members

Roger M. Belcourt, MD, MPH, FACOEM Consultant, OEM

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Past President, Western Occupational and Environmental Medical Association (WOEMA); Member, ACOEM Presidential Appointment to Biosafety Task Force Committee; Past President, Nevada Health Professional Assistance Foundation

Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Member, ACOEM Evidence-based Practice Elbow Panel; Contributing Author, *Guides to the Evaluation of Disease and Injury Causation*, AMA (2008)

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

Kevin Byrne, MD, MPH, FACOEM, FAAFP Medical Division Officer, Wellness Department, Navy Medical Hospital; President, CorpMed, LLC

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Member, Ergonomics Committee, ACOEM

Other Guidelines Related Professional Activities—None

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

Lee S. Glass, MD, JD Associate Medical Director, State of Washington's Department of Labor and Industries

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Past Chair, Coding and Classification Committee, ACOEM; Member, Council on OEM Practice, ACOEM; ACOEM Representative to AMA's Relative Value System Update Committee; ACOEM Representative to AMA's CPT® Editorial Advisory Committee; Committee on Homeland Security, State of Washington Department of Emergency Management; Disaster Preparedness Task Force, Washington State Medical Association; Bioterrorism Preparedness and Response Program Advisory Committee, Washington State's Department of Health; Member, Expert Panel, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Prevention of Prescription Abuse in the Workplace

Other Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Member, APS/ACP Low Back Pain Guideline Project; Member, IOM/ASP Back Pain Panel; Immediate Past Chair, Guidelines Committee, ACOEM; Editor, ACOEM's *Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, 2nd Edition*; and Past Associate Editor, *APG Insights*

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

Harold Hoffman, MD (Panel Chair) Specialist in Occupational and Environmental Medicine; Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of Medicine, Division of Preventive Medicine, University of Alberta; Consultant at the Occupational and Environmental Medicine Clinic, University of Alberta; Occupational Medicine consultant for several industries

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—None

Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Member, Practice Guidelines Committee, ACOEM (Second and Third Edition)

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

J. Mark Melhorn, MD, FAAOS, FACOEM, FAADEP, FACS, FASSH, FAAHS The Hand Center, P. A. ; Clinical Associate Professor, Section of Orthopaedics, Department of Surgery, University of Kansas School of Medicine - Wichita

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations – Past Board Chair, Current Past President and Current Chairman of Nomination Committee, and Member of Ethics & Discipline Committee, American Academy of Disability Evaluating Physicians; Member of Occupational Health Committee, Program Director for Expert Witness Program, and Program Director for Occupational Orthopaedics and Workers' Compensation: A Multidisciplinary Perspective,

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons; Member, Stay-at-Work and Return-to-Work Process Improvement Committee, ACOEM

Other Guidelines Related Professional Activities – Member, ACOEM's Evidence-based Practice Shoulder Panel; Lead Author, Section of Musculoskeletal Upper Extremity, AMA's Guides to the Evaluation of Permanent Impairment, 6th Edition; Member, Advisory Board, The Medical Disability Advisor; Member, Medical Advisory Board, Official Disability Guidelines; Developer and Medical Consultant, CtdMAP (MAP Managers and PHI (Physical Health Index), co-editor of the text "AMA Guides™ to the Evaluation of Work Ability and Return to Work" 2nd edition AMA Press (2011) and the "AMA Guides™ to the Evaluation of Disease and Injury Causation" 2nd edition AMA Press (2014)

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

Jack Richman, MD Executive Vice President and Medical Director, AssessMed Inc. ; President, AssessMed Quality Review

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Chair, Research Committee of the Canadian Institute for the Relief of Pain and Disability (CIRPD)

Other Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Member, Guidelines Committee, ACOEM (2nd Edition); Ontario Government Occupational Disease Panel for the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board; and Chair, Standards Committee, Canadian Society of Medical Evaluators

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

Phillip Zinni III, DO, FAOASM, MS, ATC Managing Director, StemGen Therapeutics; National Medical Director, The Industrial Athlete; Chief Medical Officer, Health Resource Professionals

National, Regional, Local Committee Affiliations—Past President, American Osteopathic Academy of Sports Medicine

Other Guidelines Related Professional Activities—Member, Guidelines Committee, ACOEM (2nd Edition); Member, Guidelines Committee, PPE (3rd Edition)

Research Grants/Other Support—None

Financial/Non-Financial Conflict of Interest—None

REFERENCES

1. Mannion, A. F., Muntener, M., Taimela, S., Dvorak, J. . Comparison of three active therapies for chronic low back pain: results of a randomized clinical trial with one-year follow-up. *Rheumatology*; Jul 2001.

2. Kankaanpaa, M., Taimela, S., Airaksinen, O., Hanninen, O. . The efficacy of active rehabilitation in chronic low back pain. Effect on pain intensity, self-experienced disability, and lumbar fatigability. *Spine*; May 15 1999.

3. Cohen, I., Rainville, J. . Aggressive exercise as treatment for chronic low back pain. *Sports Med*; 2002.

4. Danielsen, J. M., Johnsen, R., Kibsgaard, S. K., Hellevik, E. . Early aggressive exercise for postoperative rehabilitation after discectomy. *Spine*; Apr 15 2000.

5. Faro, F., Wolf, J. M. . Lateral epicondylitis: review and current concepts. *J Hand Surg Am*; Oct 2007.

6. Doran, A., Gresham, G. A., Rushton, N., Watson, C. . Tennis elbow. A clinicopathologic study of 22 cases followed for 2 years. *Acta Orthop Scand*; Dec 1990.

7. Regan, W., Wold, L. E., Coonrad, R., Morrey, B. F. . Microscopic histopathology of chronic refractory lateral epicondylitis. *Am J Sports Med*; Nov-Dec 1992.

8. Eygendaal, D., Rahussen, F. T., Diercks, R. L. . Biomechanics of the elbow joint in tennis players and relation to pathology. *Br J Sports Med*; Nov 2007.

9. Nirschl, RP, Ashman, ES. Elbow tendinopathy: tennis elbow. *Clin Sports Med*; 2003.

10. Gross, D. P., Battie, M. C., Asante, A. . Development and validation of a short-form functional capacity evaluation for use in claimants with low back disorders. *J Occup Rehabil*; Mar 2006.

11. Mayer, TG, Gatchel, RJ. Functional Restoration for Spinal Disorders: The Sports Medicine Approach. 1988.

12. Mayer, TG, Gatchel, RJ, Kishino, N,et al. Objective assessment of spine function following industrial accident. A prospective study with comparison group and one-year follow-up. *Spine*; 1985.

13. Mayer, T. G., Gatchel, R. J., Kishino, N., Keeley, J., Mayer, H., Capra, P., Mooney, V. . A prospective short-term study of chronic low back pain patients utilizing novel objective functional measurement. *Pain*; Apr 1986.

14. Mayer, T. G., Gatchel, R. J., Mayer, H., Kishino, N. D., Keeley, J., Mooney, V. . A prospective two-year study of functional restoration in industrial low back injury. An objective assessment procedure. *JAMA*; Oct 2 1987.

15. Rainville, J., Kim, R. S., Katz, J. N. . A review of 1985 Volvo Award winner in clinical science: objective assessment of spine function following industrial injury: a prospective study with comparison group and 1-year follow-up. *Spine*; Aug 15 2007.

16. Jousset, N., Fanello, S., Bontoux, L., Dubus, V., Billabert, C., Vielle, B., Roquelaure, Y., Penneau-Fontbonne, D., Richard, I. . Effects of functional restoration versus 3 hours per week physical therapy: a randomized controlled study. *Spine*; Mar 1 2004.

17. Hildebrandt, J., Pfingsten, M., Saur, P., Jansen, J. . Prediction of success from a multidisciplinary treatment program for chronic low back pain. *Spine*; May 1 1997.

18. Dorland. Dorland's Illustrated Medical Dictionary 30th edition. 2003.

19. Khan, KM., Cook, JL., Sci, BA., Taunton, JE, Bonar, F. . Overuse tendinosis, not tendinitis. Part 1: a new paradigm for a difficult clinical problem. . *Phys Sports Med.* ; 2000.

20. Shiri, R., Viikari-Juntura, E., Varonen, H., Heliovaara, M. . Prevalence and determinants of lateral and medial epicondylitis: a population study. *Am J Epidemiol*; Dec 1 2006.

21. Bernard, B. P. . Musculoskeletal Disorders and Workplace Factors. A Critical Review of Epidemiologic Evidence for Work-Related Musculoskeletal Disorders of the Neck, Upper Extremity, and Low Back. *National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health*; 1997.

22. Kuorinka, I., Forcier. Work Related Musculoskeletal Disorders (WMSDs): A Reference Book for Prevention. 1995.

23. National Research Council and Institute of Medicine. Musculoskeletal Disorders and the Workplace: Low Back and Upper Extremities. 2001.

24. Bellamy, N, Buchanan, WW, Goldsmith, CH, Campbell, J, Stitt, LW. Validation study of WOMAC: a health status instrument for measuring clinically important patient relevant outcomes to antirheumatic drug therapy in patients with osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. *J Rheumatol*; Dec 1988.

25. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Nonfatal Occupational Illness Data by Category of Illness, 1992-1994. 1995.

26. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Nonfatal Occupational Injuries and Illnesses Requiring Days Away from Work, 2008. 2009.

27. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Workplace Injuries and Illnesses in 1996. 1997.

28. Brogmus, G. E., Sorock, G. S., Webster, B. S. . Recent trends in work-related cumulative trauma disorders of the upper extremities in the United States: an evaluation of possible reasons. *J Occup Environ Med*; Apr 1996.

29. Hales, T. R., Bernard, B. P. . Epidemiology of work-related musculoskeletal disorders. *Orthop Clin North Am*; Oct 1996.

30. Silverstein, B., Welp, E., Nelson, N., Kalat, J. . Claims incidence of work-related disorders of the upper extremities: Washington state, 1987 through 1995. *Am J Public Health*; Dec 1998.

31. Snider, RK (Ed). . Essentials of Musculoskeletal Care. *American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons and American Academy of Pediatrics*; 1997.

32. Goldman, S. B., Brininger, T. L., Schrader, J. W., Koceja, D. M. . A review of clinical tests and signs for the assessment of ulnar neuropathy. *J Hand Ther*; Jul-Sep 2009.

33. Institute for Work & Health. The DASH Outcome Measure. Disabilities of the Arm, Shoulder and Hand.

34. Pransky, G., Feuerstein, M., Himmelstein, J., Katz, J. N., Vickers-Lahti, M. . Measuring functional outcomes in work-related upper extremity disorders. Development and validation of the Upper Extremity Function Scale. *J Occup Environ Med*; Dec 1997.

35. Kryger, A. I., Lassen, C. F., Andersen, J. H. . The role of physical examinations in studies of musculoskeletal disorders of the elbow. *Occup Environ Med*; Nov 2007.

36. Pansky, B. Review of Gross Anatomy, 6th ed. . 1996.

37. Thiese, MS., Hegmann, KT., Garg, A. . Prevalance of lateral epiconylitis and physical examination findings in a cohort at baseline. *Proceedings of the Prevention of Musculoskeletal Disorders Conference. Premus.* ; 2004.

38. Mallen, C. D., Chesterton, L. S., Hay, E. M. . Tennis elbow. *Br Med J*; 2009.

39. Cannon, D. E., Dillingham, T. R., Miao, H., Andary, M. T., Pezzin, L. E. . Musculoskeletal disorders in referrals for suspected cervical radiculopathy. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; Oct 2007.

40. Zendman, A. J., van Venrooij, W. J., Pruijn, G. J. . Use and significance of anti-CCP autoantibodies in rheumatoid arthritis. *Rheumatology*; Jan 2006.

41. Tan, E. M., Feltkamp, T. E., Smolen, J. S., Butcher, B., Dawkins, R., Fritzler, M. J., Gordon, T., Hardin, J. A., Kalden, J. R., Lahita, R. G., Maini, R. N., McDougal, J. S., Rothfield, N. F., Smeenk, R. J., Takasaki, Y., Wiik, A., Wilson, M. R., Koziol, J. A. . Range of antinuclear antibodies in "healthy" individuals. *Arthritis Rheum*; Sep 1997.

42. Ratnoff, W. D. . Inherited deficiencies of complement in rheumatic diseases. *Rheum Dis Clin North Am*; Feb 1996.

43. Egner, W. . The use of laboratory tests in the diagnosis of SLE. *J Clin Pathol*; Jun 2000.

44. Walport, M. J. . Lupus, DNase and defective disposal of cellular debris. *Nat Genet*; Jun 2000.

45. Hsu, J. W., Gould, J. L., Fonseca-Sabune, H., Hausman, M. H. . The emerging role of elbow arthroscopy in chronic use injuries and fracture care. *Hand Clin*; Aug 2009.

46. Dodson, C. C., Nho, S. J., Williams, R. J.,3rd, Altchek, D. W. . Elbow arthroscopy. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*; Oct 2008.

47. Rahusen, F, Surgeon, O, Eygendaal, D. Arthroscopic surgery of the elbow; indications, contra-indications, complications and operative technique. *Surgical Science*; 2011.

48. McKillop, J. H., Fogelman, I. . Bone scintigraphy in benign bone disease. *Br Med J*; Jan 28 1984.

49. Van der Wall, H., Fogelman, I. . Scintigraphy of benign bone disease. *Semin Musculoskelet Radiol*; Dec 2007.

50. Arce, K., Assael, L. A., Weissman, J. L., Markiewicz, M. R. . Imaging findings in bisphosphonate-related osteonecrosis of jaws. *J Oral Maxillofac Surg*; May 2009.

51. Slade, J. F.,3rd, Gillon, T. . Retrospective review of 234 scaphoid fractures and nonunions treated with arthroscopy for union and complications. *Scand J Surg*; 2008.

52. Malizos, K. N., Karantanas, A. H., Varitimidis, S. E., Dailiana, Z. H., Bargiotas, K., Maris, T. . Osteonecrosis of the femoral head: etiology, imaging and treatment. *Eur J Radiol*; Jul 2007.

53. Murakami, H., Kawahara, N., Gabata, T., Nambu, K., Tomita, K. . Vertebral body osteonecrosis without vertebral collapse. *Spine*; Aug 15 2003.

54. Bahrs, C., Rolauffs, B., Sudkamp, N. P., Schmal, H., Eingartner, C., Dietz, K., Pereira, P. L., Weise, K., Lingenfelter, E., Helwig, P. . Indications for computed tomography (CT-) diagnostics in proximal humeral fractures: a comparative study of plain radiography and computed tomography. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*; 2009.

55. Ohashi, K., El-Khoury, G. Y. . Musculoskeletal CT: recent advances and current clinical applications. *Radiol Clin North Am*; May 2009.

56. Haapamaki, V. V., Kiuru, M. J., Mustonen, A. O., Koskinen, S. K. . Multidetector computed tomography in acute joint fractures. *Acta Radiol*; Oct 2005.

57. Miller, A., Green, M., Robinson, D. . Simple rule for calculating normal erythrocyte sedimentation rate. *Br Med J*; Jan 22 1983.

58. Brigden, M. . The erythrocyte sedimentation rate. Still a helpful test when used judiciously. *Postgrad Med*; May 1998.

59. Morley, K. D., Hughes, G. R. . Systemic lupus erythematosus: causative factors and treatment. *Drugs*; Jun 1982.

60. Wener, M. H., Daum, P. R., McQuillan, G. M. . The influence of age, sex, and race on the upper reference limit of serum C-reactive protein concentration. *J Rheumatol*; Oct 2000.

61. Jablecki, CK, Andary, MT, Floeter, MK,et al. Practice parameter: Electrodiagnostic studies in carpal tunnel syndrome. Report of the American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine, American Academy of Neurology, and the American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation. *Neurology*; 2002.

62. Rempel, D, Evanoff, B, Amadio, PC,et al. Consensus criteria for the classification of carpal tunnel syndrome in epidemiologic studies. *Am J Public Health*; 1998.

63. Franzblau, A, Werner, RA, Johnston, E, Torrey, S. Evaluation of current perception threshold testing as a screening procedure for carpal tunnel syndrome among industrial workers. *J Occup Med*; 1994.

64. American Association of Electrodiagnostic Medicine. Practice parameter for electrodiagnostic studies in ulnar neuropathy at the elbow: summary statement. *Muscle Nerve*; 1999.

65. Thibault, M. W., Robinson, L. R., Franklin, G., Fulton-Kehoe, D. . Use of the AAEM guidelines in electrodiagnosis of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*; Apr 2005.

66. Scheiber, C., Meyer, M. E., Dumitresco, B., Demangeat, J. L., Schneegans, O., Javier, R. M., Durkel, J., Grob, J. C., Grucker, D. . The pitfalls of planar three-phase bone scintigraphy in nontraumatic hip avascular osteonecrosis. *Clin Nucl Med*; Jul 1999.

67. Helenius, I., Jalanko, H., Remes, V., Tervahartiala, P., Salminen, S., Sairanen, H., Holmberg, C., Helenius, M., Nietosvaara, Y., Peltonen, J. . Avascular bone necrosis of the hip joint after solid organ transplantation in childhood: a clinical and MRI analysis. *Transplantation*; Jun 27 2006.

68. Sakai, T., Sugano, N., Nishii, T., Hananouchi, T., Yoshikawa, H. . Extent of osteonecrosis on MRI predicts humeral head collapse. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; May 2008.

69. Jones, LC, Hungerford, DS. Osteonecrosis: etiology, diagnosis, and treatment. *Curr Opin Rheumatol*; 2004.

70. Koo, K. H., Kim, R., Ko, G. H., Song, H. R., Jeong, S. T., Cho, S. H. . Preventing collapse in early osteonecrosis of the femoral head. A randomised clinical trial of core decompression. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; Nov 1995.

71. Coombs, RRH, de WM Thomas, R. Avascular necrosis of the hip. *Br J Hospital Med*; 1994.

72. Cherian, SF, Laorr, A, Saleh, KJ, Kuskowski, MA, Bailey, RF, Cheng, EY. Quantifying the extent of femoral head involvement in osteonecrosis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; 2003.

73. Radke, S., Rader, C., Kenn, W., Kirschner, S., Walther, M., Eulert, J. . Transient marrow edema syndrome of the hip: results after core decompression. A prospective MRI-controlled study in 22 patients. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*; Jun 2003.

74. Brunton, L. M., Anderson, M. W., Pannunzio, M. E., Khanna, A. J., Chhabra, A. B. . Magnetic resonance imaging of the elbow: update on current techniques and indications. *J Hand Surg Am*; Jul-Aug 2006.

75. Walton, M. J., Mackie, K., Fallon, M., Butler, R., Breidahl, W., Zheng, M. H., Wang, A. . The reliability and validity of magnetic resonance imaging in the assessment of chronic lateral epicondylitis. *J Hand Surg Am*; Mar 2011.

76. Watrous, B. G., Ho, G.,Jr. . Elbow pain. *Prim Care*; Dec 1988.

77. O'Driscoll, S. W. . Elbow instability. *Acta Orthop Belg*; Dec 1999.

78. Darracq, M. A., Vinson, D. R., Panacek, E. A. . Preservation of active range of motion after acute elbow trauma predicts absence of elbow fracture. *Am J Emerg Med*; Sep 2008.

79. Lennon, R. I., Riyat, M. S., Hilliam, R., Anathkrishnan, G., Alderson, G. . Can a normal range of elbow movement predict a normal elbow x ray?. *Emerg Med J*; Feb 2007.

80. Ward, W. G., Belhobek, G. H., Anderson, T. E. . Arthroscopic elbow findings: correlation with preoperative radiographic studies. *Arthroscopy*; 1992.

81. Hawksworth, C. R., Freeland, P. . Inability to fully extend the injured elbow: an indicator of significant injury. *Arch Emerg Med*; Dec 1991.

82. Frick, M. A. . Imaging of the elbow: a review of imaging findings in acute and chronic traumatic disorders of the elbow. *J Hand Ther*; Apr-Jun 2006.

83. Bancroft, L. W., Berquist, T. H., Peterson, J. J., Kransdorf, M. J. . Imaging of elbow pathology. *Applied Radiology*; 2007.

84. Sauser, D. D., Thordarson, S. H., Fahr, L. M. . Imaging of the elbow. *Radiol Clin North Am*; Sep 1990.

85. Lowden, C., Garvin, G., King, G. J. . Imaging of the elbow following trauma. *Hand Clin*; Nov 2004.

86. Shaffer, B., O'Mara, J. . Common elbow problems: an algorithmic approach. *J Musculoskel Med*; 1997.

87. Spencer, E. E. . Update on radiology studies of the elbow. . *Curr Opin Orthop*; 2007.

88. Park, G. Y., Lee, S. M., Lee, M. Y. . Diagnostic value of ultrasonography for clinical medial epicondylitis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; Apr 2008.

89. Johnson, G. W., Cadwallader, K., Scheffel, S. B., Epperly, T. D. . Treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Am Fam Physician*; Sep 15 2007.

90. Keogh, JP, Nuwayhid, I, Gordon, JL, Gucer, PW. The impact of occupational injury on injured worker and family: outcomes of upper extremity cumulative trauma disorders in Maryland workers. *Am J Ind Med*; 2000.

91. Turner, JA, Franklin, G, Fulton-Kehoe, D. Early predictors of chronic work disability associated with carpal tunnel syndrome: a longitudinal workers' compensation cohort study. *Am J Ind Med*; 2007.

92. Bonzani, PJ, Millender, L, Keelan, B, Mangieri, MG. Factors prolonging disability in work-related cumulative trauma disorders. *J Hand Surg [Am]*; 1997.

93. Gimeno, D, Amick, BC,3rd,, Habeck, RV, Ossmann, J, Katz, JN. The role of job strain on return to work after carpal tunnel surgery. *Occup Environ Med*; 2005.

94. Melhorn, JM. Working with common upper extremity problems. *A Physician's Guide to Return to Work*; 2005.

95. Melhorn, JM. Return to work: filling out the forms. *8th Annual Occupational Orthopaedics and Workers' Compensation: A Multidisciplinary Perspective*; 2006.

96. Melhorn, JM. Carpal tunnel syndrome: three points of view on risk and recovery. *J Workers Comp*; 2006.

97. Talmage, JB, Melhorn, JM. How to think about work ability and work restrictions - capacity, tolerance, and risk. *A Physician's Guide to Return to Work*; 2005.

98. ACOEM Stay-at-Work and Return-to-Work Process Improvement Committee. Preventing needless work disability by helping people stay employed. *J Occup Environ Med*; 2006.

99. Gabel, G. T. . Acute and chronic tendinopathies at the elbow. *Curr Opin Rheumatol*; Mar 1999.

100. Rineer, C. A., Ruch, D. S. . Elbow tendinopathy and tendon ruptures: epicondylitis, biceps and triceps ruptures. *J Hand Surg Am*; Mar 2009.

101. Vidal, A. F., Drakos, M. C., Allen, A. A. . Biceps tendon and triceps tendon injuries. *Clin Sports Med*; Oct 2004.

102. Hobbs, M. C., Koch, J., Bamberger, H. B. . Distal biceps tendinosis: evidence-based review. *J Hand Surg Am*; Jul-Aug 2009.

103. Sutton, K. M., Dodds, S. D., Ahmad, C. S., Sethi, P. M. . Surgical treatment of distal biceps rupture. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*; Mar 2010.

104. van Riet, RP, Morrey, BF, Ho, E, O'Driscoll, SW. Surgical treatment of distal triceps ruptures. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; 2003.

105. Yeh, PC, Dodds, SD, Smart, LR, Mazzocca, AD, Sethi, PM. Distal triceps rupture. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*; 2010.

106. Kraushaar, B. S., Nirschl, R. P. . Tendinosis of the elbow (tennis elbow). Clinical features and findings of histological, immunohistochemical, and electron microscopy studies. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Feb 1999.

107. Saliman, J. D., Beaulieu, C. F., McAdams, T. R. . Ligament and tendon injury to the elbow: clinical, surgical, and imaging features. *Top Magn Reson Imaging*; Oct 2006.

108. Morrey, B. F. . Current concepts in the management of complex elbow trauma. *Surgeon*; Jun 2009.

109. Armstrong, AD, April, D. The terrible triad injury of the elbow. *Curr Opinion Orthopaed*; 2005.

110. Chemama, B., Bonnevialle, N., Peter, O., Mansat, P., Bonnevialle, P. . Terrible triad injury of the elbow: how to improve outcomes?. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res*; Apr 2010.

111. McKee, M. D., Pugh, D. M., Wild, L. M., Schemitsch, E. H., King, G. J. . Standard surgical protocol to treat elbow dislocations with radial head and coronoid fractures. Surgical technique. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Mar 2005.

112. Ring, D., Jupiter, J. B., Zilberfarb, J. . Posterior dislocation of the elbow with fractures of the radial head and coronoid. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Apr 2002.

113. Pugh, D. M., Wild, L. M., Schemitsch, E. H., King, G. J., McKee, M. D. . Standard surgical protocol to treat elbow dislocations with radial head and coronoid fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Jun 2004.

114. Bryan, RS, Morrey, BF. Fractures of the distal humerus. *The Elbow and Its Disorders*; 1985.

115. Mighell, M. A., Harkins, D., Klein, D., Schneider, S., Frankle, M. . Technique for internal fixation of capitellum and lateral trochlea fractures. *J Orthop Trauma*; Nov-Dec 2006.

116. Cheung, E. V. . Fractures of the capitellum. *Hand Clin*; Nov 2007.

117. Ring, D. . Apparent capitellar fractures. *Hand Clin*; Nov 2007.

118. Wong, A. S., Baratz, M. E. . Elbow fractures: distal humerus. *J Hand Surg Am*; Jan 2009.

119. Suresh, S. . Type 4 capitellum fractures: Diagnosis and treatment strategies. *Indian J Orthop*; Jul 2009.

120. Dubberley, J. H., Faber, K. J., Macdermid, J. C., Patterson, S. D., King, G. J. . Outcome after open reduction and internal fixation of capitellar and trochlear fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Jan 2006.

121. McKee, M. D., Jupiter, J. B., Bamberger, H. B. . Coronal shear fractures of the distal end of the humerus. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Jan 1996.

122. Sano, S., Rokkaku, T., Saito, S., Tokunaga, S., Abe, Y., Moriya, H. . Herbert screw fixation of capitellar fractures. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*; May-Jun 2005.

123. Clough, T. M., Jago, E. R., Sidhu, D. P., Markovic, L. . Fractures of the capitellum: a new method of fixation using a maxillofacial plate. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; Mar 2001.

124. Liberman, N., Katz, T., Howard, C. B., Nyska, M. . Fixation of capitellar fractures with the Herbert screw. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*; 1991.

125. Bilic, R., Kolundzic, R., Anticevic, D. . Absorbable implants in surgical correction of a capitellar malunion in an 11-year-old: a case report. *J Orthop Trauma*; Jan 2006.

126. Hirvensalo, E., Bostman, O., Partio, E., Tormala, P., Rokkanen, P. . Fracture of the humeral capitellum fixed with absorbable polyglycolide pins. 1-year follow-up of 8 adults. *Acta Orthop Scand*; Feb 1993.

127. Alvarez, E., Patel, M. R., Nimberg, G., Pearlman, H. S. . Fracture of the capitulum humeri. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Dec 1975.

128. Feldman, M. D. . Arthroscopic excision of type II capitellar fractures. *Arthroscopy*; Dec 1997.

129. Appelboam, A., Reuben, A. D., Benger, J. R., Beech, F., Dutson, J., Haig, S., Higginson, I., Klein, J. A., Le Roux, S., Saranga, S. S., Taylor, R., Vickery, J., Powell, R. J., Lloyd, G. . Elbow extension test to rule out elbow fracture: multicentre, prospective validation and observational study of diagnostic accuracy in adults and children. *Br Med J*; 2008.

130. Valdes, A. M., Loughlin, J., Oene, M. V., Chapman, K., Surdulescu, G. L., Doherty, M., Spector, T. D. . Sex and ethnic differences in the association of ASPN, CALM1, COL2A1, COMP, and FRZB with genetic susceptibility to osteoarthritis of the knee. *Arthritis Rheum*; Jan 2007.

131. Jurmain, RD. Stress and the etiology of osteoarthritis. *Am J Phys Anthrop*; 1977.

132. Kellgren, J. H. . Osteoarthrosis in patients and populations. *Br Med J*; Jul 1 1961.

133. Kellgren, J. H., Lawrence, J. S., Bier, F. . Genetic Factors in Generalized Osteo-Arthrosis. *Ann Rheum Dis*; Jul 1963.

134. Lawrence, J. S. . Generalized osteoarthrosis in a population sample. *Am J Epidemiol*; Nov 1969.

135. Bagge, E., Bjelle, A., Valkenburg, H. A., Svanborg, A. . Prevalence of radiographic osteoarthritis in two elderly European populations. *Rheumatol Int*; 1992.

136. Felson, DT, Lawrence, RC, Dieppe, PA. NIH Conferences - Osteoarthritis: New Insights. Part 1: The disease and its risk factors. *Ann Intern Med*; 2000.

137. Silberberg, R. Obesity and joint disease. *Gerontology*; 1976.

138. Burger, H., van Daele, P. L., Odding, E., Valkenburg, H. A., Hofman, A., Grobbee, D. E., Schutte, H. E., Birkenhager, J. C., Pols, H. A. . Association of radiographically evident osteoarthritis with higher bone mineral density and increased bone loss with age. The Rotterdam Study. *Arthritis Rheum*; Jan 1996.

139. Kellgren, J. H., Lawrence, J. S. . Osteo-arthrosis and disk degeneration in an urban population. *Ann Rheum Dis*; Dec 1958.

140. Meachim, G., Whitehouse, G. H., Pedley, R. B., Nichol, F. E., Owen, R. . An investigation of radiological, clinical and pathological correlations in osteoarthrosis of the hip. *Clin Radiol*; Sep 1980.

141. Kellgren, J. H., Moore, R. . Generalized osteoarthritis and Heberden's nodes. *Br Med J*; Jan 26 1952.

142. Kellgren, J. H. . Primary generalised osteoarthritis. *Bull Rheum Dis*; Jan 1954.

143. Nirschl, R. P., Ashman, E. S. . Tennis elbow tendinosis (epicondylitis). *Instr Course Lect*; 2004.

144. Nirschl, R. P., Rodin, D. M., Ochiai, D. H., Maartmann-Moe, C. . Iontophoretic administration of dexamethasone sodium phosphate for acute epicondylitis. A randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled study. *Am J Sports Med*; Mar-Apr 2003.

145. Adelaar, RS., Maddy, L., Emroch, KS. . Diflunisal vs. naproxen in the management of mild to moderate pain associated with epicondylitis. *Adv Ther.* ; 1987.

146. Simunovic, Z., Trobonjaca, T., Trobonjaca, Z. . Treatment of medial and lateral epicondylitis--tennis and golfer's elbow--with low level laser therapy: a multicenter double blind, placebo-controlled clinical study on 324 patients. *J Clin Laser Med Surg*; Jun 1998.

147. Stahl, S., Kaufman, T. . The efficacy of an injection of steroids for medial epicondylitis. A prospective study of sixty elbows. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Nov 1997.

148. van Rijn, R. M., Huisstede, B. M., Koes, B. W., Burdorf, A. . Associations between work-related factors and specific disorders at the elbow: a systematic literature review. *Rheumatology*; May 2009.

149. Leclerc, A., Landre, M. F., Chastang, J. F., Niedhammer, I., Roquelaure, Y. . Upper-limb disorders in repetitive work. *Scand J Work Environ Health*; Aug 2001.

150. Haahr, J. P., Andersen, J. H. . Physical and psychosocial risk factors for lateral epicondylitis: a population based case-referent study. *Occup Environ Med*; May 2003.

151. Ono, Y., Nakamura, R., Shimaoka, M., Hiruta, S., Hattori, Y., Ichihara, G., Kamijima, M., Takeuchi, Y. . Epicondylitis among cooks in nursery schools. *Occup Environ Med*; Mar 1998.

152. Roto, P., Kivi, P. . Prevalence of epicondylitis and tenosynovitis among meatcutters. *Scand J Work Environ Health*; Jun 1984.

153. Chiang, H. C., Ko, Y. C., Chen, S. S., Yu, H. S., Wu, T. N., Chang, P. Y. . Prevalence of shoulder and upper-limb disorders among workers in the fish-processing industry. *Scand J Work Environ Health*; Apr 1993.

154. Ritz, B. R. . Humeral epicondylitis among gas- and waterworks employees. *Scand J Work Environ Health*; Dec 1995.

155. Hansson, G. A., Balogh, I., Ohlsson, K., Palsson, B., Rylander, L., Skerfving, S. . Impact of physical exposure on neck and upper limb disorders in female workers. *Appl Ergon*; Jun 2000.

156. Luopajarvi, T., Kuorinka, I., Virolainen, M., Holmberg, M. . Prevalence of tenosynovitis and other injuries of the upper extremities in repetitive work. *Scand J Work Environ Health*; 1979.

157. Lindenhovius, A., Henket, M., Gilligan, B. P., Lozano-Calderon, S., Jupiter, J. B., Ring, D. . Injection of dexamethasone versus placebo for lateral elbow pain: a prospective, double-blind, randomized clinical trial. *J Hand Surg Am*; Jul-Aug 2008.

158. Descatha, A., Leclerc, A., Chastang, J. F., Roquelaure, Y. . Medial epicondylitis in occupational settings: prevalence, incidence and associated risk factors. *J Occup Environ Med*; Sep 2003.

159. Labelle, H., Guibert, R. . Efficacy of diclofenac in lateral epicondylitis of the elbow also treated with immobilization. The University of Montreal Orthopaedic Research Group. *Arch Fam Med*; May-Jun 1997.

160. Hay, E. M., Paterson, S. M., Lewis, M., Hosie, G., Croft, P. . Pragmatic randomised controlled trial of local corticosteroid injection and naproxen for treatment of lateral epicondylitis of elbow in primary care. *Br Med J*; Oct 9 1999.

161. Lewis, M., Hay, E. M., Paterson, S. M., Croft, P. . Local steroid injections for tennis elbow: does the pain get worse before it gets better?: Results from a randomized controlled trial. *Clin J Pain*; Jul-Aug 2005.

162. Stull, P. A., Jokl, P. . Comparison of diflunisal and naproxen in the treatment of tennis elbow. *Clin Ther*; 1986.

163. Spacca, G., Cacchio, A., Forgacs, A., Monteforte, P., Rovetta, G. . Analgesic efficacy of a lecithin-vehiculated diclofenac epolamine gel in shoulder periarthritis and lateral epicondylitis: a placebo-controlled, multicenter, randomized, double-blind clinical trial. *Drugs Exp Clin Res*; 2005.

164. Ritchie, L. D. . A clinical evaluation of flurbiprofen LAT and piroxicam gel: a multicentre study in general practice. *Clin Rheumatol*; May 1996.

165. Burnham, R., Gregg, R., Healy, P., Steadward, R. . The effectiveness of topical diclofenac for lateral epicondylitis. *Clin J Sport Med*; Apr 1998.

166. Kroll, M. P., Wiseman, R. L., Guttadauria, M. . A clinical evaluation of piroxicam gel: an open comparative trial with diclofenac gel in the treatment of acute musculoskeletal disorders. *Clin Ther*; May-Jun 1989.

167. Schapira, D., Linn, S., Scharf, Y. . A placebo-controlled evaluation of diclofenac diethylamine salt in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis of the elbow. *Cur Ther Res.* ; 1991.

168. Burton, A. A comparative trial of forearm strap and topical anti-inflammatory as adjuncts to manipulative therapy in tennis elbow. *Manual Med*; 1988.

169. Callaghan, M., Holloway, J. . Towards evidence based emergency medicine: best BETs from the Manchester Royal Infirmary. Tennis elbow and epicondyle clasp. *Emerg Med J*; Apr 2007.

170. Dwars, BJ, Feiter, Pde, Patka, P, Haarman, H. Functional treatment of tennis elbow. A comparative study between an elbow support and physical therapy. . *Sports, Medicine and Health*; 1990;.

171. Faes, M., van den Akker, B., de Lint, J. A., Kooloos, J. G., Hopman, M. T. . Dynamic extensor brace for lateral epicondylitis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; Jan 2006.

172. Struijs, P. A., Kerkhoffs, G. M., Assendelft, W. J., Van Dijk, C. N. . Conservative treatment of lateral epicondylitis: brace versus physical therapy or a combination of both-a randomized clinical trial. *Am J Sports Med*; Mar 2004.

173. Van De Streek, M. D., Van Der Schans, C. P., De Greef, M. H., Postema, K. . The effect of a forearm/hand splint compared with an elbow band as a treatment for lateral epicondylitis. *Prosthet Orthot Int*; Aug 2004.

174. Haker, Lundeberg T. . Elbowband, splintage and steroids in lateral epicondylalgia (tennis elbow). . *Pain Clin*; 1993.

175. Hijmans, J. M., Postema, K., Geertzen, J. H. . Elbow orthoses: a review of literature. *Prosthet Orthot Int*; Dec 2004.

176. Struijs, P. A., Smidt, N., Arola, H., Dijk, C. N., Buchbinder, R., Assendelft, W. J. . Orthotic devices for the treatment of tennis elbow. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*; 2002.

177. Struijs, P. A., Smidt, N., Arola, H., van Dijk, C. N., Buchbinder, R., Assendelft, W. J. . Orthotic devices for tennis elbow: a systematic review. *Br J Gen Pract*; Nov 2001.

178. Borkholder, C. D., Hill, V. A., Fess, E. E. . The efficacy of splinting for lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review. *J Hand Ther*; Apr-Jun 2004.

179. Mellor, S. . Treatment of tennis elbow: the evidence. *Br MEd J*; Aug 9 2003.

180. Bisset, L., Paungmali, A., Vicenzino, B., Beller, E. . A systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical trials on physical interventions for lateral epicondylalgia. *Br J Sports Med*; Jul 2005.

181. Svernlov, B., Adolfsson, L. . Non-operative treatment regime including eccentric training for lateral humeral epicondylalgia. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*; Dec 2001.

182. Foye, P. M., Sullivan, W. J., Sable, A. W., Panagos, A., Zuhosky, J. P., Irwin, R. W. . Industrial medicine and acute musculoskeletal rehabilitation. 3. Work-related musculoskeletal conditions: the

role for physical therapy, occupational therapy, bracing, and modalities. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; Mar 2007.

183. Luginbuhl, R., Brunner, F., Schneeberger, A. G. . No effect of forearm band and extensor strengthening exercises for the treatment of tennis elbow: a prospective randomised study. *Chir Organi Mov*; Jan 2008.

184. Altan, L., Kanat, E. . Conservative treatment of lateral epicondylitis: comparison of two different orthotic devices. *Clin Rheumatol*; Aug 2008.

185. Garg, R., Adamson, G. J., Dawson, P. A., Shankwiler, J. A., Pink, M. M. . A prospective randomized study comparing a forearm strap brace versus a wrist splint for the treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*; Jun 2010.

186. Assendelft, W., Green, S., Buchbinder, R., Struijs, P., Smidt, N. . Tennis elbow. *Br Med J*; Aug 9 2003.

187. Assendelft, W., Green, S., Buchbinder, R., Struijs, P., Smidt, N. . Tennis elbow. *Clin Evid*; Jun 2004.

188. Scher, D. L., Wolf, J. M., Owens, B. D. . Lateral epicondylitis. *Orthopedics*; Apr 2009.

189. Buchbinder, R., Green, S., Struijs, P. . Tennis elbow. *Am Fam Physician*; Mar 1 2007.

190. Buchbinder, R., Green, S. E., Struijs, P. . Tennis elbow. *Clin Evid (Online)*; 2008.

191. Gottschalk, A. W. . Current concepts in conservative mangement of tennis elbow. *Evidence-Based Practice*; 2010.

192. Vrettos, B. C. . A clinical approach to chronic injuries of the elbow. *International SportMed Journal*; 2005.

193. Struijs, P. A., Korthals-de Bos, I. B., van Tulder, M. W., van Dijk, C. N., Bouter, L. M., Assendelft, W. J. . Cost effectiveness of brace, physiotherapy, or both for treatment of tennis elbow. *Br J Sports Med*; Jul 2006.

194. Smidt, N., van der Windt, D. A., Assendelft, W. J., Deville, W. L., Korthals-de Bos, I. B., Bouter, L. M. . Corticosteroid injections, physiotherapy, or a wait-and-see policy for lateral epicondylitis: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*; Feb 23 2002.

195. Bisset, L., Beller, E., Jull, G., Brooks, P., Darnell, R., Vicenzino, B. . Mobilisation with movement and exercise, corticosteroid injection, or wait and see for tennis elbow: randomised trial. *Br Med J*; Nov 4 2006.

196. Newcomer, K. L., Laskowski, E. R., Idank, D. M., McLean, T. J., Egan, K. S. . Corticosteroid injection in early treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Clin J Sport Med*; Oct 2001.

197. Nimgade, A., Sullivan, M., Goldman, R. . Physiotherapy, steroid injections, or rest for lateral epicondylosis? What the evidence suggests. *Pain Pract*; Sep 2005.

198. Trudel, D., Duley, J., Zastrow, I., Kerr, E. W., Davidson, R., MacDermid, J. C. . Rehabilitation for patients with lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review. *J Hand Ther*; Apr-Jun 2004.

199. Stasinopoulos, D., Stasinopoulos, I. . Comparison of effects of Cyriax physiotherapy, a supervised exercise programme and polarized polychromatic non-coherent light (Bioptron light) for the treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Clin Rehabil*; Jan 2006.

200. Pienimaki, T. T., Tarvainen, T. K., Siira, P. T., Vanharanta, H. . Progressive strengthening and stretching exercises and ultrasound for chronic lateral epicondylitis [corrected] [published erratum appears in PHYSIOTHERAPY 1997 Jan; 83(1): 48]. *Physiotherapy*; 1996.

201. Martinez-Silvestrini, J. A., Newcomer, K. L., Gay, R. E., Schaefer, M. P., Kortebein, P., Arendt, K. W. . Chronic lateral epicondylitis: comparative effectiveness of a home exercise program including

stretching alone versus stretching supplemented with eccentric or concentric strengthening. *J Hand Ther*; Oct-Dec 2005.

202. Finestone, H. M., Rabinovitch, D. L. . Tennis elbow no more: practical eccentric and concentric exercises to heal the pain. *Can Fam Physician*; Aug 2008.

203. Nilsson, P., Thom, E., Baigi, A., Marklund, B., Mansson, J. . A prospective pilot study of a multidisciplinary home training programme for lateral epicondylitis. *Musculoskeletal Care*; Mar 2007.

204. Coombes, B. K., Bisset, L., Brooks, P., Khan, A., Vicenzino, B. . Effect of corticosteroid injection, physiotherapy, or both on clinical outcomes in patients with unilateral lateral epicondylalgia: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*; Feb 6 2013.

205. Manias, P., Stasinopoulos, D. . A controlled clinical pilot trial to study the effectiveness of ice as a supplement to the exercise programme for the management of lateral elbow tendinopathy. *Br J Sports Med*; Jan 2006.

206. Runeson, L., Haker, E. . Iontophoresis with cortisone in the treatment of lateral epicondylalgia (tennis elbow)--a double-blind study. *Scand J Med Sci Sports*; Jun 2002.

207. Saggini, R., Zoppi, M., Vecchiet, F., Gatteschi, L., Obletter, G., Giamberardino, M. A. . Comparison of electromotive drug administration with ketorolac or with placebo in patients with pain from rheumatic disease: a double-masked study. *Clin Ther*; Nov-Dec 1996.

208. Baskurt, F., Ozcan, A., Algun, C. . Comparison of effects of phonophoresis and iontophoresis of naproxen in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Clin Rehabil*; Feb 2003.

209. Demirtas, R. N., Oner, C. . The treatment of lateral epicondylitis by iontophoresis of sodium salicylate and sodium diclofenac. *Clin Rehabil*; Feb 1998.

210. Vecchini, L., Grossi, E. . Ionization with diclofenac sodium in rheumatic disorders: a double-blind placebo-controlled trial. *J Int Med Res*; 1984.

211. Lundeberg, T., Abrahamsson, P., Haker, E. . A comparative study of continuous ultrasound, placebo ultrasound and rest in epicondylalgia. *Scand J Rehabil Med*; 1988.

212. Oken, O., Kahraman, Y., Ayhan, F., Canpolat, S., Yorgancioglu, Z. R., Oken, O. F. . The short-term efficacy of laser, brace, and ultrasound treatment in lateral epicondylitis: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *J Hand Ther*; Jan-Mar 2008.

213. Halle, J. S., Franklin, R. J., Karalfa, B. L. . Comparison of four treatment approaches for lateral epicondylitis of the elbow*. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*; 1986.

214. Klaiman, M. D., Shrader, J. A., Danoff, J. V., Hicks, J. E., Pesce, W. J., Ferland, J. . Phonophoresis versus ultrasound in the treatment of common musculoskeletal conditions. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*; Sep 1998.

215. D'Vaz, A. P., Ostor, A. J., Speed, C. A., Jenner, J. R., Bradley, M., Prevost, A. T., Hazleman, B. L. . Pulsed low-intensity ultrasound therapy for chronic lateral epicondylitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Rheumatology*; May 2006.

216. Binder, A., Hodge, G., Greenwood, A. M., Hazleman, B. L., Page Thomas, D. P. . Is therapeutic ultrasound effective in treating soft tissue lesions?. *Br Med J*; Feb 16 1985.

217. Haker, E., Lundeberg, T. . Pulsed ultrasound treatment in lateral epicondylalgia. *Scand J Rehabil Med*; 1991.

218. Smidt, N., Assendelft, W. J., Arola, H., Malmivaara, A., Greens, S., Buchbinder, R., van der Windt, D. A., Bouter, L. M. . Effectiveness of physiotherapy for lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review. *Ann Med*; 2003.

219. van der Windt, D. A., van der Heijden, G. J., van den Berg, S. G., ter Riet, G., de Winter, A. F., Bouter, L. M. . Ultrasound therapy for musculoskeletal disorders: a systematic review. *Pain*; Jun 1999.

220. Sevier, T. L., Wilson, J. K. . Treating lateral epicondylitis. *Sports Med*; Nov 1999.

221. Howitt, S. D. . Lateral epicondylosis: a case study of conservative care utilizing ART and rehabilitation. *J Can Chiropr Assoc*; Sep 2006.

222. Bisset, L. M., Coppieters, M. W., Vicenzino, B. . Sensorimotor deficits remain despite resolution of symptoms using conservative treatment in patients with tennis elbow: a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; Jan 2009.

223. Langen-Pieters, P., Weston, P., Brantingham, J. W. . A randomized, prospective pilot study comparing chiropractic care and ultrasound for the treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Eur J Chiropractic*; 2003.

224. Struijs, P. A., Damen, P. J., Bakker, E. W., Blankevoort, L., Assendelft, W. J., van Dijk, C. N. . Manipulation of the wrist for management of lateral epicondylitis: a randomized pilot study. *Phys Ther*; Jul 2003.

225. Drechsler, W, Knarr, JF, Snyder-Mackler. A comparison of the effectiveness of two treatment regimens for lateral epicondylitis: a randomized trial of clinical interventions. *J Sports Rehabil*; 1997.

226. Nourbakhsh, M. R., Fearon, F. J. . The effect of oscillating-energy manual therapy on lateral epicondylitis: a randomized, placebo-control, double-blinded study. *J Hand Ther*; Jan-Mar 2008.

227. Vicenzino, B., Paungmali, A., Buratowski, S., Wright, A. . Specific manipulative therapy treatment for chronic lateral epicondylalgia produces uniquely characteristic hypoalgesia. *Man Ther*; Nov 2001.

228. Radpasand, M., Owens, E. . Combined multimodal therapies for chronic tennis elbow: pilot study to test protocols for a randomized clinical trial. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*; Sep 2009.

229. McHardy, A., Hoskins, W., Pollard, H., Onley, R., Windsham, R. . Chiropractic treatment of upper extremity conditions: a systematic review. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*; Feb 2008.

230. Fernandez-Carnero, J., Fernandez-de-las-Penas, C., Cleland, J. A. . Immediate hypoalgesic and motor effects after a single cervical spine manipulation in subjects with lateral epicondylalgia. *J Manipulative Physiol Ther*; Nov-Dec 2008.

231. Stratford, P. W., Levy, D. R., Gauldie, S., Miseferi, D., Levy, K. . The evaluation of phonophoresis and friction massage as treatments for extensor carpi radialis tendinitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Physiother Can*; 1989.

232. Viola, L. . A critical review of the current conservative therapies for tennis elbow (lateral epicondylitis). *Australas Chiropr Osteopathy*; Jul 1998.

233. Brosseau, L., Casimiro, L., Milne, S., Robinson, V., Shea, B., Tugwell, P., Wells, G. . Deep transverse friction massage for treating tendinitis. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*; 2002.

234. Buchbinder, R., Green, S. E., Youd, J. M., Assendelft, W. J., Barnsley, L., Smidt, N. . Systematic review of the efficacy and safety of shock wave therapy for lateral elbow pain. *J Rheumatol*; Jul 2006.

235. Chung, B., Wiley, J. P. . Effectiveness of extracorporeal shock wave therapy in the treatment of previously untreated lateral epicondylitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Sports Med*; Oct-Nov 2004.

236. Speed, C. A., Nichols, D., Richards, C., Humphreys, H., Wies, J. T., Burnet, S., Hazleman, B. L. . Extracorporeal shock wave therapy for lateral epicondylitis--a double blind randomised controlled trial. *J Orthop Res*; Sep 2002.

237. Melikyan, E. Y., Shahin, E., Miles, J., Bainbridge, L. C. . Extracorporeal shock-wave treatment for tennis elbow. A randomised double-blind study. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; Aug 2003.

238. Haake, M., Konig, I. R., Decker, T., Riedel, C., Buch, M., Muller, H. H. . Extracorporeal shock wave therapy in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis : a randomized multicenter trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Nov 2002.

239. Melegati, G., Tornese, D., Bandi, M., Rubini, M. . Comparison of two ultrasonographic localization techniques for the treatment of lateral epicondylitis with extracorporeal shock wave therapy: a randomized study. *Clin Rehabil*; Jun 2004.

240. Crowther, M. A., Bannister, G. C., Huma, H., Rooker, G. D. . A prospective, randomised study to compare extracorporeal shock-wave therapy and injection of steroid for the treatment of tennis elbow. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; Jul 2002.

241. Rompe, J. D., Decking, J., Schoellner, C., Theis, C. . Repetitive low-energy shock wave treatment for chronic lateral epicondylitis in tennis players. *Am J Sports Med*; Apr-May 2004.

242. Rompe, J. D., Hope, C., Kullmer, K., Heine, J., Burger, R. . Analgesic effect of extracorporeal shock-wave therapy on chronic tennis elbow. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; Mar 1996.

243. Mehra, A., Zaman, T., Jenkin, A. I. . The use of a mobile lithotripter in the treatment of tennis elbow and plantar fasciitis. *Surgeon*; Oct 2003.

244. Pettrone, F. A., McCall, B. R. . Extracorporeal shock wave therapy without local anesthesia for chronic lateral epicondylitis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Jun 2005.

245. Buchbinder, R., Green, S. E., Youd, J. M., Assendelft, W. J., Barnsley, L., Smidt, N. . Shock wave therapy for lateral elbow pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*; 2005.

246. Radwan, Y. A., ElSobhi, G., Badawy, W. S., Reda, A., Khalid, S. . Resistant tennis elbow: shock-wave therapy versus percutaneous tenotomy. *Int Orthop*; Oct 2008.

247. Sems, A., Dimeff, R., Iannotti, J. P. . Extracorporeal shock wave therapy in the treatment of chronic tendinopathies. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*; Apr 2006.

248. Stasinopoulos, D., Johnson, M. I. . Effectiveness of extracorporeal shock wave therapy for tennis elbow (lateral epicondylitis). *Br J Sports Med*; Mar 2005.

249. Rompe, J. D., Maffulli, N. . Repetitive shock wave therapy for lateral elbow tendinopathy (tennis elbow): a systematic and qualitative analysis. *Br Med Bull*; 2007.

250. Ko, J. Y., Chen, H. S., Chen, L. M. . Treatment of lateral epicondylitis of the elbow with shock waves. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; Jun 2001.

251. Ozturan, K. E., Yucel, I., Cakici, H., Guven, M., Sungur, I. . Autologous blood and corticosteroid injection and extracoporeal shock wave therapy in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Orthopedics*; Feb 2010.

252. Haker, E., Lundeberg, T. . Laser treatment applied to acupuncture points in lateral humeral epicondylalgia. A double-blind study. *Pain*; Nov 1990.

253. Haker, E. H., Lundeberg, T. C. . Lateral epicondylalgia: report of noneffective midlaser treatment. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; Nov 1991.

254. Krasheninnikoff, M., Ellitsgaard, N., Rogvi-Hansen, B., Zeuthen, A., Harder, K., Larsen, R., Gaardbo, H. . No effect of low power laser in lateral epicondylitis. *Scand J Rheumatol*; 1994.

255. Vasseljen, O.,Jr., Hoeg, N., Kjeldstad, B., Johnsson, A., Larsen, S. . Low level laser versus placebo in the treatment of tennis elbow. *Scand J Rehabil Med*; 1992.

256. Basford, J. R., Sheffield, C. G., Cieslak, K. R. . Laser therapy: a randomized, controlled trial of the effects of low intensity Nd:YAG laser irradiation on lateral epicondylitis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; Nov 2000.

257. Haker, E., Lundeberg, T. . Is low-energy laser treatment effective in lateral epicondylalgia?. *J Pain Symptom Manage*; May 1991.

258. Vasseljen, O.,Jr. . Low-level laser versus traditional physiotherapy in the treatment of tennis elbow. . *Physiotherapy*; 1992.

259. Stasinopoulos, D. I., Johnson, M. I. . Effectiveness of low-level laser therapy for lateral elbow tendinopathy. *Photomed Laser Surg*; Aug 2005.

260. Lam, L. K., Cheing, G. L. . Effects of 904-nm low-level laser therapy in the management of lateral epicondylitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Photomed Laser Surg*; Apr 2007.

261. Stergioulas, A. . Effects of low-level laser and plyometric exercises in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Photomed Laser Surg*; Jun 2007.

262. Chang, W. D., Wu, J. H., Yang, W. J., Jiang, J. A. . Therapeutic effects of low-level laser on lateral epicondylitis from differential interventions of Chinese-Western medicine: systematic review. *Photomed Laser Surg*; Jun 2010.

263. Bjordal, J. M., Lopes-Martins, R. A., Joensen, J., Couppe, C., Ljunggren, A. E., Stergioulas, A., Johnson, M. I. . A systematic review with procedural assessments and meta-analysis of low level laser therapy in lateral elbow tendinopathy (tennis elbow). *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*; 2008.

264. Stasinopoulos, D., Stasinopoulos, I., Pantelis, M., Stasinopoulou, K. . Comparing the effects of exercise program and low-level laser therapy with exercise program and polarized polychromatic non-coherent light (bioptron light) on the treatment of lateral elbow tendinopathy. *Photomed Laser Surg*; Jun 2009.

265. Molsberger, A., Hille, E. . The analgesic effect of acupuncture in chronic tennis elbow pain. *Br J Rheumatol*; Dec 1994.

266. Fink, M., Wolkenstein, E., Luennemann, M., Gutenbrunner, C., Gehrke, A., Karst, M. . Chronic epicondylitis: effects of real and sham acupuncture treatment: a randomised controlled patient- and examiner-blinded long-term trial. *Forsch Komplementarmed Klass Naturheilkd*; 2002.

267. Fink, M., Wolkenstein, E., Karst, M., Gehrke, A. . Acupuncture in chronic epicondylitis: a randomized controlled trial. *Rheumatology*; Feb 2002.

268. Yong, H, Zhonghua, F, Dongbin, X, Rangke, W. Introduction to floating acupuncture : Clinical study on the treatment of lateral epicondylitis. *Am J Acupuncture*; 1998.

269. Davidson, J. H., Vandervoort, A., Lessard, L., Miller, L. . The effect of acupuncture versus ultrasound on pain level, grip strength and disability in individuals with lateral epicondylitis: a pilot study. *Physiotherapy Canada*; 2001.

270. Green, S., Buchbinder, R., Barnsley, L., Hall, S., White, M., Smidt, N., Assendelft, W. . Acupuncture for lateral elbow pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*; 2002.

271. Trinh, K. V., Phillips, S. D., Ho, E., Damsma, K. . Acupuncture for the alleviation of lateral epicondyle pain: a systematic review. *Rheumatology*; Sep 2004.

272. Birch, S., Hesselink, J. K., Jonkman, F. A., Hekker, T. A., Bos, A. . Clinical research on acupuncture. Part 1. What have reviews of the efficacy and safety of acupuncture told us so far?. *J Altern Complement Med*; Jun 2004.

273. Haker, E, Lundeberg, T. Acupuncture treatment in epicondylalgia: a comparative study of two acupuncture techniques. *Clin J Pain*; 1990.

274. Tsui, P., Leung, M. C. . Comparison of the effectiveness between manual acupuncture and electro-acupuncture on patients with tennis elbow. *Acupunct Electrother Res*; 2002.

275. Uzunca, K., Birtane, M., Tastekin, N. . Effectiveness of pulsed electromagnetic field therapy in lateral epicondylitis. *Clin Rheumatol*; Jan 2007.

276. Calfee, R. P., Patel, A., DaSilva, M. F., Akelman, E. . Management of lateral epicondylitis: current concepts. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*; Jan 2008.

277. Price, R., Sinclair, H., Heinrich, I., Gibson, T. . Local injection treatment of tennis elbow--hydrocortisone, triamcinolone and lignocaine compared. *Br J Rheumatol*; Feb 1991.

278. Verhaar, J. A., Walenkamp, G. H., van Mameren, H., Kester, A. D., van der Linden, A. J. . Local corticosteroid injection versus Cyriax-type physiotherapy for tennis elbow. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; Jan 1996.

279. Altay, T., Gunal, I., Ozturk, H. . Local injection treatment for lateral epicondylitis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; May 2002.

280. Saartok, T., Eriksson, E. . Randomized trial of oral naproxen or local injection of betamethasone in lateral epicondylitis of the humerus. *Orthopedics*; Feb 1986.

281. Solveborn, S. A., Buch, F., Mallmin, H., Adalberth, G. . Cortisone injection with anesthetic additives for radial epicondylalgia (tennis elbow). *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; Jul 1995.

282. Torp-Pedersen, T. E., Torp-Pedersen, S. T., Qvistgaard, E., Bliddal, H. . Effect of glucocorticosteroid injections in tennis elbow verified on colour Doppler ultrasonography: evidence of inflammation. *Br J Sports Med*; Dec 2008.

283. Barr, S., Cerisola, F. L., Blanchard, V. . Effectiveness of corticosteroid injections compared with physiotherapeutic interventions for lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review. *Physiotherapy*; Dec 2009.

284. Coombes, B. K., Bisset, L., Vicenzino, B. . Efficacy and safety of corticosteroid injections and other injections for management of tendinopathy: a systematic review of randomised controlled trials. *Lancet*; Nov 20 2010.

285. Weitoft, T., Forsberg, C. . Importance of immobilization after intraarticular glucocorticoid treatment for elbow synovitis: a randomized controlled study. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*; May 2010.

286. Krogh, T. P., Fredberg, U., Stengaard-Pedersen, K., Christensen, R., Jensen, P., Ellingsen, T. . Treatment of Lateral Epicondylitis With Platelet-Rich Plasma, Glucocorticoid, or Saline: A Randomized, Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *Am J Sports Med*; Jan 17 2013.

287. Hayton, M. J., Santini, A. J., Hughes, P. J., Frostick, S. P., Trail, I. A., Stanley, J. K. . Botulinum toxin injection in the treatment of tennis elbow. A double-blind, randomized, controlled, pilot study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Mar 2005.

288. Wong, S. M., Hui, A. C., Tong, P. Y., Poon, D. W., Yu, E., Wong, L. K. . Treatment of lateral epicondylitis with botulinum toxin: a randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med*; Dec 6 2005.

289. Placzek, R., Drescher, W., Deuretzbacher, G., Hempfing, A., Meiss, A. L. . Treatment of chronic radial epicondylitis with botulinum toxin A. A double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomized multicenter study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Feb 2007.

290. Lin, Y. C., Tu, Y. K., Chen, S. S., Lin, I. L., Chen, S. C., Guo, H. R. . Comparison between botulinum toxin and corticosteroid injection in the treatment of acute and subacute tennis elbow: a prospective, randomized, double-blind, active drug-controlled pilot study. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*; Aug 2010.

291. Espandar, R., Heidari, P., Rasouli, M. R., Saadat, S., Farzan, M., Rostami, M., Yazdanian, S., Mortazavi, S. M. . Use of anatomic measurement to guide injection of botulinum toxin for the management of chronic lateral epicondylitis: a randomized controlled trial. *CMAJ*; May 18 2010.

292. Kalichman, L., Bannuru, R. R., Severin, M., Harvey, W. . Injection of botulinum toxin for treatment of chronic lateral epicondylitis: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*; Jun 2011.

293. Sampson, S., Gerhardt, M., Mandelbaum, B. . Platelet rich plasma injection grafts for musculoskeletal injuries: a review. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med*; Dec 2008.

294. Mishra, A., Pavelko, T. . Treatment of chronic elbow tendinosis with buffered platelet-rich plasma. *Am J Sports Med*; Nov 2006.

295. Mishra, A., Woodall, J.,Jr., Vieira, A. . Treatment of tendon and muscle using platelet-rich plasma. *Clin Sports Med*; Jan 2009.

296. Foster, T. E., Puskas, B. L., Mandelbaum, B. R., Gerhardt, M. B., Rodeo, S. A. . Platelet-rich plasma: from basic science to clinical applications. *Am J Sports Med*; Nov 2009.

297. Hall, M. P., Band, P. A., Meislin, R. J., Jazrawi, L. M., Cardone, D. A. . Platelet-rich plasma: current concepts and application in sports medicine. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*; Oct 2009.

298. de Vos, R. J., van Veldhoven, P. L., Moen, M. H., Weir, A., Tol, J. L., Maffulli, N. . Autologous growth factor injections in chronic tendinopathy: a systematic review. *Br Med Bull*; 2010.

299. Thanasas, C, Papadimitriou, G, Charalambidis, C, Paraskevopoulos, I, Papanikolaou, A. Platelet-rich plasma versus autologous whole blood for the treatment of chronic lateral elbow epicondylitis: a randomized controlled clinical trial. *Am J Sports Med*; 2011.

300. Kazemi, M., Azma, K., Tavana, B., Rezaiee Moghaddam, F., Panahi, A. . Autologous blood versus corticosteroid local injection in the short-term treatment of lateral elbow tendinopathy: a randomized clinical trial of efficacy. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*; Aug 2010.

301. Creaney, L., Wallace, A., Curtis, M., Connell, D. . Growth factor-based therapies provide additional benefit beyond physical therapy in resistant elbow tendinopathy: a prospective, single-blind, randomised trial of autologous blood injections versus platelet-rich plasma injections. *Br J Sports Med*; Mar 28 2011.

302. Rabago, D., Best, T. M., Zgierska, A. E., Zeisig, E., Ryan, M., Crane, D. . A systematic review of four injection therapies for lateral epicondylosis: prolotherapy, polidocanol, whole blood and platelet-rich plasma. *Br J Sports Med*; Jul 2009.

303. Zeisig, E., Fahlstrom, M., Ohberg, L., Alfredson, H. . Pain relief after intratendinous injections in patients with tennis elbow: results of a randomised study. *Br J Sports Med*; Apr 2008.

304. Petrella, R. J., Cogliano, A., Decaria, J., Mohamed, N., Lee, R. . Management of tennis elbow with sodium hyaluronate periarticular injections. *Sports Med Arthrosc Rehabil Ther Technol*; 2010.

305. Akermark, C., Crone, H., Elsasser, U., Forsskahl, B. . Glycosaminoglycan polysulfate injections in lateral humeral epicondylalgia: a placebo-controlled double-blind trial. *Int J Sports Med*; Apr 1995.

306. McShane, J. M., Shah, V. N., Nazarian, L. N. . Sonographically guided percutaneous needle tenotomy for treatment of common extensor tendinosis in the elbow: is a corticosteroid necessary?. *J Ultrasound Med*; Aug 2008.

307. Housner, J. A., Jacobson, J. A., Misko, R. . Sonographically guided percutaneous needle tenotomy for the treatment of chronic tendinosis. *J Ultrasound Med*; Sep 2009.

308. Leppilahti, J., Raatikainen, T., Pienimaki, T., Hanninen, A., Jalovaara, P. . Surgical treatment of resistant tennis elbow. A prospective, randomised study comparing decompression of the posterior

interosseous nerve and lengthening of the tendon of the extensor carpi radialis brevis muscle. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg*; Jun 2001.

309. Dunkow, P. D., Jatti, M., Muddu, B. N. . A comparison of open and percutaneous techniques in the surgical treatment of tennis elbow. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; Jul 2004.

310. Keizer, S. B., Rutten, H. P., Pilot, P., Morre, H. H., v Os, J. J., Verburg, A. D. . Botulinum toxin injection versus surgical treatment for tennis elbow: a randomized pilot study. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; Aug 2002.

311. Nirschl, R. P. . Lateral extensor release for tennis elbow. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Jun 1994.

312. Lo, M. Y., Safran, M. R. . Surgical treatment of lateral epicondylitis: a systematic review. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; Oct 2007.

313. Yerger, B., Turner, T. . Percutaneous extensor tenotomy for chronic tennis elbow: an office procedure. *Orthopedics*; Oct 1985.

314. Bosworth, D. M. . Surgical treatment of tennis elbow; a follow-up study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Dec 1965.

315. Rosen, M. J., Duffy, F. P., Miller, E. H., Kremchek, E. J. . Tennis elbow syndrome: results of the "lateral release" procedure. *Ohio State Med J*; Feb 1980.

316. Baumgard, S. H., Schwartz, D. R. . Percutaneous release of the epicondylar muscles for humeral epicondylitis. *Am J Sports Med*; Jul-Aug 1982.

317. Khashaba, A. . Nirschl tennis elbow release with or without drilling. *Br J Sports Med*; Jun 2001.

318. Buchbinder, R., Green, S., Bell, S., Barnsley, L., Smidt, N., Assendelft, W. J. . Surgery for lateral elbow pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*; 2002.

319. Coleman, B., Quinlan, J. F., Matheson, J. A. . Surgical treatment for lateral epicondylitis: a long-term follow-up of results. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*; Apr 2010.

320. Buchbinder, R., Johnston, R. V., Barnsley, L., Assendelft, W. J., Bell, S. N., Smidt, N. . Surgery for lateral elbow pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*; 2011.

321. Goldberg, E. J., Abraham, E., Siegel, I. . The surgical treatment of chronic lateral humeral epicondylitis by common extensor release. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; Aug 1988.

322. Verhaar, J., Walenkamp, G., Kester, A., van Mameren, H., van der Linden, T. . Lateral extensor release for tennis elbow. A prospective long-term follow-up study. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Jul 1993.

323. Tan, P. K., Lam, K. S., Tan, S. K. . Results of modified Bosworth's operation for persistent or recurrent tennis elbow. *Singapore Med J*; Aug 1989.

324. Kumar, V. S., Shetty, A. A., Ravikumar, K. J., Fordyce, M. J. . Tennis elbow--outcome following the Garden procedure: a retrospective study. *J Orthop Surg*; Dec 2004.

325. Peart, R. E., Strickler, S. S., Schweitzer, K. M.,Jr. . Lateral epicondylitis: a comparative study of open and arthroscopic lateral release. *Am J Orthop*; Nov 2004.

326. Grundberg, A. B., Dobson, J. F. . Percutaneous release of the common extensor origin for tennis elbow. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*; Jul 2000.

327. Owens, B. D., Murphy, K. P., Kuklo, T. R. . Arthroscopic release for lateral epicondylitis. *Arthroscopy*; Jul 2001.

328. Baker, CL, Cummings, PD. Arthroscopic management of miscellaneous elbow disorders. *Oper Tech Sports Med*; 1998.

329. Baker, C. L.,Jr., Murphy, K. P., Gottlob, C. A., Curd, D. T. . Arthroscopic classification and treatment of lateral epicondylitis: two-year clinical results. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*; Nov-Dec 2000.

330. Savoie, F. H.,3rd. Guidelines to becoming an expert elbow arthroscopist. *Arthroscopy*; Nov 2007.

331. Meknas, K., Odden-Miland, A., Mercer, J. B., Castillejo, M., Johansen, O. . Radiofrequency microtenotomy: a promising method for treatment of recalcitrant lateral epicondylitis. *Am J Sports Med*; Oct 2008.

332. Latko, W. A., Armstrong, T. J., Franzblau, A., Ulin, S. S., Werner, R. A., Albers, J. W. . Cross-sectional study of the relationship between repetitive work and the prevalence of upper limb musculoskeletal disorders. *Am J Ind Med*; Aug 1999.

333. Franzblau, A, Armstrong, TJ, Werner, RA, Ulin, SS. A cross-sectional assessment of the ACGIH TLV for hand activity level. *J Occup Rehabil*; 2005.

334. Moore, JS, Garg, A. The Strain Index: a proposed method to analyze jobs for risk of distal upper extremity disorders. *Am Indus Hyg Assoc J*; 1995.

335. Shell, D., Perkins, R., Cosgarea, A. . Septic olecranon bursitis: recognition and treatment. *J Am Board Fam Pract*; May-Jun 1995.

336. Cardone, D. A., Tallia, A. F. . Diagnostic and therapeutic injection of the elbow region. *Am Fam Physician*; Dec 1 2002.

337. Salzman, K. L., Lillegard, W. A., Butcher, J. D. . Upper extremity bursitis. *Am Fam Physician*; Nov 1 1997.

338. Weinstein, P. S., Canoso, J. J., Wohlgethan, J. R. . Long-term follow-up of corticosteroid injection for traumatic olecranon bursitis. *Ann Rheum Dis*; Feb 1984.

339. Smith, D. L., McAfee, J. H., Lucas, L. M., Kumar, K. L., Romney, D. M. . Treatment of nonseptic olecranon bursitis. A controlled, blinded prospective trial. *Arch Intern Med*; Nov 1989.

340. Tsai, T. M., Syed, S. A. . A transverse skin incision approach for decompression of pronator teres syndrome. *J Hand Surg Br*; Feb 1994.

341. Morris, H. H., Peters, B. H. . Pronator syndrome: clinical and electrophysiological features in seven cases. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*; May 1976.

342. Hartz, C. R., Linscheid, R. L., Gramse, R. R., Daube, J. R. . The pronator teres syndrome: compressive neuropathy of the median nerve. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Jul 1981.

343. Neal, S., Fields, K. B. . Peripheral nerve entrapment and injury in the upper extremity. *Am Fam Physician*; Jan 15 2010.

344. Tsai, P., Steinberg, D. R. . Median and radial nerve compression about the elbow. *Instr Course Lect*; 2008.

345. Dang, A. C., Rodner, C. M. . Unusual compression neuropathies of the forearm, part II: median nerve. *J Hand Surg Am*; Dec 2009.

346. Rehak, D. C. . Pronator syndrome. *Clin Sports Med*; Jul 2001.

347. Lee, M. J., LaStayo, P. C. . Pronator syndrome and other nerve compressions that mimic carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*; Oct 2004.

348. Johnson, R. K., Spinner, M., Shrewsbury, M. M. . Median nerve entrapment syndrome in the proximal forearm. *J Hand Surg Am*; Jan 1979.

349. Carlson, N., Logigian, E. L. . Radial neuropathy. *Neurol Clin*; Aug 1999.

350. Nakano, K. K. . Nerve entrapment syndromes. *Curr Opin Rheumatol*; Mar 1997.

351. Plate, A. M., Green, S. M. . Compressive radial neuropathies. *Instr Course Lect*; 2000.

352. Henry, M., Stutz, C. . A unified approach to radial tunnel syndrome and lateral tendinosis. *Tech Hand Up Extrem Surg*; Dec 2006.

353. Campbell, W. W., Landau, M. E. . Controversial entrapment neuropathies. *Neurosurg Clin N Am*; Oct 2008.

354. Muhammed, N., Campbell, P., Smith, I. S. . Peripheral nerve entrapment syndromes: diagnosis and management. *Br J Hosp Med*; Feb 15-28 1995.

355. Latinovic, R., Gulliford, M. C., Hughes, R. A. . Incidence of common compressive neuropathies in primary care. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*; Feb 2006.

356. Moss, S. H., Switzer, H. E. . Radial tunnel syndrome: a spectrum of clinical presentations. *J Hand Surg Am*; Jul 1983.

357. Konjengbam, M., Elangbam, J. . Radial nerve in the radial tunnel: anatomic sites of entrapment neuropathy. *Clin Anat*; Jan 2004.

358. Cleary, C. K. . Management of radial tunnel syndrome: a therapist's clinical perspective. *J Hand Ther*; Apr-Jun 2006.

359. Stanley, J. . Radial tunnel syndrome: a surgeon's perspective. *J Hand Ther*; Apr-Jun 2006.

360. Toussaint, C. P., Zager, E. L. . What's new in common upper extremity entrapment neuropathies. *Neurosurg Clin N Am*; Oct 2008.

361. Bencardino, J. T., Rosenberg, Z. S. . Entrapment neuropathies of the shoulder and elbow in the athlete. *Clin Sports Med*; Jul 2006.

362. Roquelaure, Y., Raimbeau, G., Dano, C., Martin, Y. H., Pelier-Cady, M. C., Mechali, S., Benetti, F., Mariel, J., Fanello, S., Penneau-Fontbonne, D. . Occupational risk factors for radial tunnel syndrome in industrial workers. *Scand J Work Environ Health*; Dec 2000.

363. Elhassan, B., Steinmann, S. P. . Entrapment neuropathy of the ulnar nerve. *J Am Acad Orthop Surg*; Nov 2007.

364. Dawson, D. M. . Entrapment neuropathies of the upper extremities. *N Engl J Med*; Dec 30 1993.

365. Cutts, S. . Cubital tunnel syndrome. *Postgrad Med J*; Jan 2007.

366. Palmer, B. A., Hughes, T. B. . Cubital tunnel syndrome. *J Hand Surg Am*; Jan 2010.

367. Mondelli, M, Aretini, A, Rossi, S. Ulnar neuropathy at the elbow in diabetes. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*; 2009.

368. . Personal Communication, PREMUS, Zurich on July 13, 2004.

369. Descatha, A., Leclerc, A., Chastang, J. F., Roquelaure, Y. . Incidence of ulnar nerve entrapment at the elbow in repetitive work. *Scand J Work Environ Health*; Jun 2004.

370. Andreisek, G., Crook, D. W., Burg, D., Marincek, B., Weishaupt, D. . Peripheral neuropathies of the median, radial, and ulnar nerves: MR imaging features. *Radiographics*; Sep-Oct 2006.

371. Geutjens, G. G., Langstaff, R. J., Smith, N. J., Jefferson, D., Howell, C. J., Barton, N. J. . Medial epicondylectomy or ulnar-nerve transposition for ulnar neuropathy at the elbow?. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; Sep 1996.

372. Svernlov, B., Larsson, M., Rehn, K., Adolfsson, L. . Conservative treatment of the cubital tunnel syndrome. *J Hand Surg Eur Vol*; Apr 2009.

373. O'Connor, D., Marshall, S., Massy-Westropp, N. . Non-surgical treatment (other than steroid injection) for carpal tunnel syndrome. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*; 2003.

374. Giele, H. Evidence-based treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Curr Orthop*; 2001.

375. de Pablo, P, Katz, JN. Pharmacotherapy of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Expert Opin Pharmacother*; 2003.

376. Banta, C. A. . A prospective, nonrandomized study of iontophoresis, wrist splinting, and antiinflammatory medication in the treatment of early-mild carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Occup Med*; Feb 1994.

377. Celiker, R., Arslan, S., Inanici, F. . Corticosteroid injection vs. nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drug and splinting in carpal tunnel syndrome. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*; Mar 2002.

378. Chang, M. H., Chiang, H. T., Lee, S. S., Ger, L. P., Lo, Y. K. . Oral drug of choice in carpal tunnel syndrome. *Neurology*; Aug 1998.

379. Chang, M. H., Ger, L. P., Hsieh, P. F., Huang, S. Y. . A randomised clinical trial of oral steroids in the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome: a long term follow up. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*; Dec 2002.

380. Herskovitz, S., Berger, A. R., Lipton, R. B. . Low-dose, short-term oral prednisone in the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Neurology*; Oct 1995.

381. Mishra, S., Prabhakar, S., Lal, V., Modi, M., Das, C. P., Khurana, D. . Efficacy of splinting and oral steroids in the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome: a prospective randomized clinical and electrophysiological study. *Neurol India*; Sep 2006.

382. Wong, S. M., Hui, A. C., Tang, A., Ho, P. C., Hung, L. K., Wong, K. S., Kay, R., Li, E. . Local vs systemic corticosteroids in the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Neurology*; Jun 12 2001.

383. Hui, A. C., Wong, S. M., Tang, A., Mok, V., Hung, L. K., Wong, K. S. . Long-term outcome of carpal tunnel syndrome after conservative treatment. *Int J Clin Pract*; Apr 2004.

384. Hui, A. C., Wong, S. M., Wong, K. S., Li, E., Kay, R., Yung, P., Hung, L. K., Yu, L. M. . Oral steroid in the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Ann Rheum Dis*; Aug 2001.

385. Ellis, J. M., Folkers, K., Levy, M., Shizukuishi, S., Lewandowski, J., Nishii, S., Schubert, H. A., Ulrich, R. . Response of vitamin B-6 deficiency and the carpal tunnel syndrome to pyridoxine. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*; Dec 1982.

386. Spooner, G. R., Desai, H. B., Angel, J. F., Reeder, B. A., Donat, J. R. . Using pyridoxine to treat carpal tunnel syndrome. Randomized control trial. *Can Fam Physician*; Oct 1993.

387. Stransky, M., Rubin, A., Lava, N. S., Lazaro, R. P. . Treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome with vitamin B6: a double-blind study. *South Med J*; Jul 1989.

388. Guzman, FJL, Gonzalez-Buitrago, JM, de Arriba, F, Mateos, F, Moyano, JC, Lopez-Alburquerque, T. Carpal tunnel syndrome and vitamin B6. *Klin Wochenschr*; 1989.

389. Keniston, R. C., Nathan, P. A., Leklem, J. E., Lockwood, R. S. . Vitamin B6, vitamin C, and carpal tunnel syndrome. A cross-sectional study of 441 adults. *J Occup Environ Med*; Oct 1997.

390. Franzblau, A., Rock, C. L., Werner, R. A., Albers, J. W., Kelly, M. P., Johnston, E. C. . The relationship of vitamin B6 status to median nerve function and carpal tunnel syndrome among active industrial workers. *J Occup Environ Med*; May 1996.

391. Sato, Y., Honda, Y., Iwamoto, J., Kanoko, T., Satoh, K. . Amelioration by mecobalamin of subclinical carpal tunnel syndrome involving unaffected limbs in stroke patients. *J Neurol Sci*; Apr 15 2005.

392. Nalamachu, S., Crockett, R. S., Gammaitoni, A. R., Gould, E. M. . A comparison of the lidocaine patch 5% vs naproxen 500 mg twice daily for the relief of pain associated with carpal tunnel syndrome: a 6-week, randomized, parallel-group study. *MedGenMed*; 2006.

393. Nalamachu, S., Crockett, R. S., Mathur, D. . Lidocaine patch 5 for carpal tunnel syndrome: how it compares with injections: a pilot study. *J Fam Pract*; Mar 2006.

394. Galer, B. S., Rowbotham, M. C., Perander, J., Friedman, E. . Topical lidocaine patch relieves postherpetic neuralgia more effectively than a vehicle topical patch: results of an enriched enrollment study. *Pain*; Apr 1999.

395. Poyhia, R., Vainio, A. . Topically administered ketamine reduces capsaicin-evoked mechanical hyperalgesia. *Clin J Pain*; Jan 2006.

396. Gammaitoni, A., Gallagher, R. M., Welz-Bosna, M. . Topical ketamine gel: possible role in treating neuropathic pain. *Pain Med*; Mar 2000.

397. Carter, R., Aspy, C. B., Mold, J. . The effectiveness of magnet therapy for treatment of wrist pain attributed to carpal tunnel syndrome. *J Fam Pract*; Jan 2002.

398. Weintraub, M. I., Cole, S. P. . A randomized controlled trial of the effects of a combination of static and dynamic magnetic fields on carpal tunnel syndrome. *Pain Med*; Jul-Aug 2008.

399. Szabo, R. M., Kwak, C. . Natural history and conservative management of cubital tunnel syndrome. *Hand Clin*; Aug 2007.

400. Branco, K., Naeser, M. A. . Carpal tunnel syndrome: clinical outcome after low-level laser acupuncture, microamps transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation, and other alternative therapies--an open protocol study. *J Altern Complement Med*; Feb 1999.

401. Padua, L., Giannini, F., Girlanda, P., Insola, A., Luchetti, R., Lo Monaco, M., Padua, R., Uncini, A., Tonali, P. . Usefulness of segmental and comparative tests in the electrodiagnosis of carpal tunnel syndrome: the Italian multicenter study. Italian CTS Study Group. *Ital J Neurol Sci*; Oct 1999.

402. Fitz-Ritson, D. Lasers and their therapeutic applications in chiropractic. *J Can Chiropr Assoc*; 2001.

403. Bakhtiary, A. H., Rashidy-Pour, A. . Ultrasound and laser therapy in the treatment of carpal tunnel syndrome. *Aust J Physiother*; 2004.

404. Oztas, O., Turan, B., Bora, I., Karakaya, M. K. . Ultrasound therapy effect in carpal tunnel syndrome. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; Dec 1998.

405. Ebenbichler, G. R., Resch, K. L., Nicolakis, P., Wiesinger, G. F., Uhl, F., Ghanem, A. H., Fialka, V. . Ultrasound treatment for treating the carpal tunnel syndrome: randomised "sham" controlled trial. *Br Med J*; Mar 7 1998.

406. Curtis, BF. Traumatic ulnar neuritis; transplantation of the nerve. *J Nerv Ment Dis*; 1898.

407. Leffert, R. D. . Anterior submuscular transposition of the ulnar nerves by the Learmonth technique. *J Hand Surg Am*; Mar 1982.

408. Gay, J. R., Love, J. G. . Diagnosis and treatment of tardy paralysis of the ulnar nerve; based on a study of 100 cases. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; Oct 1947.

409. Harrison, M. J., Nurick, S. . Results of anterior transposition of the ulnar nerve for ulnar neuritis. *Br Med J*; Jan 3 1970.

410. King, T. . The treatment of traumatic ulnar neuritis; mobilization of the ulnar nerve at the elbow by removal of the medial epicondyle and adjacent bone. *Aust N Z J Surg*; Aug 1950.

411. King, T, Morgan, FP. Late results of removing the medial humeral epicondyle for traumatic ulnar neuritis. *J Bone Joint Surg*; 1970.

412. Learmonth, JR. A technique for transplanting the ulnar nerve. *Surg Gynecol Obstet*; 1942.

413. Levy, D. M., Apfelberg, D. B. . Results of anterior transposition for ulnar neuropathy at the elbow. *Am J Surg*; Mar 1972.

414. Catalano, L. W.,3rd, Barron, O. A. . Anterior subcutaneous transposition of the ulnar nerve. *Hand Clin*; Aug 2007.

415. Macnicol, M. F. . The results of operation for ulnar neuritis. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; May 1979.

416. Osborne, GV. The surgical treatment of tardy ulnar neuritis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*; 1957.

417. Wadsworth, T. G. . Tennis elbow: conservative, surgical, and manipulative treatment. *Br Med J (Clin Res Ed)*; Mar 7 1987.

418. Wilson, D. H., Krout, R. . Surgery of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow: 16 cases treated by decompression without transposition. Technical note. *J Neurosurg*; Jun 1973.

419. Adson, AW. The surgical treatment of progressive ulnar paralysis. *Minnesota Med*; 1918;.

420. McGowan, AJ. The results of transposition of the ulnar nerve for traumatic ulnar neuritis. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*; Aug 1950.

421. Caliandro, P., La Torre, G., Padua, R., Giannini, F., Padua, L. . Treatment for ulnar neuropathy at the elbow. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*; 2011.

422. Abuelem, T., Ehni, B. L. . Minimalist cubital tunnel treatment. *Neurosurgery*; Oct 2009.

423. Waugh, R. P., Zlotolow, D. A. . In situ decompression of the ulnar nerve at the cubital tunnel. *Hand Clin*; Aug 2007.

424. Macadam, S. A., Gandhi, R., Bezuhly, M., Lefaivre, K. A. . Simple decompression versus anterior subcutaneous and submuscular transposition of the ulnar nerve for cubital tunnel syndrome: a meta-analysis. *J Hand Surg Am*; Oct 2008.

425. Gellman, H. . Compression of the ulnar nerve at the elbow: cubital tunnel syndrome. *Instr Course Lect*; 2008.

426. Chung, K. C. . Treatment of ulnar nerve compression at the elbow. *J Hand Surg Am*; Nov 2008.

427. Osterman, A. L., Spiess, A. M. . Medial epicondylectomy. *Hand Clin*; Aug 2007.

428. Williams, E. H., Dellon, A. L. . Anterior submuscular transposition. *Hand Clin*; Aug 2007.

429. Merolla, G., Staffa, G., Paladini, P., Campi, F., Porcellini, G. . Endoscopic approach to cubital tunnel syndrome. *J Neurosurg Sci*; Sep 2008.

430. Nabhan, A., Ahlhelm, F., Kelm, J., Reith, W., Schwerdtfeger, K., Steudel, W. I. . Simple decompression or subcutaneous anterior transposition of the ulnar nerve for cubital tunnel syndrome. *J Hand Surg Br*; Oct 2005.

431. Mowlavi, A., Andrews, K., Lille, S., Verhulst, S., Zook, E.G., Milner, S. . The management of cubital tunnel syndrome: a meta-analysis of clinical studies. *Plast Reconstr Surg*; Aug 2000.

432. Macadam, S. A., Bezuhly, M., Lefaivre, K. A. . Outcomes measures used to assess results after surgery for cubital tunnel syndrome: a systematic review of the literature. *J Hand Surg Am*; Oct 2009.

433. Ahcan, U., Zorman, P. . Endoscopic decompression of the ulnar nerve at the elbow. *J Hand Surg Am*; Oct 2007.

434. Assmus, H, Antoniadis, G, Bischoff, C, Hoffmann, R, Martini, AK, Preissler, P, Scheglmann, K, Schwerdtfeger, K, Wessels, KD, Wüstner-Hofmann, M. Cubital tunnel syndrome - a review and management guidelines. *Cent Eur Neurosurg*; 2011.

435. Harris, J. S., Sinnott, P. L., Holland, J. P., Ording, J., Turkelson, C., Weiss, M., Hegmann, K. T. . Methodology to update the practice recommendations in the American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine's Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, second edition. *J Occup Environ Med*; Mar 2008.

436. Toker, S., Kilincoglu, V., Aksakalli, E., Gulcan, E., Ozkan, K. . Short-term results of treatment of tennis elbow with anti-inflammatory drugs alone or in combination with local injection of a corticosteroid and anesthetic mixture. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc*; May-Jul 2008.

437. Liow, R. Y., Cregan, A., Nanda, R., Montgomery, R. J. . Early mobilisation for minimally displaced radial head fractures is desirable. A prospective randomised study of two protocols. *Injury*; Nov 2002.

438. Holdsworth, LK, Anderson, DM. Effectiveness of ultrasound used with a hydrocortisone coupling medium or epicondylitis clasp to treat lateral epicondylitis: pilot study. *Physiotherapy*; 1993.

439. Clements, LG, Chow, S. Effectiveness of a custom-made below lateral counterforce splint in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis (tennis elbow). *Can J Occup Ther.* ; 1993.

440. Jafarian, F. S., Demneh, E. S., Tyson, S. F. . The immediate effect of orthotic management on grip strength of patients with lateral epicondylosis. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*; Jun 2009.

441. Ng, G. Y., Chan, H. L. . The immediate effects of tension of counterforce forearm brace on neuromuscular performance of wrist extensor muscles in subjects with lateral humeral epicondylosis. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther*; Feb 2004.

442. Croisier, J. L., Foidart-Dessalle, M., Tinant, F., Crielaard, J. M., Forthomme, B. . An isokinetic eccentric programme for the management of chronic lateral epicondylar tendinopathy. *Br J Sports Med*; Apr 2007.

443. Tyler, T. F., Thomas, G. C., Nicholas, S. J., McHugh, M. P. . Addition of isolated wrist extensor eccentric exercise to standard treatment for chronic lateral epicondylosis: a prospective randomized trial. *J Shoulder Elbow Surg*; Sep 2010.

444. Rompe, J. D., Riedel, C., Betz, U., Fink, C. . Chronic lateral epicondylitis of the elbow: A prospective study of low-energy shockwave therapy and low-energy shockwave therapy plus manual therapy of the cervical spine. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; May 2001.

445. Emanet, S. K., Altan, L. I., Yurtkuran, M. . Investigation of the effect of GaAs laser therapy on lateral epicondylitis. *Photomed Laser Surg*; Jun 2010.

446. Reza Nourbakhsh, M., Fearon, F. J. . An alternative approach to treating lateral epicondylitis. A randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blinded study. *Clin Rehabil*; Jul 2008.

447. Weng, C. S., Shu, S. H., Chen, C. C., Tsai, Y. S., Hu, W. C., Chang, Y. H. . The evaluation of two modulated frequency modes of acupuncture-like TENS on the treatment of tennis elbow pain. *Biomed Eng Appl Basis Comm*; 2005.

448. Van Leemput, T., Mahieu, G. . Conservative management of minimally displaced isolated fractures of the ulnar shaft. *Acta Orthop Belg*; Dec 2007.

449. Warwick, L., Seradge, H. . Early versus late range of motion following cubital tunnel surgery. *J Hand Ther*; Oct-Dec 1995.

450. Hong, C. Z., Long, H. A., Kanakamedala, R. V., Chang, Y. M., Yates, L. . Splinting and local steroid injection for the treatment of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow: clinical and electrophysiological evaluation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*; Jun 1996.

APPENDIX 1: LOW-QUALITY RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS AND NON-RANDOMIZED STUDIES

The following low-quality randomized controlled studies (RCTs) and other non-randomized studies were reviewed by the Evidence-based Practice Elbow Panel to be all inclusive, but were not relied upon for purpose of developing this document's guidance on treatments because they were not of high quality due to one or more errors (e.g., lack of defined methodology, incomplete database searches, selective use of the studies and inadequate or incorrect interpretation of the studies' results, etc.), which may render the conclusions invalid. ACOEM's Methodology requires that only moderate- to high-quality literature be used in making recommendations.(540)

LATERAL EPICONDYLALGIA

Author/Year Study Type	Score (0-11)	Population	Comparison Group	Results	Conclusion	Comments
NSAIDs						
Stull 1986 RCT	2.0	N = 38 with "tennis elbow"	Diflunisal 1,000mg initially, followed by 500mg BID vs. 500mg of naproxen initially, followed by 250mg QID.	Overall pain relief, self reported favored diflunisal (100% good to excellent) vs naproxen (71% good to excellent), (p = 0.019). Self reported elbow limitations favored diflunisal, p = 0.039. No statistically significant differences between patients: 1) overall elbow condition; 2) overall rating of elbow pain; 3) elbow flexion; 4) elbow extension; 5) pronation; 6) supination; 7) pain reduction; 8) reduction in swelling; and 9) reduction in tenderness.	"[D]iflunisal and naproxen significantly reduce pain and inflammation associated with this condition. However, diflunisal provided more effective pain relief in the group studied. Prompt pain relief allows rapid progression to physical therapy and a return to normal activities. We also believe that diflunisal provides advantages of a longer-lasting effect and less frequent dosing, which may promote better patient compliance."	Open-label. Randomization unclear. Only baseline comparability of groups that is given relates to gender. Tables only have 16 or 17 in each group, as some participants apparently did not report. Most analyses were not statistically significant; however there were small numbers with multiple individuals refusing to answer questions, which may be sufficient to skew results. No placebo group.
Adelaar 1987 RCT	1.5	N = 18 with lateral, medial or "posterior" epi-condylitis	Diflunisal (initial dose of diflunisal 1000mg followed by diflunisal 500mg every 12 hours for a period of up to 15 days) vs. naproxen.	No statistically significant differences for any categories between study drugs or between pretest and post-test results at the fifth level single tail distribution. One patient receiving diflunisal developed transient nausea and stomach cramps though both study agents were generally well tolerated.	"Diflunisal and naproxen were generally effective in the treatment of mild to moderate pain associated with epicondylitis; there were no significant differences between the drugs."	Methods not well described. Open-label. Small study population. Short duration (15 days). No placebo group.

Toker 2008 RCT	1.5	N=21with lateral elbow pain with confirmed tennis elbow after physical examinati on.	Depomedrol 1mL plus prilocaine 1mL plus oral diclofenac plus topical etofenamate cream (n=11) vs. oral and topical anti-inflammatory treatment (n=10).	Anti-inflammatory group showed a significant improvement in pain scores from before and after treatment (p=0.026). The injection group showed a significant improvement as well (p=0.003).	“[S]ignificantly enhanced efficacy of the combination treatment used in this study might be limited to the short-term and that adverse effects of steroids on the tendons should be taken into consideration.”	Sparse details. Unknown follow-up duration. No medication doses provided.
Topical NSAIDs and Other Agents						
Liow 2002 RCT	3.0	N=60 patients with Mason 1 and 2 radial head fractures	Immediate (24 hours after injury) exercise program to restore elbow movement (group A, n=30) vs. 5 day rest in broad arm sling before exercise program (group B, n=30). Follow ups at 1, 4 weeks, and 3 months.	VAS (mean±SD): week 1 (group A 5.9±2.0 vs. group B 7.6±1.9), p=0.002; week 4 and 12 (NS). ROM: extension deficit (NS); flexion week 1 (group A 112±14.9 vs. group B 98±14.2), p=0.0004; week 4 and 12 (NS); supination (NS); pronation (NS). Elbow strength and grip strength: extension (NS); flexion (NS); supination week 1 (58±2.9 vs. 47±2.2, p=0.0022), week 4 and 12 (NS); pronation (NS); grip strength (NS). Morrey Score: pain week 1 (10.3 vs. 6.3, p=0.009), week 4 and 12 (NS); ROM (NS); strength week 1 (16.1 vs. 14.7, p=0.035), week 4 and 12 (NS); function week 1 (8.2 vs. 5.4, p=0.012), week 4 and 12 (NS); total score week 1 (54.4 vs. 43.5, p=0.005), week 4 and 12 (NS).	"[T]his study has demonstrated the safety and early benefit of immediate active mobilization in Mason 1 and 2 radial head fractures. We have also shown that a delay of 5 days before mobilization was not detrimental and the final outcome of the two groups were similar."	Quasi-randomized by provider preference (next available fracture clinic). Data support early mobilization for minimally displaced fx.
Burton 1988 RCT	3.0	N = 33 with tennis elbow (pain, tenderness and at least 2 of pain with increased grip/twist/ lift, pain with resisted	All received manual therapy, 2 times a week for 1st week, then 1 times a week. Strap (Chen strap) all day vs. benzydamine topical cream 5 times a day vs. strap plus		“The results do not show any therapeutic advantage from the use of these adjuncts, when assessed over three weeks, though the majority of patients in all groups were significantly improved.”	Sparse details. Small sample sizes among 4 groups. No short or longer term followup. Likely underpowered for differences, especially in relatively acute population with better prognoses.

		MF extension, pain with pronation/ wrist flexion). Duration <3 months (mean 4.8 weeks).	NSAID cream. No follow-up beyond 3 week trial.			
Kroll 1989 RCT	2.5	N = 173 acute musculo-skeletal disorders, mean 2-5 days (not well described proportions of: sprains and tendinitis of ankle sprain, AC joint sprain, supra-spinatus tendinitis, Achilles tendinitis, epicondy-litis)	Piroxicam 0.5% gel (3 cm of gel corresponding to 5 mg piroxicam) QID vs. diclofenac 1.16% (5 to 10 cm of gel corresponding to 20 to 40 mg diclofenac) QID for up to 14 days.	"Restriction of active movement" (baseline/2/4days): piroxicam (50.0±2.77/34.2±2.26/ 15.0±2.39) vs. diclofenac (50.9±2.92/37.8±2.63/ 9.8±1.81). Reductions in mean pain scores on joint movement, and tenderness also NS.	"The results of this study show that piroxicam 0.5% gel and diclofenac 1.16% gel are equally effective and well tolerated in the treatment of selected acute sprains and tendonitis."	Open label. Many disorders. Short term (therapy was begun within 3-5 days of injury and continued for up to 14 days). Study did not differentiate results by injury location (i.e., elbow, ankle, or shoulder), only by treatment (piroxicam vs. diclofenac) and injury type (sprains and tendinitis). Data suggest equal efficacy.
Tennis Elbow Straps, Bands, Supports, and Braces						
Luginbühl 2008 RCT	3.5	N = 36 enrolled, but 6 dropped out. 29 (30 elbows) with tennis elbow with no more than 3 injections in the prior 6 months.	All started with 2-3mL injection Triamcinolone/ Kenacort 40mg plus 1% Scandicain. Forearm support band vs. progressive isometric strengthening exercises vs combination.	Mean modified Nirschl Pettrone scores (pre/ last): Band (3.7±0.7/ 2.6±1.4) vs. exercise (3.4±0.7/1.7±1.3) vs. combination (3.1±0.7/ 1.8±1.4) NS. Subjective improvements of much better or better in 5/5 (50%) vs. 7/10 (70%) vs. 7/10 (70%). No differences in grip strength (p = 0.29).	"[W]e could not show any beneficial effect either for the forearm support band or for the strengthening exercises."	Trial consists of fairly resistant cases, thus generalizability of results may be similarly limited. High dropouts at year 1. Trend towards worse cases at baseline for band then exercise, may bias in favor of combination.
Holdsworth 1993 RCT	3.0	N = 36 with lateral epicondy-lits, duration 2 weeks to 18 months	Ultrasound (3MHz, 1.5W/ cm^2) with aqua-sonic 100 vs. phonophoresis (ultrasound with hydrocortisone 1% cream with dimethicone 330 2%) vs.	Mean subjective scores of pain at rest (pre/post): US 5.6/5.1 vs. Phono 14.3/12.2 vs. US plus clasp 5.6/7.8 vs. phono plus clasp 6.1/5.8. (Graph and data do not match. Graph suggests phono plus clasp far worse, but data suggest phono	"Our study has confirmed that ultrasound treatment does bring about a favourable response in the majority of patients. We found no suggestion that the application of a hydrocortisone coupling medium enhanced this	Small group sizes. Unclear if blinded ("independent") assessor. If so, study is moderate quality by score. Data suggest equivalency, but are likely underpowered for effects.

			ultrasound with clasp vs. phonophoresis with clasp. 12 treatments over maximum 6 weeks.	alone did worse).	favourable response."	
Burton 1988 RCT	3.0	N = 33 tennis elbow (pain, tenderness; at least 2 of pain with increased grip/twist/ lift, pain with resisted MF extension, pain with pronation/ wrist flexion). Duration <3 months (mean 4.8 weeks).	All received manual therapy, 2 times a week for 1st week, then once a week. Strap (Chen strap) all day vs. Benzydamine topical cream 5 times a day vs. strap plus NSAID cream. No follow-up beyond 3 week trial.	Mean pain scores (pre/3 days/1 week/3 weeks): Strap plus NSAID (3.6/2.8/2.5/1.5) vs. NSAID cream (3.0/2.5/1.7/1.0) vs. Strap (3.2/2.8/2.5/1.6) vs. Manipulation only (3.2/2.8/2.5/1.5).	"The results do not show any therapeutic advantage from the use of these adjuncts, when assessed over three weeks, though the majority of patients in all groups were significantly improved."	Sparse details. Small sample sizes among 4 groups. No short or longer term followup. Likely underpowered for differences, especially in relatively acute population with better prognoses.
Altan 2008 Pseudo-randomized clinical trial	3.0	N = 50 (ages 34-60) with diagnosis of lateral epicondylitis (lateral elbow pain, tenderness, pain with resisted wrist dorsi-flexion). Duration less than 12 weeks.	Lateral epicondyle bandage vs wrist splint (Rehband). To be worn "continuously"; 6 weeks follow-up.	Good responses at 2 and 6 weeks in 33.3% vs. 48% and at 6 weeks in 66.7% vs. 72% (NS). Lateral epicondyle bandage improved in all parameters (Pain at rest, pain with movement, sensitivity, algometer score, and hand grip strength) at 6 weeks. Wrist splint group also showed a significant improvement in all parameters by 6 weeks. No differences between groups other than at 2 weeks, where wrist splint favored.	"[E]picondyle bandage was not found to be superior to wrist splint in our study, we may suggest that it could be favored over splint since it is more practical and cosmetically acceptable."	Every other allocation. Mostly subacute patients (mean ~6 weeks). Data mostly suggest wrist splint and lateral epicondyle bandage equally efficacious.
Clements 1993 Pseudo-randomized clinical trial	2.5	N = 16 workers performing repetitive tasks with lateral epi-condylitis	Custom-made splint plus physiotherapy (US, ice stretch, strengthening) vs. physio-therapy alone. PT 3 times a week; 4 weeks follow-up.	Reported less pain, and grip-affected arm strength also better in splint plus PT group. (minimal data provided).	"[T]his custom-made splint is of value in facilitating the recovery from lateral epicondylitis."	Pseudorandomized (every other). States to be worn at night and daytime, but compliance numbers indicate worn less than 50% as directed. Sparse results. Small numbers of subjects.

Garg 2010 RCT	2.0	N = 70 lateral epi-condylitis, 42 (44 elbow) not lost to follow-up; acute patients (duration not described)	Velcro elbow strap vs. thumb spica wrist extension splint; 6 weeks follow-up.	American Shoulder and Elbow Society scores (pre/post): elbow strap (35.2±16.9/51.119.0) vs. wrist splint (40.7±25.2/54.3±16.6, p = 0.60).	“The wrist extension splint allows a greater degree of pain relief than does the forearm strap brace for patients with lateral epicondylitis.”	Many details sparse. High dropouts. Baseline data sparse and suggest differences may be present. Most results suggest no difference between treatments.
Dwars 1990 RCT	1.5	N = 120 patients with tennis elbow	Elbow support (Epitrain) worn all day (n = 60) vs. physical therapy (friction massage plus stretching) (n = 60) for 6 weeks	No difference between groups for pain changes. Patients with elbow support more satisfied vs. physical therapy group.	“[T]he favorable results warrant the use of the elbow support for the treatment of tennis elbow.”	Many details sparse. Results suggest support as effective as physical therapy.
Splints – Experimental Studies						
Jafarian 2009 Experimental, Randomized Crossover Study.	N/A	N=52 patients with lateral epicondylitis for at least 3 months.	All patients used a placebo, counterforce elbow strap, counterforce elbow sleeve, and a wrist splint in a randomized order.	Both elbow orthoses and wrist orthosis superior for pain-free grip strength vs. placebo (p<0.02).Values for pain-free grip were 135±77 (22-404) for placebo, 156±88 (20-466) for elbow strap, 156±91 (14-440) for elbow sleeve, and 129±74 (17-387) for wrist splint, p≤0.003. The values for the maximum grip were 161±95 (28-510) for placebo, 174±97 (22-567) for elbow strap, 175±95 (22-484) for elbow sleeve, and 142±73 (13-369) for wrist splint.	"The use of the 2 types of elbow orthoses (strap and sleeve) resulted in an immediate increase in pain-free grip strength."	No follow-up as experimental only. Data suggest elbow strap or sleeve may be superior to wrist splint or brace for pain free grip, however, without clinical follow-up, no firm conclusions for treatment possible.
Ng 2004 Experimental Study	N/A	N=15 patients with lateral humeral epicondylitis in their dominant arm.	Control vs. brace without tension vs. brace with 25 N of tension vs brace with 50 N of tension.	For within-subject effect of brace significant (p=0.01). Univariate tests revealed significant differences for wrist proprioception (p=0.032) and passive wrist extensors stretching pain threshold (P=0.05). Mean±SD joint position error comparing no brace vs. brace 0N vs. brace 25N vs. brace 50N: 0.5±4.6 vs.	"The counterforce forearm brace had no effect on isokinetic wrist extensor strength and stretch reflex latency of the extensor carpi ulnaris muscle in subjects with lateral humeral epicondylitis."	Experimental Study. No clinical follow-up. Data suggest counterforce brace increases pain threshold to passive stretch. Clinical relevance uncertain.

				0.3±5.0 vs. 2.4±4.9 (p<0.05) vs. 0.7±4.8; p<0.32.		
Exercise						
Luginbühl 2008 RCT	3.5	N = 36 enrolled (6 dropped out); 29 (30 elbows) with tennis elbow with no more than 3 injections in prior 6 months.	All 2-3mL injection triamcinolone/ Kenacort 40mg plus 1% Scandicain. Forearm support band vs. progressive isometric strengthening exercises vs. combination.	Mean modified Nirschl Pettrone scores (pre/ last): band (3.7±0.7/2.6 ±1.4) vs. exercise (3.4± 0.7/1.7±1.3) vs. combination (3.1±0.7/ 1.8±1.4), NS. Subjective improvements of much better or better in 5/5 (50%) vs. 7/10 (70%) vs. 7/10 (70%). No differences in grip strength (p = 0.29).	"[W]e could not show any beneficial effect either for the forearm support band or for the strengthening exercises."	Trial consists of fairly resistant cases, thus generalizability of results may be similarly limited. High dropouts at year 1. Trend towards worse cases at baseline for band then exercise, may bias in favor of combination.
Croisier 2007 Quasi Randomized	2.5	N=92 with unilateral chronic lateral epicondylar tendinopathy.	Passive standard rehabilitation program (control group) (n=46) vs. passive standard rehabilitation plus eccentric strength exercises (n=46).	By end of treatment, treatment group had a significantly lower VAS pain score compared to control (p<0.001). After treatment both groups improved in disability, but treatment group improved significantly compared to control (p<0.001).	"[A] patient with chronic lateral epicondylar tendinopathy has more than two times a greater chance of obtaining relief with eccentric intervention."	Quasi randomized with matching on age, gender and activity level. Timing appears variable. Many details sparse.
Tyler 2010 RCT	2.5	N=21 with chronic lateral epicondylitis for 6 weeks or longer.	Eccentric training (n=11) vs. standard treatment (n=10).	The eccentric group improved significantly in DASH (p=0.01), VAS pain (p=0.002), combined strength (p=0.011), and tenderness deficit (p=0.003) compared to the standard group.	"All outcome measures for chronic lateral epicondylitis were markedly improved with the addition of an eccentric wrist extensor exercise to standard physical therapy, compared with physical therapy without the isolated eccentric exercise."	Small groups. Many details sparse. Data suggest eccentric group modestly superior.
Clements 1993 Pseudo-randomized clinical	2.5	N = 16 workers performing repetitive tasks with lateral epi-condylitis.	Custom-made splint plus physiotherapy (US, ice stretch, strengthening) vs. physio-therapy alone. PT 3 times a week; 4 weeks follow-up.	Reported less pain, and grip-affected arm strength also better in splint plus PT group. (minimal data provided).	"[T]his custom-made splint is of value in facilitating the recovery from lateral epicondylitis."	Pseudorandomized (every other). States to be worn at night and daytime, but compliance numbers indicate worn less than 50% as directed. Sparse results. Small number of subjects.

Svernlöv 2001 RCT	2.0	N = 38 with lateral epicondy-lalgia. All lateral elbow pain, tender to palpation, pain with resisted wrist extension, positive middle finger test. Mean durations 8.4 to 10.7 months.	Group S (stretching, contract-relax-stretching program) vs. Group E (eccentric, eccentric exercises). Daily HEP exercises for 12 weeks. Forearm bands with activity and wrist support nightly in both groups. 12months follow-up.	Mean VAS scores before training vs. after 3 months: At rest: 0.9 vs. 0.1; p <0.0001. At palpation: 5.0 vs. 2.3; p <0.0001. Pain on isometric testing: 5.3 vs. 1.3; p = 0.0002. Pain during middle finger test: 5.5 vs. 2.4; p <0.0001. Pain during grip strength testing: 2.9 vs. 0.6; p <0.0001. Complete recovery in 12/17 (71%) of eccentric exercise vs. 7/18 (39%) stretching, p = 0.09.	"The eccentric training regime can considerably reduce symptoms in a majority of patients with lateral humeral epicondylalgia, regardless of duration, and is possibly superior to conventional stretching."	Pilot study. Some baseline differences, including steroid injections (4/15 vs. 9/15). Baseline table is of completions. Data suggest eccentric exercises superior to stretching.
Dwars 1990 RCT	1.5	N = 120 patients with tennis elbow	Elbow support (Epitrain) worn all day (n = 60) vs. physical therapy (friction massage plus stretching) (n = 60) for 6 weeks.	No difference between groups for pain changes. Patients with elbow support more satisfied vs. physical therapy group.	"[T]he favorable results warrant the use of the elbow support for the treatment of tennis elbow."	Many details sparse. Results suggest support as effective as physical therapy.
Ultrasound						
Holdsworth 1993 RCT	3.0	N = 36 with lateral epi-condylitis. Duration 2 weeks-18 months.	Ultrasound (3MHz, 1.5W/cm^2) with aquasonic 100 vs. phonophoresis (ultrasound with hydrocortisone 1% cream with dimethicone 330 2%) vs. ultrasound with clasp vs. phonophoresis with clasp; 12 treatments over maximum 6 weeks.	Mean subjective scores of pain at rest (pre/post): US 5.6/5.1 vs. Phono 14.3/12.2 vs. US plus clasp 5.6/7.8 vs. phono plus clasp 6.1/5.8. (Graph and data do not match. Graph suggests phono plus clasp far worse, but data suggest phono alone did worse).	"Our study has confirmed that ultrasound treatment does bring about a favourable response in the majority of patients. We found no suggestion that the application of a hydrocortisone coupling medium enhanced this favourable response."	Small group sizes. Unclear if blinded ("independent") assessor. If so, study is moderate quality by score. Data suggest equivalency, but are likely underpowered for effects.
Halle 1986 RCT	2.0	N = 48 with lateral epi-condylitis (pain over common extensor origin with resisted wrist extension and point tenderness over	Ultrasound with coupling agent vs. ultrasound with 10% hydrocortisone coupling agent vs. transcutaneou s electrical nerve stimulation vs. hydrocortisone	Pain Intensity Index: US 16.5 vs. US with hydrocortisone 13.5 vs. TENS 1.5 vs. Injection 2.5 (latter 3 p<0.05). Pain rating index total: US 7.5 vs. US with hydrocortisone 16.0 vs. TENS 7.0 vs. Injection 3.0 (all but US with hydrocortisone	"While no difference was demonstrated to exist between the four treatment protocols, it was shown that improvement, as measured by the pain indexes, did occur over all four treatment groups when the pre-treatment and post-treatment values were compared."	Much of study not well described. No placebo. Short follow up (5 days). Poor blinding, though ultrasound attempted blinding. No description of randomization/ confounders – no discussion of individual group demographics. One-

		epicondyle)	and lidocaine injection. Treatment details not provided. Treatments QD for 5 days except injection. All treated with elbow cuff, avoiding strenuous activity, ice massage BID; 5 days treatment.	p<0.05). Comparing pre/post tests: US 69% of variables improved, 12% same, and 19% worse. US with hydrocortisone 65% improved, 12 % same, 23% worse. TENS 56% improved, 23% same, 21% worse. Injections 63% improved, 25% same, 12% worse.		tailed t-tests. Conclusions of lack of differences between groups appear likely underpowered and incorrect.
Manipulation and Mobilization						
Fernández-Carnero 2008 RCT	3.5	N = 10 with lateral epi-condylitis ages 30 to 49 years who responded to a local advertisement; duration unclear.	Cervical spine manipulation (high velocity, low amplitude thrust manipulation directed at C5-6) vs. manual contact (simulated, but no thrust). No follow-up beyond 2 treatments (about 48 hours).	Both groups similar pain threshold values for dominant (p = 0.2)/nondominant (p = 0.3). Hot pain thresholds not different for dominant (p = 0.8)/ nondominant (p = 0.4). Cold pain thresholds similar, dominant (p = 0.8) and nondominant (p = 0.7). Pain free grip not different between groups (p = 0.3).	"No significant changes for HPT and CPT were found. Finally, cervical manipulation increased PFG on the affected side, but not the MGF on the unaffected arm."	Inadequate sample size. Study design somewhat unclear as possible crossover trial. No short or intermediate term results. Results suggest no differences, but likely underpowered if there is an effect.
Radpasand 2009 RCT	3.5	N= 6 with chronic lateral epicondylitis for at least 6 months and diagnosed by at least 2 of the following tests: palpation, resisted wrist extension, resisted finger extension, and resisted extension of the middle finger. 12 week study with 4 follow-ups.	Group A (n=4): high-velocity low-amplitude manipulation (delivered as a HVLA thrust), high-voltage pulse galvanic stimulation, counterforce bracing (used hard pad's knob exactly located on top of most painful area), ice (applied ice for 10 minutes and removed for 15 minutes. Repeated twice 3 times per day), and exercises (forearm supinator and pronator muscles; forearm extensor and flexor muscle	Group A vs. Group B: 59% vs. 9.5% change for PRTEE (Patient-Rated Tennis Elbow Evaluation) total, 3.2 % vs. 169.0% change for PFGS (Pain-Free Grip Strength), and 51.4% vs. 65.1% VAS_24hs.	"The pilot study demonstrated that the study design is feasible and that patients could be recruited for a 12-week trial of multimodal treatment. A large trial is warranted in a multicenter setting to detect difference in the effects of these treatment strategies."	The direct aim of this study is not about the effectiveness of the treatments. Small sample size with uneven numbers in the groups. Pilot study.

			exercise, forearm supinator and pronator muscle exercise, and putty therapeutic exercise. Contractions performed for 10 seconds with 10 repetitions twice a day) vs. Group B (n=2) with ultrasound (3 MHz, 1.5 W/cm2, and pulsed mode of 1 millisecond on and 5 milliseconds off for 8 minutes), counterforce bracing, and exercise.			
Drechsler 1997 RCT	3.0	N = 18 with lateral epi-condylitis (criteria unclear). Duration unclear.	Neural tension group (mobilize radial head with wrist flexion/ shoulder abduction; anterior-posterior mobilizations) plus HEP vs. standard treatment (US 1.0-1.5W/cm^2, 3MHz, 5 minutes; transverse friction massage, stretching, strengthening, HEP). Average 2 times a week 6 weeks; 3 months follow-up.	Occupational status (pre/post/3 month): NT (2.0/1.5/1.23) vs. standard (1.5/1.6/1.5). Grip strengths NT (73.25/85.12/87.12) vs. standard (92.6/97.7/92.5).	"Results of the NTG (neural tension group) treatment were linked to the radial head treatment, and isolated effects of the NTG treatment could not be determined. There were no long-term positive results in the (standard treatment group)."	Small sample sizes that preclude quality assessments. Baseline differences (e.g., mean grips 73 vs. 92 pounds). Multiple co-interventions. All received HEP. No placebo/sham control.
Burton 1988 RCT	3.0	N = 33 with tennis elbow (pain, tenderness, at least 2 of pain with increased grip/twist/ lift, pain with	All received manual therapy, 2 times a week for first week, then once a week. Strap (Chen strap) all day vs. Benzydamine topical cream 5	Mean pain scores (pre/3 days/1 week/3 weeks): Strap plus NSAID (3.6/2.8/2.5/1.5) vs. NSAID cream (3.0/2.5/1.7/1.0) vs. Strap (3.2/2.8/2.5/1.6) vs. Manipulation only (3.2/2.8/2.5/1.5).	"The results do not show any therapeutic advantage from the use of these adjuncts, when assessed over three weeks, though the majority of patients in all groups were significantly improved."	Sparse details. Small sample sizes among 4 groups. No short or longer term follow-up. Likely underpowered for differences, especially in relatively acute population with better prognoses.

		resisted MF extension, pain with pronation/ wrist flexion). Duration less than 3 months (mean 4.8 weeks).	times a day vs. strap plus NSAID cream. No follow-up beyond 3 week trial.			
Nourbakhsh 2008 RCT	2.5	N = 23 (age 24-72) with lateral epi-condylitis; duration at least 3 months (means 17 and 20 months).	Oscillating-energy manual therapy (OMET) vs placebo (sham). 6 treatments over 2 to 3 weeks. No subsequent follow-up in both groups.	Grip strengths (pre/post: OMET (61.3/73.6) vs. sham (81.1/79.2). OMET with improved pain intensity (p = 0.000), functional level (p = 0.000), and pain limited activity (p = 0.004). Placebo group did not improve.	"[O]MET could significantly improve the symptoms of chronic LE in a relatively short period of time."	Unclear how 2 RCTs run simultaneously. Trial claims double blinding, but patient blinding not plausible when manual therapy differed. Blinding/sham adequacy not assessed; small sample, unclear how many drops. Major baseline difference in grip strength suggests randomization failure. Reductions in grip strength post-treatment unexplained.
Massage, Including Friction Massage						
Dwars 1990 RCT	1.5	N = 120 patients with tennis elbow	Elbow support (Epitrain) worn all day (n = 60) vs. physical therapy (friction massage plus stretching) (n = 60) for 6 weeks	No difference between groups for pain changes. Patients with elbow support more satisfied vs. physical therapy group.	"[T]he favorable results warrant the use of the elbow support for the treatment of tennis elbow."	Many details sparse. Results suggest support as effective as physical therapy.
Extracorporeal Shockwave Therapy						
Melegati 2004 RCT	3.5	N = 41 with lateral epi-condylitis	Extracorporeal shockwave therapy with lateral tangential focusing vs. back tangential focusing.	No statistically significant difference between groups in initial TESS and VAS (p >0.05), but both groups did make a significant increase in TESS follow up scores (p <0.05) and significant decrease in VAS (p <0.05).	"According to TESS and VAS scores both localization techniques gave a decrease of symptoms but did not eliminate the pain." "There was no difference between the two techniques of using ESWT."	Confounders addressed age, gender, duration of symptoms. No placebo group. Evaluations compiled by same physician who performed ESWT. No drop outs. Did not state intent-to-treat analysis. No difference between techniques.

Rompe 2001 Prospective RCT/ Matched Prospective Trial	3.5	N = 60 diagnosed with lateral epicondylitis who did not respond to conservative treatment for 6 months or longer.	30 patients received 1000 impulses of shock waves once a week for 3 weeks and also received manual therapy to the cervical spine (group 1) vs. 30 patients received 1000 impulses of shock waves once a week for 3 weeks (group 2) with follow-ups at 3 months and 12 months.	At 3 months, 12 patients in group 1 and 15 patients in group 2 had an excellent or good condition. At 12 months, 15 patients in group 1 and 15 patients in group 2 had a good or excellent condition. No significant differences found between two groups. Within the 2 groups, significant difference in the improvement on the VAS and on Roles and Maudsley outcome scores at both follow-ups ($p<0.001$)	The authors concluded "ESWT may be an effective conservative treatment for unilateral chronic tennis elbow. The efficacy of additional cervical manual therapy for lateral epicondylitis remains questionable."	Many details sparse. Data suggest cervical manipulation of no additive benefit to ESWT.
Melikyan 2003 RCT	2.5	N = 74 with chronic lateral epi-condylitis awaiting surgery	Extracorporeal shockwave therapy vs. sham. 12 months follow-up.	No difference between groups at any point or in rate of improvement of score ($p = 0.87$). Mean pain on lifting 5kg dumbbell decreased significantly over time in both groups ($p <0.001$), NS between groups. Grip strength with elbow flexed 90° and arm adducted (M1) not improved in either group (baseline, 29.5kg; 12 months, 34.2kg, $p = 0.22$). Mean grip strength (M2) improved (baseline, 21.2kg; 12 months, 32.4kg; $p <0.001$). No difference between groups before treatment ($p = 0.77$ and $p = 0.93$, for M1/ M2) or follow-up ($p = 0.38$ and $p = 0.65$).	“We have not been able to show a significant difference between the treatment and the control groups in respect of any of the measured parameters at this dosage.” “Study showed no evidence that extracorporeal shock-wave therapy for tennis elbow is better than placebo.”	Confounders addressed age, gender, and use of analgesics. Both treatment and placebo trended towards improvement. There was no difference in the proportion of patients using analgesics at any stage.
Crowther 2002 RCT	2.0	N = 93 with tennis elbow	Steroid injection (triamcinolone 20mg plus lignocaine) vs. extracorporeal shockwave therapy; 3 months follow-up.	Group 1 (steroid injection); 6 weeks after injection, mean VAS fell from pre-treatment level of 67 to 21, and at 3 months 12. Group 2 (ESWT) VAS score fell from 61 before treatment to 35 at 6 weeks after end of treatment (tailed t-test, $p = 0.052$) and to 31 at 3 months. Using a reduction of pain of	“Our results have shown that injection of steroid and local anaesthetic was more effective than ESWT in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis, although both treatments relieve symptoms.”	Confounders addressed: age and gender. Data suggest steroid injection superior to ESWT.

				50% as a criterion of success at 3 months after treatment end, 21 (84%) of Group 1 had pain reduction ≥50% vs. 29 (60%) of Group 2 (chi-squared test, p <0.05).		
Phonophoresis						
Holdsworth 1993 RCT	3.0	N = 36 with lateral epi-condylitis. Duration 2 weeks to 18 months.	Ultrasound (3MHz, 1.5W/cm^2) with aquasonic 100 v. phonophoresis (ultrasound with hydrocortisone 1% cream with dimethicone) vs. ultrasound with clasp (Thämert) v. phonophoresis with clasp; 12 treatments maximum 6 weeks.	Mean subjective scores of pain at rest (pre/post): US 5.6/5.1 vs. Phono 14.3/12.2 vs. US plus clasp 5.6/7.8 vs. phono plus clasp 6.1/5.8. (Graph and data do not match. Graph suggests phono plus clasp far worse, but data suggest phono alone did worse).	"Our study has confirmed that ultrasound treatment does bring about a favourable response in the majority of patients. We found no suggestion that the application of a hydrocortisone coupling medium enhanced this favourable response."	Small group sizes. Unclear if blinded ("independent") assessor. If so, study is moderate quality by score. Data suggest equivalency, but are likely underpowered for effects.
Low-level Laser Therapy						
Emanet 2010 RCT	3.5	N= 49 having symptoms of lateral epicondylitis less than 3 months duration	Patients received 15 sessions of laser (Endolaser 422-230 VAC, laser probe one diode laser, LP 100) to most sensitive points around lateral epicondyle with dose of 1 J/cm² for 2 minutes (5d per week for 3 weeks) (n=25) vs. placebo group which received same protocol by same physiotherapist : without device being turn. Follow-up at 0/3/12 weeks.	No significant differences were found between groups though at 12 weeks both group had significant improvement.	"Although low energy laser therapy had no advantage compared to placebo in patients with LE for the short term, a significant improvement, particularly in functional parameters, was achieved in the long term. Laser, which has relatively no side effects, might be included among long-term treatment options for LE."	Some data suggest place group worse at baseline. Sequential allocations. Less than 3 month duration. Quasi randomized trial with 12 weeks follow-up.
Simunovic 1998 RCT	2.5	N = 324 with medial or lateral	Patients with bilateral symptoms all underwent	No significant differences between 2 groups when both centers combined.	"The current clinical study provides further evidence of the efficacy of LLLT in the	Stated technician was blinded but unclear how that could have been. Not stratified,

		epicon-dylitis (case definitions not provided) durations unclear though at minimum include subacute and chronic	trigger point technique (tender point). Patients with unilateral symptoms randomly allocated to 1 of 3 treatment groups: trigger points, scanner, and combination therapy.	Statistically significant difference was found between the groups with the scanner technique ($p < 0.05$). In acute cases, scanner technique was favored over TPs ($p > 0.001$). For acute and chronic a significant difference was found favoring scanner technique over combination technique ($p < 0.001$).	management of lateral and medial epicondylitis."	analyses use both lateral and medial epicondylitis combined. Lack of analyses and smaller numbers of medial epicondylitis suggests non-significant results. Strong potential for bias (as seen in combination vs. each location analyses). Many details sparse, including unclear methodology, selection, case definition, and administration of treatments.
Acupuncture						
Tsui 2002 RCT	1.5	N = 20 with pain over lateral epicondyle	Manual acupuncture (MA) (n=10) vs. electro-acupuncture (EA) (n = 10) 3 times a week for 2 weeks. Study duration unclear, possibly no follow-up beyond 2 weeks (not stated).	Pain VAS scores favored EA vs. MA ($p < 0.001$) and EA. Pain free grip better in both groups vs. baseline control ($p < 0.05$).	"[B]oth MA and EA group have significant differences in pain relief compare with control group….There were significant pain reduction and greater improvement in handgrip strength in the EA group than the MA group."	Small sample size. Some text no understandable. Patients not described. Many details sparse. Time and outcomes unclear.
Electrical Stimulation						
Reza Nourbakhsh 2008 RCT	3.5	N = 18 (ages 24 to 72) with lateral epi-condylitis (apparently required all of tenderness, Cozen's Mill's middle finger extension tests) Duration at least 3 months (means 14 and 23 months).	Noxious level electrical stimulation (4Hz, DC for 30s to the most tender point, "adjusted to the subject's pain tolerance level") vs placebo stimulation (sham). 6 treatments over 2-3 weeks. No subsequent follow-up in both groups as sham received active treatment after trial.	Grip strengths (pre/post): E-stim (70.4/90.2) vs. sham (91.5/89.2), $p = 0.04$. Pain intensity: E-stim (4.2/1.1) vs. sham (3.85/4.0), $p = 0.01$. Noxious level e-stim superior for functional level ($p = 0.013$), and pain-limited activity ($p = 0.003$).	"[T]reating tender points over the lateral epicondyle with low-frequency hyperstimulation could clinically improve pain, grip strength, limited activity due to pain and functional activities in subjects with chronic lateral epicondylitis."	Unclear how 2 RCTs run simultaneously and whether double enrolled. Trial claims double blinding, but patient blinding not plausible when "noxious" level stimulation used and adjusted to patient tolerance level. Adequacy of sham/ blinding not measured. Sham/placebo likely more equivalent to no treatment. Small sample; baseline grip strengths different between groups, apparent randomization failure may invalidate results. Methodological issues result in a low quality trial.
TENS						

Weng 2005 Randomized Crossover Trial	2.0	N=20 patients between the ages of 20-30 with tennis elbow pain for at least 3 months	5 KHz modulated by 2 Hz frequency mode TENS on acupuncture points LI10 and LI11 (LF group) vs. 5 KHz modulated by 100 Hz frequency mode of TENS on acupuncture points LI10 and LI11 (HF group) vs. sham TENS (control group) 15 minutes per visit, 3 times a week for 2 weeks.	VAS (before/after): control (4.80±1.93/4.95±2.01) vs. LF (4.40±2.16/3.70±2.00, p<0.05) vs. HF (4.16±2.37/3.42±2.01, p<0.05). Percentage change in VAS: control (4.16±25.0, p<0.05) vs. LF (-18.51±18.1, p<0.05) vs. HF (-16.32±16.56, p<0.05).	"[A]cupuncture-like TENS with modulated frequency may be a good treatment choice for patients with tennis elbow pain."	Patients not described. Many details sparse.
Glucocorticoid Steroid Injections						
Saartok 1986 RCT	3.0	N = 21with lateral epi-condylitis	Naproxen 250mg BID for 2 weeks (initial 500mg dose) vs. betamethasone 6mg plus prilocaine injection (long acting form given as injection). Follow-up unclear, but possibly 2 weeks.	Grip strength improved 9% in naproxen vs. 2% betamethasone (NS). Doctor's evaluations were50% improved on naproxen vs. 40% with injection at 2 weeks (NS).	"The results of this pilot study indicate that oral naproxen (250 mg twice daily for two weeks) is as effective as a single injection of a corticosteroid into the site of tenderness in the treatment of epicondylitis."	Small sample. Groups well matched for variables: age, sex, duration of present condition, chronicity and probable causative factor. Previous history of other disorders of locomotor system more common in naproxen group (8 vs. 3). Data suggest no differences over short duration, likely underpowered.
Halle 1986 RCT	2.0	N = 48 with lateral epi-condylitis (pain over common extensor origin with resisted wrist extension and point tenderness over epicondyle)	Ultrasound with coupling agent vs. ultrasound with 10% hydrocortisone coupling agent vs. transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation vs. hydrocortisone and lidocaine injection. Details of treatment not provided. Treatments QD for 5 days except injection. All treated with	Pain Intensity Index: US 16.5 vs. US with hydrocortisone 13.5 vs. TENS 1.5 vs. Injection 2.5 (latter 3 p <0.05). Pain rating index total: US 7.5 vs. US with hydrocortisone 16.0 vs. TENS 7.0 vs. Injection 3.0 (all but US with hydrocortisone p <0.05). Comparing pre/post tests: US 69% of variables improved, 12% same, and 19% worse. US with hydrocortisone 65% improved, 12 % same, 23% worse.	"While no difference was demonstrated to exist between the four treatment protocols, it was shown that improvement, as measured by the pain indexes, did occur over all four treatment groups when the pre-treatment and post-treatment values were compared."	Much of study not well described. No Placebo. Short follow up (5 days). Poor blinding, though ultrasound attempted blinding. No description of randomization/confounders – no discussion of individual group demographics. One-tailed t-tests. Conclusions of lack of differences between groups appear likely underpowered and incorrect.

			elbow cuff, avoiding strenuous activity, ice massage BID. Five days treatment.	TENS 56% improved, 23% same, 21% worse. Injections 63% improved, 25% same, 12% worse.		
Toker 2008 RCT	1.5	N = 21 with lateral elbow pain with confirmed tennis elbow after physical exam.	Depomedrol 1mL plus prilocaine 1mL plus oral diclofenac plus topical etofenamate cream (n=11) v. oral and topical anti-inflammatory treatment (n=10).	Anti-inflammatory group showed a significant improvement in pain scores from before and after treatment (p=0.026). The injection group showed a significant improvement as well (p=0.003).	"[S]ignificantly enhanced efficacy of the combination treatment used in this study might be limited to the short-term and that adverse effects of steroids on the tendons should be taken into consideration."	Sparse details. Unknown follow-up duration. No medication doses provided.

MEDIAL EPICONDYLALGIA

Author/Year Study Type	Score (0-11)	Population	Comparison Group	Results	Conclusion	Comments
Simunovic 1998 RCT	2.5	N = 324 with medial or lateral epicondy-litis (case definitions not provided) durations unclear though at minimum include subacute and chronic	Patients with bilateral symptoms all underwent trigger point technique (tender point). Patients with unilateral symptoms randomly allocated to one of 3 treatment groups: trigger points, scanner, and combination therapy.	No significant differences between groups when both centers combined. Statistically significant difference between groups with scanner technique ($p < 0.05$). In acute cases, scanner technique favored over TPs ($p > 0.001$). For acute and chronic a significant difference favored scanner over combination technique ($p < 0.001$).	"The current clinical study provides further evidence of the efficacy of LLLT in the management of lateral and medial epicondylitis."	Stated technician blinded, but unclear how possible. Not stratified, analyses use both lateral and medial epicondylitis combined. Lack of analyses and smaller numbers of medial epicondylitis suggests non-significant results. Strong potential for bias (as seen in combination vs. each location analyses). Details sparse, unclear methodology, selection, case definition, treatment administration.
Adelaar 1987 RCT	1.5	N = 18 with lateral, medial or "posterior" epi-condylitis	Diflunisal (initial dose of diflunisal 1000mg followed by diflunisal 500mg every 12 hours for a period of up to 15 days) vs. Naproxen.	No statistically significant differences any categories between study drugs or pre- and post-test results at 5th level single tail distribution. One patient receiving diflunisal developed transient nausea and stomach cramps though both study agents generally well tolerated.	"Diflunisal and naproxen were generally effective in the treatment of mild to moderate pain associated with epicondylitis; there were no significant differences between the drugs."	Methods not well described. Open-label. Small study population. Short duration (15 days). No placebo group.

OLECRANON BURSITIS

Author/Year Study Type	Score (0-11)	Sample Size	Comparison Group	Results	Conclusion	Comments
Aspiration						
Weinstein 1984 Controlled clinical trial	3.5	N=60 males with traumatic olecranon bursitis followed 31 months (range 6-62).	Bursal aspiration vs. aspiration plus corticosteroid injection. Techniques and doses may have varied.	Final data obtained from 49 (82%). Faster resolution with steroid injection (graphic interpretation: effusions in 4% vs. 28% at 4wks).	"[L]ocal corticosteroid is an effective treatment for traumatic olecranon bursitis, the high incidence of side effects and self-limiting nature of the condition indicate conservative therapy for most patients."	Not randomized. Clinical trial. Many details sparse. Data suggest complications occurred in those treated with corticosteroid injection.

ELBOW FRACTURES

Author/Year Study Type	Score (0-11)	Sample Size	Comparison Group	Results	Conclusion	Comments
Immobilization						
Van Leemput 2007 Pseudo-randomized clinical trial	3.0	N = 102 allocated by date of hospital; excluded open fractures, <18 years, obvious signs of infection in fracture, and multiple traumas.	Immobilization in below-elbow for 3 weeks vs. above-elbow for 3 weeks vs. below-elbow for 6 weeks vs compression bandage and immediate mobilization for 6 weeks; 12 weeks follow-up.	Bony healing times above/below 3 weeks 10.7 weeks (12.5% delayed union) vs. 6 weeks 10.5 weeks (13.9% delayed union) vs. no plaster cast 10.4 weeks (11.8% delayed union), NS. No differences in VAS scores, loss of rotation arc, loss of flexion/extension arc, or bony healing time.	"[A]ll three different conservative treatment strategies were compared and showed good comparable results in terms of healing, healing time, pain and function."	Randomization by date of presentation. Data suggest equal efficacy.

ULNAR NEUROPATHIES – CUBITAL TUNNEL

Author/Year Study Type	Score (0-11)	Population	Comparison Group	Results	Conclusion	Comments
Range of Motion Exercises						
Warwick 1995 RCT	2.5	N = 57 after cubital tunnel release surgery with medial epicondylectomy.	Physical therapy group with active and passive range of motion (ROM) exercises started 14 days postoperatively (n=29) vs. same treatment regiment started 3 days postoperatively.	Final elbow ROM for extension for those not achieving full active extension comparing group 1 vs. group 2: 51% vs. 4%; p<0.001.	"[B]etter results can be obtained by starting rehabilitation immediately following cubital tunnel surgery with medial epicondylectomy."	Data suggest early mobilization superior for ROM and RTW (2.2 vs. 4 months)
Glucocorticoid Steroid Injections						

Hong 1996 RCT	3.5	N = 10 men with 12 ulnar nerve lesions at the elbow. All showed signs and symptoms of ulnar neuropathy. Nerve conduction tests used, but not well described.	Nocturnal splint therapy only (n= 5 nerves) vs. splint plus triamcinolone 40mg plus lidocaine 1% 2mL into the cubital tunnel and around ulnar nerve (n= 7 nerves). Follow-up at 1 and 6 months.	Severity of symptoms (pre/1mo/6mo): splint (3.4±0.8/1.6±1.2/1.8±1.1) vs. combined (3.3±0.9/1.7±0.8/1.1±0.8), NS between treatments. Both groups also improved with signs, but NS. No change in sensory conduction was in either group at 1 or 6 months (p>0.05). Both groups did not differ.	"[S]plinting alone seems to be adequate for treatment of ulnar neuropathy at the elbow, since local steroid injection did not offer any additional benefit."	Small sample sizes. No mention of definition of ulnar neuropathy, especially condylar groove vs. cubital tunnel with NCS, which may be critical.