Transposing Mechanobiology to Sport: Performance-Oriented Applications in Tissue Load Management

Pedro Morouço *

Review

Transposing Mechanobiology to Sport: Performance-Oriented Applications in Tissue Load Management

Pedro Morouço [1,2]

[1] National Program for Physical Activity Promotion, Directorate-General of Health, 1049-005 Lisbon, Portugal; pedromorouco@dgs.min-saude.pt

[2] Clínica Espregueira, FIFA Medical Centre of Excellence, 4350-415 Porto, Portugal

Abstract

Optimizing sports performance implies precisely balancing the training load applied and the adaptability of biological tissues. Recent advances in mechanobiology have clarified how cells and tissues respond to mechanical stimuli, offering a solid foundation for anchoring prescription, progression, and recovery decisions. However, there is still a gap between this fundamental knowledge and everyday training. In this review, we synthesize central principles of mechanotransduction and tissue remodeling, and propose the operative concept of tissue dose as an axis for tissue load management: the mechanical stimulus effectively felt by muscles, tendons, ligaments, and bone. Applications in strength, speed and power training are discussed, stressing the importance of field metrics (e.g., contact times, force development rates, muscle-tendon stiffness) to estimate dose and adjust interventions in a timely manner. Injury prevention strategies based on the identification of risk windows, monitoring of early signs and tissue-oriented reconditioning protocols are also addressed. Finally, future perspectives are explored, including higher-fidelity wearables and interpretable analytics for custom load-response models. Together, these elements support a paradigm of tissue-oriented training, capable of enhancing performance and reducing the incidence of injuries, reconciling scientific rigor with practical applicability.

Keywords: mechanobiology; tissue dose; tissue load management; biomechanical monitoring; injury prevention; muscle-tendon stiffness; strength-speed-power; sports performance

1. Introduction

In high-performance contexts, optimizing sports performance requires carefully balancing the imposed training load with the adaptability of biological tissues. Traditionally, training planning is based on well-established physiological and biomechanical principles, seeking a controlled progression of stimuli to promote gains in strength, power, speed or endurance [1]. However, the high incidence of overload injuries and the variation in individual responses to training highlight limitations of conventional load management models [2,3]. Thus, mechanobiology emerges as an emerging field with great potential to transform the understanding and application of the concept of load in sports training [4].

Mechanobiology studies how cells and tissues respond to mechanical stimuli, influencing fundamental processes such as growth, regeneration, differentiation, and tissue remodeling. Although it has been widely explored in areas such as regenerative medicine and tissue engineering [5], this science is still underused in sports. Understanding the mechanisms of cellular mechanotransduction (i.e., how mechanical stimuli convert into biochemical responses) allows the development of more informed training strategies that maximize adaptation and minimize the risk of injury. In addition, the concept of "tissue load management" has gained importance not only in rehabilitation but also in sports performance [6]. Instead of considering only the external load (e.g.

speed, number of repetitions or load lifted) or the traditional internal load (heart rate, lactate, RPE), it is increasingly relevant to assess the load at the level of the target tissues (bones, muscles, tendons and ligaments). Such a perspective allows a more precise individualization of the training process, adjusting the stimuli to the real adaptation capacities of each athlete at each moment.

With the advent of portable monitoring technologies (such as inertial sensors, force platforms, high-speed cameras and wearables) it has become feasible to obtain real-time data on applied forces, movement patterns, tendon stiffness and neuromuscular fatigue [7]. However, the usefulness of these data depends on their interpretation according to robust biological models, such as those provided by mechanobiology. This article proposes a critical analysis of the application of the principles of mechanobiology to sports training, with the aim of optimizing performance and preventing injuries. To this end, the cellular and tissue foundations of adaptation to mechanical stress and its practical application in different contexts (strength, speed and power) are explored. The potential of biomechanical monitoring and the emergence of customized load management models supported by advanced technologies and algorithms are also discussed. Promoting this integration between basic science and applied practice, we seek to contribute to a new training paradigm: more precise, safer and more effective.

This narrative (critical) review was developed through iterative, targeted searches of PubMed and Scopus, complemented by backward and forward citation tracking from seminal mechanobiology papers and recent sports biomechanics literature. Search terms combined mechanobiology constructs (e.g., mechanotransduction, integrins, ion channels, extracellular matrix, collagen turnover, tendon/ligament remodeling, bone mechanoadaptation) with applied training and monitoring concepts (e.g., external/internal load, tissue loading, rate of force development, ground reaction forces, stiffness, sprint/plyometrics, wearable sensors, field-based monitoring). We prioritized peer-reviewed studies and high-quality reviews with direct relevance to performance-oriented tissue load management, particularly in trained and elite athletic contexts. The evidence was synthesized using a thematic approach, organized around (i) cellular and tissue-level mechanisms, (ii) operationalization of "tissue dose" in the field, and (iii) implications for training prescription, recovery, and injury prevention.

2. Fundamentals of Mechanobiology Relevant to Sports Performance

The biological response of the tissues to mechanical stimuli is decisive for optimizing training and recovery. Mechanobiology offers a solid framework for interpreting the effects of different loads, identifying boundaries between effective stimulus, overload, and injury. In this section, three pillars are summarized: (i) cellular mechanotransduction, (ii) tissue remodeling, and (iii) dose-response relationship of mechanical loading.

2.1. Cellular Mechanotransduction

Mechanotransduction corresponds to the conversion of mechanical stimuli into intracellular biochemical signals, triggering structural and functional changes. This process is mediated by components such as integrins, cytoskeleton and mechanosensitive ion channels, among other cell-matrix binding elements. In a sports context, its relevance stems from the fact that training (strength, speed or endurance) generates stresses and deformations that induce specific responses, namely increased protein synthesis in skeletal muscle and reinforcement of the extracellular matrix in tendons [8]. The magnitude, frequency, and duration of the stimulus modulate the quality of the response [1]. Subthreshold stimuli tend to produce discrete adaptations; excessive loads, on the other hand, can precipitate inflammation and tissue degradation. Thus, understanding these mechanisms allows us to prescribe stimuli that maximize the desired adaptation with controlled risk. In summary, mechanotransduction provides the cellular basis that underpins tissue-oriented training decisions.

2.2. Tissue Remodeling and Adaptation

Musculoskeletal tissues have distinct adaptation profiles. In muscle, hypertrophy, gains in neuromuscular efficiency, and possible alterations in fiber recruitment predominate. In tendons and ligaments, the response is slower and focuses on increasing stiffness and resistance to deformation. The bone adapts according to principles of structural optimization, reinforcing regions subjected to greater mechanical stress. These responses depend not only on the load imposed, but also on recovery cycles, nutritional support, and biological age [9]. Ignoring the time needed for cell regeneration compromises gains and increases the risk of injury due to overload; conversely, insufficient stimulus promotes atrophy and frailty. In practical terms, the progression of loading must respect the timing of each tissue, articulating stimulus and recovery in a judicious way.

2.3. Dose-Response Relationship of Mechanical Load

The relationship between mechanical 'dose' and biological response is non-linear and specific to individual, tissue and stage of training. There is an optimal stimulus zone in which the load promotes positive adaptations; below it, gains are reduced, and above it is observed a greater probability of prolonged fatigue or injury [10]. Accurate quantification of tissue load remains challenging [11]. However, the integration of biomechanical (e.g., reaction forces), physiological (e.g., heart rate variability), and perceptual (e.g., RPE) metrics brings the decision-making process closer to the athlete's biological reality. In this way, it becomes possible to design more effective load management strategies, aligning the stimulus applied with the adaptive capacity of the target tissues.

3. From Theory to practice: Operationalization of Mechanobiology in Training

The transposition of the principles of mechanobiology to the real training context requires an interdisciplinary approach that integrates biological knowledge, biomechanical evaluation and applied load control methodologies. This section describes practical implications for load management, field monitoring and the development of customized adaptive response models.

3.1. Training Load: External, Internal and Tissue Dose

The distinction between external and internal load has become central to training control [2]. External load refers to the mechanical work performed (e.g., mileage, sprint speed, number of repetitions, load lifted). The internal load reflects the body's response to the stimulus (e.g., heart rate, lactate, RPE, heart rate variability). Still, none of these dimensions directly captures the effective tissue dose: the specific mechanical stimulus felt by the cells of the target tissues (bones, muscles, tendons, and ligaments) [11]. The mechanobiological perspective suggests favoring metrics that approximate this dose, such as local tensions, strain rates, muscle-tendon stiffness and contact times. Aligning the prescription with the expected tissue dose allows to maximize the desired adaptations and reduce the likelihood of overload.

3.2. Biomechanical Monitoring in the Field

The recent evolution of wearable devices has made it feasible to collect, in an ecological context, data with mechanobiological relevance. Inertial sensors, accelerometers and gyroscopes, portable force platforms and computer vision systems allow monitoring, in real time, parameters such as:

- impact forces and ground contact times;
- angular velocity and acceleration of segments;
- rates of force development;
- asymmetries of motion and signs of neuromuscular fatigue [12,13].

Interpreted from a mechanobiological perspective, these data help to estimate tissue dose, identify risk patterns (e.g., tendon overload, decreased stiffness, compensations) and immediately adjust training content (exercises, volumes, intensities and rest). Thus, field monitoring is no longer

a technological accessory and becomes an operational tool for load management and injury prevention.

3.3. Personalized Adaptive Response Models

Adaptive capacity is intrinsically individual and depends on factors such as injury history, biological age, muscle fiber profile, and hormonal status [14]. Building custom load-response models requires longitudinal and integrated collection of biomechanical, physiological, and perceptual information, analyzed with robust analytical methods (including machine learning, where relevant). Based on these models, it is possible to delimit optimal stimulus zones for different tissues, distinguishing, for example, intensities and load profiles that predominantly favor muscle hypertrophy, increased tendon stiffness or bone remodeling [15,16]. At the same time, these models make it possible to anticipate states of fatigue and increased risk of injury [2,3], by detecting subtle changes in variables that are particularly sensitive to overload, such as movement variability, the rate of force development or joint stiffness. With this information, it is feasible to adjust microcycles in a timely manner, modulating volume, intensity, and exercise selection according to the observed response and the expected response of the athlete [1]. Finally, the same logic supports the individualization of recovery strategies, calibrating the dose and timing of interventions (e.g. eccentric training, plyometrics or isometric work) to respect the biological adaptation times of each tissue [11]. This framework promotes tissue-oriented training, in which decisions are not only based on observed performance, but also on anticipated tissue response, reinforcing the safety and efficiency of the adaptation process.

4. Practical Applications in Strength, Speed and Power Training

The incorporation of mechanobiological principles into training requires their translation into concrete decisions on prescription, progression and recovery. This section describes operational implications for three pillars of performance: strength, speed and power. In all cases, the goal is to align the tissue dose with the intended adaptation, reducing the risk of overload.

4.1. Strength Training

Strength development relies on the systematic application of progressive loads that induce controlled microtrauma and anabolic signaling in skeletal muscle. The adaptive response depends not only on the absolute load, but also on the time under tension, the rate of force development, and neuromuscular coordination [17].

- Type of contraction: Concentric, eccentric, and isometric contractions produce distinct mechanobiological stimuli. Eccentric work tends to generate high stresses and elongation rates, favoring adaptations in the extracellular matrix and increased tendon stiffness; still, it requires cautious progression to avoid excess damage. Isometric work at specific angles can modulate muscle-tendon stiffness and reduce pain in clinical settings, without excessive mechanical costs.
- Temporal load distribution: Sessions with poorly spaced load peaks increase the risk of overload. Progression should respect tissue recovery windows, adjusting volume and intensity to the observed response (e.g., RFD variations, force asymmetries, perceived exertion).
- Exercise selection: Multi-joint patterns (squats, pulls, pushes) allow to distribute tensions and train complete kinetic chains, while accessory exercises refine specific deficits (e.g., knee extension, hamstring work). The choice should consider individual tissue tolerance and injury history.

In summary, the strength training prescription should combine load progression, stress rate control and monitoring of early signs of overload, maximizing structural and functional adaptation [18].

4.2. Speed Training

Speed, whether at maximum acceleration, short sprints, and rapid changes of direction, is critically dependent on the functional stiffness of the muscle-tendon system. Stiffer tendons store and return elastic energy with greater efficiency, reducing contact times and improving economy of motion [19].

- Exposure to high load rates: Short sprints, plyometrics, and ballistic drills provide force application and strain rates compatible with tendon adaptations. Volume and frequency management is essential to avoid accumulation of microdamage.
- Technique and orientation of force vectors: Torso and lower limb angles determine the directionality of the force (horizontal vs. vertical), modulating the stresses in the tissues. Technical instruction should minimize compensatory patterns (e.g., collapse of dynamic valgus).
- In-field monitoring: Contact times, asymmetry and angular velocity variations help detect fatigue and adjust the session. Persistent signs of increased contact time or decreased velocity indicate the need for dose reduction or further recovery.

The goal is to expose the tissues to specific stimuli sufficient to promote adaptation, without exceeding the ability to recover between sessions [20].

4.3. Power Training

Power comes from the ability to generate force quickly by taking advantage of the stretch-shortening cycle (SSC). Performance depends on the balance between muscle contractile elements and elastic (tendon) components [21].

- SSC Exploration: Jumps, throws, and ballistic lifts optimize elastic energy utilization and neuromuscular synchronization. The quality of the execution (amplitude, rhythm, functional stifness) is as relevant as the number of repetitions.
- Force-velocity profiles: Identification of specific deficits (need for more force at low speeds vs. more speed at low loads) guides exercise choice and load calibration.
- Stiffness management: Insufficient stiffness compromises force transfer; Excessive stiffness can increase the risk of microinjury, especially in phases of highly competitive demand. Planned alternation between eccentric, isometric and ballistic stimuli helps to modulate stiffness to functional levels.

Operationally, power training should integrate brief, high-quality exposures, with sufficient rest intervals to preserve speed of execution and tissue integrity [22].

Accordingly, in strength, speed and power training, the practical application of mechanobiological principles translates into aligning exercise content, progression and recovery with the tolerance and adaptation times of the tissues. Decision informed by field metrics (e.g., contact times, RFD, asymmetries) allows to intervene early, preventing overload and sustaining performance gains.

5. Injury Prevention Based on Mechanobiological Principles

Injury prevention in high-performance sport remains a persistent challenge, despite the evolution of training, monitoring and recovery methods [3]. In many cases, overload injuries reflect a mismatch between the mechanical dose to which the tissues are exposed and their ability to adapt in a given period. Mechanobiology provides a particularly useful framework for interpreting this process, by conceptualizing injury as the result of progressive adaptive failure [23]. Not necessarily as a sudden event, but as the cumulative consequence of mechanically relevant stimuli that repeatedly exceed tissue tolerance. From this perspective, prevention no longer depends only on overall load reduction and starts to focus on tissue dose management, respecting biological remodeling times and integrating early signs of dysfunction.

5.1. From Load-Capacity Mismatch to Injury

When the progression of the load repeatedly exceeds the window of adaptation of the tissues (especially those with a slower response, such as tendons and ligaments), there is an accumulation of microdamage and activation of inflammatory cascades that increase the probability of injury [2,3]. The sustainability of the training process depends, therefore, on respect for the biological repair and remodeling times, which vary between tissues and are influenced by factors such as age, injury history, sleep, energy availability and systemic stress [20]. It is important to note that the risk does not derive only from "too much load", but from the way the load is distributed over time, namely through sudden peaks in volume, intensity or density (reduction of rest intervals). Conversely, the insufficiency of mechanical stimulus can reduce stiffness and load capacity, weakening the tissue and increasing vulnerability when the demand rises again. Thus, prevention requires a balance between sufficient exposure for adaptation and control of load variability to avoid abrupt transitions.

5.2. Early Signs and Continuous Monitoring

In many athletes, subtle changes in biomechanical patterns precede the onset of symptoms. Functional asymmetries, modifications in muscle-tendon stiffness, consistent increases in contact times, decreases in the rate of force development, or increased variability in movement may represent early signs of accumulated fatigue or localized overload [24,25]. The relevance of these markers increases when interpreted in a mechanobiological logic, i.e., as proxies of changes in tissue dose or system responsiveness. From an operational point of view, continuous monitoring gains value when it is longitudinal and individualized: small momentary variations can be expected, but persistent deviations from the usual profile tend to signal the need for stimulus adjustment [26]. The integration of biomechanical metrics with physiological and perceptual indicators allows for a more robust reading of the athlete's condition, reducing decisions based on a single marker and favoring early preventive interventions.

5.3. Tissue-Oriented Rehabilitation and Reconditioning

The return to training and competition after injury should consider not only the clinical resolution of symptoms, but the recovery of the mechanical and structural properties of the affected tissue, including stiffness, tolerance to deformation, and ability to dissipate and store energy [27]. At this stage, the mechanical dose must be titrated with particular care, selecting the type of contraction, the time under tension, the amplitude and the rate of load depending on the tissue objective and the stage of repair. Progressive protocols that evolve from lower mechanical stimuli to more specific tasks (e.g., from isometric and concentric control to eccentric and, later, plyometric exposures) favor the reorganization of the extracellular matrix and functional recovery [23]. The gradual reintroduction of sport-specific tasks (e.g. changes of direction, sprints, jumps or decelerations) should be accompanied by sensitive markers to ensure that the load capacity of the tissue keeps pace with the imposed demand and reduce the risk of recurrence.

5.4. Predictive Models and Timely Decision

In competitive environments, decision-making benefits from models that integrate information on external load, internal load and biomechanical indicators with tissue relevance [25]. The usefulness of these models lies not only in "predicting" injuries in a deterministic way, but in identifying periods of greater vulnerability and supporting timely adjustments (e.g., volume modulation, exercise redistribution, change in the stimulus profile (load rate) or recovery increment). Analytical approaches, including machine learning models, can be particularly useful when built with longitudinal data from the athlete himself and when they privilege interpretability. Prevention thus becomes an iterative process: the athlete is exposed to stimuli, the response is monitored, and planning adjusts based on objective and subjective signs of adaptation. In this logic, mechanobiology

works as an "explanatory layer" to guide which signals are most relevant and how to interpret them in relation to the target tissue and the type of load.

Table 1. Practical translation of mechanobiological principles for injury prevention [2,3,14,20,23,24,26–28].

Operational focus	Indicator/decision	Mechanobiological rationale
Load progression	Avoid sudden spikes in volume/intensity/density	Reduces adaptive window overflow and accumulated microdamage
Slow-response tissue (tendon/ligament)	Increased spacing of high load rate sessions	Slower remodeling requires recovery and phased exposure
Biomechanical monitoring	Track contact time, RFD, asymmetry trends	Stiffness/load-absorbing capacity change proxies
State triangulation	Combine biomechanical + physiological + RPE/pain metrics	Increases robustness of inference about adaptation vs. fatigue
Post-injury reconditioning	Isometric/concentric → eccentric progression → plyometrics	Dose titration to restore extracellular matrix and SSC
Competitive specificity	Phased reintroduction of monitored sprints/change of direction/jumps	Increases tolerance to load rates typical of the modality
Microcycle adjustment	Timely modulation (volume, selection, load rate)	Maintains tissue dose in adaptive zone, minimizing risk
Customized models	Individual and interpretable load-response profiles	Capture inter-individual variability and support practical decision making

6. Future Prospects and Technological Challenges

The application of mechanobiology to training is consolidating with the maturation of field technologies and analytical methods. Three axes stand out for the next decade:

(i) Advanced analytics with practical utility. Machine learning techniques may detect individual patterns of adaptation [29] and suggest safe/effective stimulus ranges per tissue [30]. However, adoption should favor transparent models, which explain "why" and "how" to adjust (avoiding black boxes that are difficult to operationalize).

(ii) Portable sensors and tissue metrics. The miniaturization and improvement of the fidelity of IMUs, portable platforms and computer vision already allow to estimate, in an ecological context, proxies of local stress, strain rate and functional stiffness [31]. The next step involves standardized protocols, frequent calibration, and data interoperability between devices and software.

(iii) Ecosystem, ethics and qualification. Real gains require partnerships between clubs, clinical centers, universities, and technology companies. At the same time, it is necessary to ensure data privacy and security, independent validation of metrics and training of professionals to interpret and apply mechanobiological information consistently.

The potential lies not only in "having more data", but in translating data into prescribing decisions that respect the biology of the tissues: in a timely manner, with operational simplicity and focus on the athlete.

7. Conclusions

The transposition of mechanobiological principles into sports training is a strategic opportunity to raise the quality of prescription, optimize performance and reduce the incidence of injuries. Seeing tissues as dynamic entities, with specific adaptation times and limits, allows adequate training content alignment, progressions and recovery with the biological reality of each athlete. This article sought to show that mechanobiology is an applied tool: knowledge about mechanotransduction, tissue remodeling, and dose-response relationships inform practical decisions (from the selection of exercises to the modulation of volume, intensity, and density, including the choice of the type of contraction and the time under tension). Biomechanical field monitoring, interpreted in this light, provides early indicators to adjust the load before damage occurs.

Successful integration requires a paradigm shift: complementing models focused only on external/physiological metrics with a tissue-oriented approach, underpinned by reliable data and simple operational routines. Thus, mechanobiology asserts itself as a new foundation of the science of training, reconciling scientific rigor and practical applicability. The ultimate goal is no longer just to avoid injury or "bear" loads, but to deliberately pursue tissue adaptation that underpins athletic performance and longevity.

References

1. Smith DJ. A framework for understanding the training process leading to elite performance. Sports medicine. 2003;33(15):1103–26.
2. Drew MK, Finch CF. The relationship between training load and injury, illness and soreness: a systematic and literature review. Sports medicine. 2016;46(6):861–83.
3. Eckard TG, Padua DA, Hearn DW, Pexa BS, Frank BS. The relationship between training load and injury in athletes: a systematic review. Sports medicine. 2018;48(8):1929–61; Correction in Sports medicine. 2020;50(6):1223.
4. Pizzolato C, Lloyd DG, Barrett RS, Cook JL, Zheng MH, Besier TF, et al. Bioinspired technologies to connect musculoskeletal mechanobiology to the person for training and rehabilitation. Front Comput Neurosci. 2017;11:96.
5. Naqvi SM, McNamara LM. Stem cell mechanobiology and the role of biomaterials in governing mechanotransduction and matrix production for tissue regeneration. Front Bioeng Biotechnol. 2020;8:597661.
6. Gabbett T. Load management: what it is and what it is not! Vol. 15, Sports Health. SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA; 2023. p. 478.
7. Edriss S, Romagnoli C, Caprioli L, Zanela A, Panichi E, Campoli F, et al. The role of emergent technologies in the dynamic and kinematic assessment of human movement in sport and clinical applications. Applied Sciences. 2024;14(3):1012.
8. Wackerhage H, Schoenfeld BJ, Hamilton DL, Lehti M, Hulmi JJ. Stimuli and sensors that initiate skeletal muscle hypertrophy following resistance exercise. J Appl Physiol. 2019;126(1):30–43.
9. Hart NH, Nimphius S, Rantalainen T, Ireland A, Siafarikas A, Newton RU. Mechanical basis of bone strength: influence of bone material, bone structure and muscle action. J Musculoskelet Neuronal Interact. 2017;17(3):114.
10. Milanez VF, Ramos SP, Okuno NM, Boullosa DA, Nakamura FY. Evidence of a non-linear dose-response relationship between training load and stress markers in elite female futsal players. J Sports Sci Med. 2014;13(1):22.
11. Gabbett TJ, Oetter E. From tissue to system: what constitutes an appropriate response to loading? Sports Medicine. 2025;55(1):17–35.
12. Tai WH, Zhang R, Zhao L. Cutting-edge research in sports biomechanics: From basic science to applied technology. Vol. 10, Bioengineering. MDPI; 2023. p. 668.
13. Penichet-Tomas A. Applied biomechanics in sports performance, injury prevention, and rehabilitation. Vol. 14, Applied Sciences. MDPI; 2024. p. 11623.
14. Hamstra-Wright KL, Huxel Bliven KC, Napier C. Training load capacity, cumulative risk, and bone stress injuries: a narrative review of a holistic approach. Front Sports Act Living. 2021;3:665683.
15. McMahon G. No strain, no gain? The role of strain and load magnitude in human tendon responses and adaptation to loading. The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research. 2022;36(10):2950–6.

16. Kjaer M. Role of extracellular matrix in adaptation of tendon and skeletal muscle to mechanical loading. Physiol Rev. 2004;

17. Viecelli C, Aguayo D. May the force and mass be with you—evidence-based contribution of mechano-biological descriptors of resistance exercise. Front Physiol. 2022;12:686119.

18. Zatsiorsky VM, Kraemer WJ, Fry AC. Science and practice of strength training. Human kinetics; 2020.

19. Alexander RM. Tendon elasticity and muscle function. Comp Biochem Physiol A Mol Integr Physiol. 2002;133(4):1001–11.

20. Gabbett TJ. The training—injury prevention paradox: should athletes be training smarter and harder? Br J Sports Med. 2016;50(5):273–80.

21. Earp JE, Newton RU, Cormie P, Blazevich AJ. The influence of loading intensity on muscle–tendon unit behavior during maximal knee extensor stretch shortening cycle exercise. Eur J Appl Physiol. 2014;114(1):59–69.

22. Turner AN, Jeffreys I. The stretch-shortening cycle: Proposed mechanisms and methods for enhancement. Strength Cond J. 2010;32(4):87–99.

23. Weir G. Anterior cruciate ligament injury prevention in sport: biomechanically informed approaches. Sports Biomech. 2024;23(11):1867–87.

24. Edwards WB. Modeling overuse injuries in sport as a mechanical fatigue phenomenon. Exerc Sport Sci Rev. 2018;46(4):224–31.

25. Grieco A, Molteni G, Vito G de, Sias N. Epidemiology of musculoskeletal disorders due to biomechanical overload. Ergonomics. 1998;41(9):1253–60.

26. Franklyn-Miller A, Roberts A, Hulse D, Foster J. Biomechanical overload syndrome: defining a new diagnosis. Br J Sports Med. 2014;48(6):415–6.

27. Shrier I, Safai P, Charland L. Return to play following injury: whose decision should it be? Br J Sports Med. 2014;48(5):394–401.

28. Hewett TE, Bates NA. Preventive biomechanics: a paradigm shift with a translational approach to injury prevention. Am J Sports Med. 2017;45(11):2654–64.

29. Van Eetvelde H, Mendonça LD, Ley C, Seil R, Tischer T. Machine learning methods in sport injury prediction and prevention: a systematic review. J Exp Orthop. 2021;8(1):27.

30. Leckey C, Van Dyk N, Doherty C, Lawlor A, Delahunt E. Machine learning approaches to injury risk prediction in sport: a scoping review with evidence synthesis. Br J Sports Med. 2025;59(7):491–500.

31. Camomilla V, Bergamini E, Fantozzi S, Vannozzi G. Trends supporting the in-field use of wearable inertial sensors for sport performance evaluation: A systematic review. Sensors. 2018;18(3):873.