International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science

e-ISSN: 2544-9435

Scholarly Publisher
RS Global Sp. z O.O.
ISNI: 0000 0004 8495 2390

Dolna 17, Warsaw,
Poland 00-773
+48 226 0 227 03
editorial_office@rsglobal.pl

ARTICLE TITLE	FATIGUE FRACTURES IN RECREATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL ATHLETES: RISK FACTORS, PREVENTION, AND RECOVERY STRATEGIES
ARTICLE INFO	Krzysztof Pietrzak, Małgorzata Wasilewska, Sebastian Polok. (2025) Fatigue Fractures in Recreational and Professional Athletes: Risk Factors, Prevention, and Recovery Strategies. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 3(47). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.3(47).2025.3466
DOI	https://doi.org/10.31435/ijitss.3(47).2025.3466
RECEIVED	05 June 2025
ACCEPTED	15 July 2025
PUBLISHED	17 July 2025
LICENSE	The article is licensed under a **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.**

© The author(s) 2025.
This article is published as open access under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0), allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

FATIGUE FRACTURES IN RECREATIONAL AND PROFESSIONAL ATHLETES: RISK FACTORS, PREVENTION, AND RECOVERY STRATEGIES

Krzysztof Pietrzak *(Corresponding Author, Email: k.p.pietrzak98@gmail.com)*
University Hospital of Zielona Góra, Zyty 26, 65-046 Zielona Góra, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0000-9249-3161

Małgorzata Wasilewska
University Hospital of Zielona Góra, Zyty 26, 65-046 Zielona Góra, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0008-0375-1391

Sebastian Polok
University Clinical Hospital No. 1 in Szczecin, Unii Lubelskiej 1, 71-252 Szczecin, Poland
ORCID ID: 0009-0006-4762-1076

ABSTRACT

Objectives: In the review we synthesized current evidence on fatigue fractures in athletes to bridge pathophysiological mechanisms with clinical strategies for prevention, diagnosis, and recovery.
Methods: A comprehensive analysis incorporated epidemiological studies, biomechanical research, clinical trials, and meta-analyses examining risk factors, diagnostics, interventions, and rehabilitation protocols.
Key findings: Fatigue fractures arise from repetitive microdamage exceeding bone repair capacity, amplified by intrinsic factors (e.g., low bone mineral density, hormonal imbalances) and extrinsic triggers (training errors, nutritional deficiencies). Magnetic resonance imaging demonstrated 90-95% diagnostic sensitivity. Gradual training progression (acute:chronic workload ratio < 1.5) reduced injuries by 30-50%, while nutritional optimization (calcium 1200-1500 mg/day; vitamin D ≥ 30ng/mL) enhanced recovery by 40%. Female athletes with relative energy deficiency faced 4-fold higher risk, mitigated through hormone/nutrition strategies. Advanced therapies like teriparatide improved outcomes in complex cases.
Conclusions: Effective management requires multidisciplinary integration of sport-specific biomechanics, nutritional/hormonal optimization, phased rehabilitation, and individualized load monitoring, with tailored approaches for post-hiatus deconditioning and aging physiology.

KEYWORDS

Fatigue Fractures, Stress Fractures, Bone Remodeling, Athletic Injuries, Hormonal Imbalances

CITATION

Krzysztof Pietrzak, Małgorzata Wasilewska, Sebastian Polok. (2025) Fatigue Fractures in Recreational and Professional Athletes: Risk Factors, Prevention, and Recovery Strategies. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 3(47). doi: 10.31435/ijitss.3(47).2025.3466

COPYRIGHT

© The author(s) 2025. This article is published as open access under the **Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0)**, allowing the author to retain copyright. The CC BY 4.0 License permits the content to be copied, adapted, displayed, distributed, republished, or reused for any purpose, including adaptation and commercial use, as long as proper attribution is provided.

1.Introduction

Fatigue fractures, also known as stress fractures, represent a significant clinical concern in both recreational and professional athletes. These injuries arise from repetitive submaximal loading of the bone, which overwhelms its intrinsic capacity for repair through the remodeling process (Matcuk et al., 2016). The pathophysiology of fatigue fractures stems from imbalance between osteoclastic bone resorption and osteoblastic formation. This is a dynamic process critical for maintaining skeletal integrity (Datta, Ng, Walker, Tuck, & Varanasi, 2008; Long, 2018). Historically, these injuries were first documented in military recruits during prolonged marches, earning the moniker "march fractures" (Anderson, 1990), but their occurance has since expanded to encompass a wide range of athletic activities, from endurance running to gymnastics.

Epidemiological studies reveal substantial sport-specific variation in fatigue fracture incidence. For instance, long-distance runners exhibit a 15–20% lifetime risk of developing stress fractures. In particular weight-bearing bones such as the tibia and metatarsals (Kakouris, Yener, & Fong, 2021; Tenforde, Yin, & Hunt, 2016). Ballet and gymnastics athletes demonstrate rates up to 35% during competitive seasons (Matheson et al., 1987). Periods of abrupt training intensification following inactivity as prominently observed during the post-COVID-19 return to training further elevate risk by disrupting bone’s adaptive capacity (Dang, Zhao, Wang, & Zhang, 2022; Hoenig et al., 2022).

While traumatic injuries like concussions dominate media attention (Pierpoint & Collins, 2021), fatigue fractures present a distinct challenge due to their insidious onset. Emerging data highlight disparities in susceptibility, with female athletes, aging populations, and individuals with nutritional deficiencies being disproportionately affected (Aspray & Hill, 2019; McInnis & Ramey, 2016). For example, female athletes with low energy availability face a 2–4-fold increased risk of stress fractures due to hormonal imbalances that impair bone mineralization (Muñoz, Robinson, & Shibli-Rahhal, 2020; Warden, Davis, & Fredericson, 2014).

2. Research Methods

We adhered to PRISMA guidelines. The analysis integrated quantitative and qualitative assessment of peer-reviewed literature (2000–2024).

Study Design

A multi-database search (PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, Cochrane Library) utilized Boolean operators combining key terms: ("fatigue fracture" OR "stress fracture") AND ("athlete" OR "sports") AND ("risk factor" OR "prevention" OR "rehabilitation") AND ("diagnosis" OR "recovery").

Inclusion Criteria:

- Population: Competitive/recreational athletes (all ages, sexes, sports)
- Interventions: Quantified strategies (training progression, nutritional supplementation, biomechanical modifications)
- Outcomes: Imaging-confirmed fracture incidence/healing
- Study Types: RCTs, cohort studies, meta-analyses, biomechanical investigations

Data Collection

Two investigators independently conducted title/abstract screening and full-text review. Quality assessment used:

- Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for observational studies
- Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool for RCTs

Analysis Techniques

Data synthesis employed:

- Meta-analysis for homogeneous outcomes using random-effects models (reported with effect sizes and 95% CIs)
- Subgroup analyses for high-risk populations and sport-specific patterns
- Sensitivity analysis to address methodological heterogeneity (e.g., variable MRI protocols)

3. Pathophysiology and Biomechanics

Fatigue fractures occur when repetitive mechanical stress disrupts the bone's intrinsic ability to repair microdamage through remodeling. This process depends on osteoclasts and osteoblasts, which maintain the equilibrium between bone formation and resorption critical for skeletal integrity (Datta, Ng, Walker, Tuck, & Varanasi, 2008). Under normal conditions, bone adapts to mechanical loading by increasing mineralization in high-stress regions. However, excessive or abrupt increases in strain common in athletes returning to training after periods of inactivity can overrun this adaptive capacity, leading to microfracture accumulation (Matcuk et al., 2016).

The pathophysiology is influenced by systemic and local factors. Osteocytes, embedded within the bone matrix, detect mechanical strain and orchestrate remodeling via signaling pathways such as Wnt/β-catenin and RANKL/OPG (Datta et al., 2008). Disruptions in energy metabolism impair osteoblast function and reduce bone formation rates (Long, 2018). For example, low energy availability in endurance athletes suppresses insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF-1), a critical anabolic hormone for bone repair (Warden, Davis, & Fredericson, 2014).

Emerging research highlights the interplay between bone and adipose tissue, mediated by hormones like leptin (indirectly inhibiting osteoblasts) and adiponectin (enhancing osteogenesis) (Reid, 2010). These interactions may explain why athletes with low body fat percentages exhibit higher fracture susceptibility despite normal bone mineral density (Varley et al., 2021).

Site-specific vulnerabilities further complicate the biomechanical landscape. Weight-bearing bones (e.g., tibia, metatarsals) are prone to fatigue fractures due to cyclical compressive forces (Anderson, 1990; Tenforde, Yin, & Hunt, 2016), while sacral fractures common in gymnasts arise from repetitive torsional stresses during hyperextension (Beit Ner, Rabau, Dosani, & Velkes, 2022). High-risk fractures (e.g., femoral neck) happen in regions with limited vascular supply. This is the factor delaying healing (Mandell, Khurana, & Smith, 2017).

Understanding these mechanisms creates targeted prevention: optimizing energy availability enhances bone's adaptive response (Warden et al., 2014), while sport-specific biomechanical assessments identify at-risk athletes (Emery & Pasanen, 2019).

4. Risk Factors

Fatigue fractures result from complex interactions between intrinsic physiological vulnerabilities and extrinsic environmental stressors. Bone mineral density (BMD) deficits critically increase susceptibility, with osteopenia (T-score -1.0 to -2.5) elevating risk 50% and osteoporosis (T-score ≤ -2.5) tripling fracture incidence (Aspray & Hill, 2019; Ensrud & Crandall, 2017). These vulnerabilities are amplified by endocrine dysfunction. Most importantly, hypoestrogenism in female athletes with low energy availability impaire osteoblast function and increases fracture risk fourfold (Muñoz, Robinson, & Shibli-Rahhal, 2020; Warden, Davis, & Fredericson, 2014). Age-related hormonal declines in masters athletes further compromise bone remodeling capacity (Perracini, Kristensen, Cunningham, & Sherrington, 2018).

Biomechanical factors substantially modulate fracture risk. Excessive hip internal rotation (>15°) during weight-bearing elevates tibial strain 2.3-fold (Kakouris, Yener, & Fong, 2021; Saunier & Chapurlat, 2018), while forefoot strike patterns concentrate 1.8× greater stress on metatarsals (Tenforde, Yin, & Hunt, 2016). Body composition alterations independently contribute; reduced lean mass diminishes muscle-mediated shock absorption (Hoenig et al., 2022), whereas elevated adiposity promotes pro-inflammatory cytokine release that accelerates bone resorption (Reid, 2010).

Training errors represent the most significant extrinsic risk. Abrupt workload increases (acute:chronic ratio >1.5) correlating with 30–50% higher fracture rates (Emery & Pasanen, 2019; Matheson et al., 1987). Post-hiatus intensification without progressive reloading further doubles metatarsal/tibial risk (Dang, Zhao, Wang, & Zhang, 2022). Nutritional deficiencies compound these risks: suboptimal calcium (<1000 mg/day) and vitamin D (<20 ng/mL) make mineralization insufficient (Fischer, Haffner-Luntzer, Amling, & Ignatius, 2018). Moreover, inadequate protein (<1.6 g/kg/day) reduces collagen synthesis (Close, Sale, Baar, & Bermon, 2019).

Sport-specific biomechanics generate distinct injury patterns. Runners develop tibial and metatarsal fractures from repetitive axial loading (Kakouris et al., 2021; Tenforde et al., 2016). Gymnasts sustain sacral injuries from rotational/hyperextension forces (Beit Ner, Rabau, Dosani, & Velkes, 2022). Military recruits exhibit femoral neck and calcaneal fractures due to loaded marching (Lambert, Ritzmann, Akoto, & Büsch, 2022).

High-risk populations require targeted management:

● Female athletes with RED-S need nutritional rehabilitation and hormone optimization (Muñoz et al., 2020; Warden et al., 2014)

● Masters athletes benefit from resistance training to offset sarcopenia-related risks (Perracini et al., 2018)

● Endurance athletes require metabolic monitoring to prevent energy deficit consequences (Vitale & Getzin, 2019)

While genetic associations (e.g., COL1A1 polymorphisms) exist, their clinical relevance remains investigational (Addai, Zarkos, & Tolekova, 2019).

5. Diagnostic Approaches

Accurate diagnosis of fatigue fractures requires careful integration of clinical assessment and advanced imaging. Athletes typically report gradual-onset pain localized to the affected bone that worsens during activity and eases with rest. Physical examination reveals focal tenderness on palpation, though visible swelling is uncommon in early stages (Matcuk et al., 2016). A detailed training history is essential, documenting recent changes in intensity, footwear modifications, or surface transitions that may contribute to injury mechanisms (Matheson et al., 1987).

Conventional radiographs serve as an initial imaging tool but demonstrate limited sensitivity (15–35%) for early-stage fractures. Periosteal reactions or fracture lines often become visible only after 2–6 weeks of symptom onset (Anderson, 1990; Mandell, Khurana, & Smith, 2017). When radiographs appear normal yet clinical suspicion remains, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) provides superior diagnostic capability. MRI shows 90–95% sensitivity for detecting bone marrow edema on fluid-sensitive sequences and fracture lines on T1-weighted images (Fredericson et al., 2006; Matcuk et al., 2016). This modality effectively differentiates stress fractures from soft-tissue pathologies like tendinopathies or muscle strains (Tenforde, Yin, & Hunt, 2016).

For complex anatomical regions like the tarsal navicular or femoral neck, computed tomography (CT) offers critical advantages. CT visualizes subtle cortical disruptions and trabecular microfractures not easily seen on MRI (Mandell et al., 2017; McInnis & Ramey, 2016). Another tool is bone scintigraphy which demonstrates high sensitivity but poor specificity, making it less suitable for routine diagnosis (Fredericson et al., 2006).

Risk stratification guides clinical management. High-risk fractures involving the femoral neck tension cortex, anterior tibial diaphysis, or fifth metatarsal base require immediate non-weight-bearing protocols due to high complication rates (McInnis & Ramey, 2016; Beit Ner, Rabau, Dosani, & Velkes, 2022). Low-risk injuries like posteromedial tibial fractures typically respond well to activity modification and protected weight-bearing (Warden, Davis, & Fredericson, 2014). Emerging serum biomarkers such as C-terminal telopeptide (CTX) show promise for monitoring healing progression but remain investigational (Hoenig et al., 2022).

Multidisciplinary assessment should include gait analysis for biomechanical contributors and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) when endocrine or metabolic disorders are suspected (Aspray & Hill, 2019; Muñoz, Robinson, & Shibli-Rahhal, 2020).

6. Prevention Strategies

Preventing fatigue fractures means a comprehensive, integrated approach that addresses the multifactorial etiology of these injuries. Foundational to this effort is the principle of progressive mechanical adaptation, which recognizes bone's inherent capacity to strengthen when subjected to gradual increases in load. The acute-to-chronic workload ratio serves as a critical quantitative framework for implementing this principle. Substantial evidence demonstrates that maintaining this ratio below 1.5 reduces fracture incidence by 30–50% across athletic populations (Emery & Pasanen, 2019; Matheson et al., 1987). This metric achieves particular importance when managing return-to-activity scenarios following periods of inactivity, such as post-injury recovery or seasonal breaks. For these transitions, a structured protocol limiting weekly volume increases to ≤10% allows osteocytes adequate time to orchestrate adaptive remodeling through Wnt/β-catenin signaling pathways, thereby avoiding microdamage accumulation (Dang, Zhao, Wang, & Zhang, 2022; Lee et al., 2019). Endurance athletes benefit further from periodization models incorporating deload weeks every 3–4 training cycles, which provide essential recovery intervals for bone to consolidate structural adaptations.

Nutritional optimization constitutes a second pillar of effective prevention. Daily calcium intake between 1,200–1,500 mg provides the mineral substrate for hydroxyapatite crystallization, while maintaining serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels ≥30 ng/mL ensures efficient intestinal calcium absorption and regulates osteoblast differentiation (Ensrud & Crandall, 2017; Fischer, Haffner-Luntzer, Amling, & Ignatius, 2018).

Athletes training indoors or during winter months often require supplemental vitamin D3 (2,000–4,000 IU/day) to maintain this threshold. Protein intake assumes coequal importance at 1.6–2.2 g/kg/day, supplying amino acids necessary for collagen matrix synthesis and repair of microstructural damage; leucine-rich sources like whey protein demonstrate superior anabolic effects on bone turnover markers (Close, Sale, Baar, & Bermon, 2019; Saunier & Chapurlat, 2018). Emerging evidence supports synergistic micronutrient combinations, particularly vitamin K2 (menaquinone-7, 100–300 μg/day) which activates osteocalcin carboxylation to facilitate calcium integration into bone matrix, and magnesium (400–500 mg/day) serving as a cofactor for alkaline phosphatase activity in mineralizing osteoid (Reid, 2010).

Biomechanical interventions offer sport-specific protection by redistributing mechanical stress away from high-risk skeletal regions. Runners exhibiting forefoot strike patterns benefit from gait retraining protocols that promote midfoot contact, reducing tibial peak acceleration by 20% through decreased knee stiffness and optimized force distribution (Tenforde, Yin, & Hunt, 2016; Lin et al., 2012). Athletes with structural variations like pes cavus or leg-length discrepancies require custom orthotics with medial arch support and varus wedging, which decrease metatarsal and femoral neck stress concentrations by 15–20% during weight-bearing activities (Kakouris, Yener, & Fong, 2021; Perracini, Kristensen, Cunningham, & Sherrington, 2018). Technological innovations enhance these approaches through wearable accelerometers providing real-time biofeedback on ground reaction forces, allowing immediate kinematic adjustments when impact thresholds exceed 8–10 times body weight (Lee et al., 2019).

Population-specific strategies address unique physiological vulnerabilities. Female athletes presenting with Relative Energy Deficiency in Sport (RED-S) require multidisciplinary management including energy availability optimization (>45 kcal/kg FFM/day) to restore hypothalamic-pituitary-ovarian axis function, coupled with transdermal estradiol (50 μg/day) or cyclic oral contraceptives to reverse estrogen-deficiency osteopenia (Muñoz, Robinson, & Shibli-Rahhal, 2020; Warden, Davis, & Fredericson, 2014). For masters athletes, resistance training assumes paramount importance; programs incorporating weighted squats, lunges, and deadlifts at ≥70% 1RM performed three times weekly stimulate dual osteogenic effects, increasing bone mineral density by 3–5% annually (Aspray & Hill, 2019; Fischer et al., 2018). Endurance athletes operating in chronic energy deficit necessitate vigilant monitoring of metabolic biomarkers including insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF-1) and cortisol, with nutritional periodization ensuring carbohydrate availability during high-intensity blocks (Vitale & Getzin, 2019).

Advanced prophylactic modalities show promise for refractory cases. Low-intensity pulsed ultrasound (LIPUS) devices deliver mechanical stimulation at 1.5 MHz for 20 minutes daily, upregulating RUNX2 expression and bone morphogenetic protein production (Wojda & Donahue, 2018). Pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMF) therapy similarly enhances calcium flux across osteocyte membranes (Walmsley et al., 2016). Pharmacological approaches remain largely investigational but may be justified in osteoporosis-complicated cases; subcutaneous teriparatide (20 μg/day) increases trabecular bone volume by 12% over six months (Wojda & Donahue, 2018). Ultimately, the most effective prevention integrates these approaches within sport-specific periodization models, continuously adjusted through monitoring of both external load metrics and internal physiological biomarkers.

7. Recovery and Rehabilitation

Effective recovery from fatigue fractures necessitates a many-sided approach. This approach combines physiotherapy, nutritional support, advanced regenerative therapies, and psychological strategies. All this to ensure physical and mental readiness for sports.

Physiotherapy Protocols

Rehabilitation begins with pain management and protected weight-bearing to prevent fracture progression. For low-risk fractures, such as those in the metatarsal diaphysis or posteromedial tibia, partial weight-bearing using crutches or pneumatic walking boots is initiated within 1-2 weeks of diagnosis (Warden, Davis, & Fredericson, 2014). Gradual reloading stimulates bone remodeling via mechanotransduction, where osteocytes convert mechanical strain into biochemical signals that enhance osteoblast activity (Datta, Ng, Walker, Tuck, & Varanasi, 2008). High-risk fractures, such as femoral neck or anterior tibial cortex injuries, require strict non-weight-bearing immobilization for 6-8 weeks, followed by progressive resistance training to restore muscle strength and joint mobility (McInnis & Ramey, 2016; Beit Ner, Rabau, Dosani, & Velkes, 2022). Aquatic therapy, leveraging buoyancy to reduce gravitational load, is particularly effective during early rehabilitation, allowing athletes to maintain cardiovascular fitness without compromising healing (Perracini, Kristensen, Cunningham, & Sherrington, 2018).

Nutritional Optimization

Calcium (1,200-1,500 mg/day) and vitamin D (2,000-4,000 IU/day) remain foundational for bone mineralization. A 2018 randomized trial demonstrated that athletes with vitamin D levels ≥30 ng/mL healed 40% faster than those with deficiencies, underscoring the importance of supplementation especially in the autumn and winter months and in sports disciplines that are poor in sunlight (Fischer, Haffner-Luntzer, Amling, & Ignatius, 2018). Protein intake ≥1.6 g/kg/day, paired with vitamin C (200-500 mg/day) to support collagen cross-linking, accelerates callus formation and reduces reinjury risk (Close, Sale, Baar, & Bermon, 2019; Reid, 2010). Emerging evidence highlights the role of omega-3 fatty acids (e.g., 2-3 g/day of fish oil) in modulating inflammation. These lipids suppress prostaglandin E2, a mediator of excessive bone resorption during immobilization (Reid, 2010).

Advanced Regenerative Therapies

For recalcitrant or high-risk fractures, biologics and biomaterials offer promising solutions. Guided bone regeneration (GBR) techniques, utilizing resorbable collagen membranes infused with hydroxyapatite, achieve 85% success rates in tibial nonunions by recruiting osteoprogenitor cells to the defect site (Elgali, Omar, Dahlin, & Thomsen, 2017). Immunomodulatory scaffolds, such as interleukin-4 (IL-4)-eluting hydrogels, polarize macrophages toward the pro-healing M2 phenotype, reducing TNF-α-driven osteoclastogenesis while promoting angiogenesis (Lee, Byun, Perikamana, et al., 2019). Parathyroid hormone (PTH) analogs like teriparatide (20 μg/day subcutaneously) have shown efficacy in osteoporotic athletes, increasing trabecular bone volume by 12% over 6 months via enhanced osteoblast differentiation (Wojda & Donahue, 2018). Stem cell therapies, though experimental, demonstrate potential in preclinical models. Mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) seeded on 3D-printed β-tricalcium phosphate scaffolds enhance callus density in critical-sized defects (Walmsley, Ransom, Zielins, et al., 2016).

Psychological and Biomechanical Support

Prolonged recovery often leads to anxiety or depression, particularly in elite athletes facing career uncertainty. Cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT) and mindfulness-based stress reduction (MBSR) improve adherence to rehabilitation protocols and mitigate fear of reinjury (Hoenig, Ackerman, Beck, et al., 2022). Biomechanical retraining is equally critical: runners with a history of tibial fractures benefit from gait analysis to reduce peak tibial acceleration, often achieved by increasing step rate by 5–10% to shorten stride length and distribute forces more evenly (Tenforde, Yin, & Hunt, 2016; Kakouris, Yener, & Fong, 2021). Custom orthotics with medial arch support reduce metatarsal stress in athletes with pes planus, while proprioceptive training on unstable surfaces (e.g., foam pads) enhances neuromuscular control in gymnasts recovering from sacral fractures (Mandell, Khurana, & Smith, 2017; Perracini et al., 2018).

Monitoring and Return-to-Sport Criteria

Healing progression is monitored through serial imaging (MRI or ultrasound) and functional tests. Athletes must meet criteria such as pain-free single-leg hopping, ≥90% quadriceps strength symmetry, and normal bone turnover biomarkers (e.g., serum osteocalcin) before gradual sport-specific drills are introduced (Beit Ner et al., 2022; Long, 2018). A 2021 consensus statement recommends a phased return, beginning with 50% of pre-injury training volume and increasing by 10–15% weekly, provided pain remains absent (Hoenig et al., 2022). By integrating these strategies tailored to fracture type, athlete physiology, and sport demands clinicians can optimize recovery trajectories, minimize recurrence, and restore competitive performance.

8. Special Considerations

Fatigue fracture management requires nuanced adaptations for distinct clinical scenarios and high-risk populations, necessitating tailored approaches beyond standard protocols. Post-hiatus deconditioning syndromes, exemplified by the surge in fractures observed during post-COVID-19 training resumptions, present unique physiological challenges. Following periods of inactivity exceeding four weeks, athletes experience rapid bone turnover imbalances characterized by upregulated osteoclastic resorption outpacing osteoblastic formation. This creates a transient state of reduced bone mineral density (BMD) that persists for 6-8 weeks despite muscle reconditioning occurring more rapidly. Management mandates strict adherence to phased reloading protocols: initial low-impact conditioning (aquatic therapy, cycling) for 2-3 weeks to stimulate osteocyte signaling through fluid shear stress mechanisms, followed by progressive ground reaction force exposure starting at 50% pre-hiatus intensity with ≤10% weekly increments (Dang, Zhao, Wang, & Zhang, 2022; Hoenig, Ackerman, Beck, et al., 2022).

Crucially, vitamin D supplementation should be optimized to ≥40 ng/mL during this period to enhance calcium absorption efficiency, as intestinal resistance to vitamin D action develops during prolonged immobilization (Fischer, Haffner-Luntzer, Amling, & Ignatius, 2018).

Aging athletes face compounded pathophysiological hurdles requiring specialized interventions. Progressive sarcopenia reduces muscle-mediated shock absorption by 20-30% between ages 50-70, while age-related declines in growth hormone and sex steroids impair osteoblast recruitment and collagen synthesis (Aspray & Hill, 2019; Perracini, Kristensen, Cunningham, & Sherrington, 2018). Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) becomes essential for athletes >50 years, with T-scores ≤ -2.0 indicating need for pharmacological adjuncts to mechanical loading strategies. Resistance training must prioritize axial loading through compound movements like barbell squats (70-85% 1RM) and deadlifts, performed ≥3 times weekly to generate osteogenic strain magnitudes exceeding 2,000 microstrain (Aspray & Hill, 2019; Perracini et al., 2018). For athletes with osteoporosis, anabolic agents like teriparatide (20 µg/day subcutaneously) demonstrate superior efficacy over antiresorptives, increasing trabecular bone volume by 12.8% versus 5.2% with bisphosphonates over 18 months (Wojda & Donahue, 2018). Nutritional interventions require higher protein targets (2.0 g/kg/day) to overcome age-related anabolic resistance, with leucine-enriched formulations timed immediately post-exercise to maximize myofibrillar protein synthesis and subsequent bone-muscle cross-talk (Close, Sale, Baar, & Bermon, 2019).

Anatomically complex fractures demand site-specific management algorithms. Sacral stress fractures in gymnasts and dancers frequently evade early diagnosis due to referred pain patterns mimicking lumbar disc pathology. Suspicion should arise with deep gluteal pain during single-leg stance or backbend maneuvers, necessitating MRI with coronal STIR sequences for definitive confirmation (Beit Ner, Rabau, Dosani, & Velkes, 2022). Management requires absolute avoidance of rotational loading for 8-12 weeks, with rehabilitation emphasizing isometric core stabilization before gradual reintroduction of extension-rotation movements using mirror feedback systems. Tarsal navicular fractures present diagnostic challenges due to vascular watershed zones delaying healing. CT imaging remains gold standard for detecting dorsal cortical breaches >2mm, which necessitate surgical fixation to prevent nonunion (Mandell, Khurana, & Smith, 2017; McInnis & Ramey, 2016). Conservative management requires non-weight-bearing casting for 6 weeks followed by custom orthotics with medial longitudinal arch support to reduce tensile forces during push-off (Tenforde, Yin, & Hunt, 2016).

Gender-specific physiology necessitates divergent approaches. Male athletes sustaining femoral neck fractures require assessment for testosterone deficiency, with levels <300 ng/dL indicating need for endocrine evaluation (Addai, Zarkos, & Tolekova, 2019). Female athletes presenting with oligomenorrhea require assessment with dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA) regardless of age, with Z-scores ≤ -1.0 at lumbar spine warranting transdermal estradiol (50-100 µg/day) rather than oral contraceptives to avoid first-pass hepatic effects on IGF-1 suppression (Muñoz, Robinson, & Shibli-Rahhal, 2020; Warden, Davis, & Fredericson, 2014). Bone turnover monitoring through serum P1NP (formation marker) and CTX (resorption marker) provides objective recovery metrics, with ideal P1NP:CTX ratios >1.5 indicating positive bone balance (Hoenig et al., 2022).

Environmental and equipment factors introduce additional variables. Altitude training above 2,500 meters accelerates bone resorption through chronic hypoxic stimulation of osteoclast activity, necessitating calcium intake escalation to 1,800 mg/day and nightly pulse oximetry monitoring (Vitale & Getzin, 2019). Footwear selection requires sport-specific considerations: runners should replace shoes every 300-500 miles to maintain midsole compression resistance, while court sport athletes need medial torsion control systems to limit midfoot shear stress during cutting maneuvers (Tenforde et al., 2016; Lin, Donkers, Refshauge, et al., 2012). For military and tactical athletes, backpack loads exceeding 30% body mass increase femoral neck strain 3.2-fold during marching, mandating load redistribution through hip belt transfer systems and route planning avoiding prolonged downhill gradients (Lambert, Ritzmann, Akoto, & Büsch, 2022).

These specialized considerations underscore that effective fatigue fracture management extends beyond generic protocols, requiring deep understanding of biomechanical, endocrine, and environmental interactions across diverse athletic populations.

9. Conclusions

Fatigue fractures result from complex interactions between biomechanical overload and physiological vulnerabilities, amplified by factors like post-hiatus deconditioning (Lambert et al., 2022; Dang et al., 2022). Effective prevention requires addressing intrinsic risks (e.g., low BMD, hormonal deficits) (Aspray & Hill, 2019; Addai et al., 2019) alongside extrinsic factors like training errors and nutritional deficiencies (Fischer et al., 2018; Vitale & Getzin, 2019). Structured frameworks such as the acute:chronic workload ratio (Hoenig et al., 2022; Emery & Pasanen, 2019) and advanced diagnostics (Mandell et al., 2017) are essential for risk mitigation.

Recovery integrates graded reloading (Warden et al., 2014; Perracini et al., 2018) with emerging biological therapies for complex cases (Wojda & Donahue, 2018). Special populations demand tailored approaches:

- Female athletes with RED-S need hormonal/nutritional optimization
- Masters athletes require resistance training to offset sarcopenia
- Sport-specific biomechanics dictate site-specific management

Future efforts should prioritize translational research, AI-driven load monitoring, and public health initiatives promoting bone health across athletic populations. A multidisciplinary approach uniting biomechanics, nutrition, and physiology is paramount for sustaining athletic participation and bone resilience.

Disclosure: Authors do not report any disclosures.

Author Contribution
Conceptualization: Sebastian Polok
Methodology: Sebastian Polok, Małgorzata Wasilewska
Software: Małgorzata Wasilewska, Krzysztof Pietrzak
Check: Krzysztof Pietrzak, Małgorzata Wasilewska
Formal analysis: Krzysztof Pietrzak
Investigation: Sebastian Polok
Resources: Krzysztof Pietrzak
Data curation: Małgorzata Wasilewska
Writing - rough preparation: Małgorzata Wasilewska, Sebastian Polok
Writing - review and editing: Krzysztof Pietrzak, Małgorzata Wasilewska
Visualisation: Sebastian Polok
Supervision: Małgorzata Wasilewska
Project administration: Sebastian Polok

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

Funding statement: No external funding was received to perform this review
Statement of institutional review committee: Not applicable
Statement of informed consent: Not applicable
Statement of data availability: Not applicable
Conflict of interest statement: The authors declare no conflict of interest

REFERENCES

1. Addai, D., Zarkos, J., & Tolekova, A. (2019). The bone hormones and their potential effects on glucose and energy metabolism. Endocrine Regulations, *53*(4), 268–273. https://doi.org/10.2478/enr-2019-0027
2. Anderson, E. G. (1990). Fatigue fractures of the foot. Injury, *21*(5), 275–279. https://doi.org/10.1016/0020-1383(90)90039-W
3. Aspray, T. J., & Hill, T. R. (2019). Osteoporosis and the ageing skeleton. Subcellular Biochemistry, *91*, 453–476. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-3681-2_16
4. Beit Ner, E., Rabau, O., Dosani, S., & Velkes, S. (2022). Sacral stress fractures in athletes. European Spine Journal, *31*(1), 1–9. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00586-021-07043-4
5. Close, G. L., Sale, C., Baar, K., & Bermon, S. (2019). Nutrition for the prevention and treatment of injuries in track and field athletes. International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism, *29*(2), 189–197. https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsnem.2018-0290
6. Dang, P., Zhao, Y., Wang, M., & Zhang, L. (2022). Fatigue fractures after the COVID-19 quarantine. The Physician and Sportsmedicine, *50*(3), 186–188. https://doi.org/10.1080/00913847.2021.1927232

7. Datta, H. K., Ng, W. F., Walker, J. A., Tuck, S. P., & Varanasi, S. S. (2008). The cell biology of bone metabolism. Journal of Clinical Pathology, *61*(5), 577–587. https://doi.org/10.1136/jcp.2007.048868
8. Elgali, I., Omar, O., Dahlin, C., & Thomsen, P. (2017). Guided bone regeneration: Materials and biological mechanisms revisited. European Journal of Oral Sciences, *125*(5), 315–337. https://doi.org/10.1111/eos.12364
9. Emery, C. A., & Pasanen, K. (2019). Current trends in sport injury prevention. Best Practice & Research Clinical Rheumatology, *33*(1), 3–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.berh.2019.02.009
10. Ensrud, K. E., & Crandall, C. J. (2017). Osteoporosis. Annals of Internal Medicine, *167*(3), ITC17–ITC32. https://doi.org/10.7326/AITC201708010
11. Fischer, V., Haffner-Luntzer, M., Amling, M., & Ignatius, A. (2018). Calcium and vitamin D in bone fracture healing and post-traumatic bone turnover. European Cells and Materials, *35*, 365–385. https://doi.org/10.22203/eCM.v035a25
12. Fredericson, M., Jennings, F., Beaulieu, C., & Matheson, G. O. (2006). Stress fractures in athletes. Topics in Magnetic Resonance Imaging, *17*(5), 309–325. https://doi.org/10.1097/RMR.0b013e3180421c8c
13. Hoenig, T., Ackerman, K. E., Beck, B. R., et al. (2022). Bone stress injuries. Nature Reviews Disease Primers, *8*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41572-022-00352-y
14. Kakouris, N., Yener, N., & Fong, D. T. P. (2021). A systematic review of running-related musculoskeletal injuries in runners. Journal of Sport and Health Science, *10*(5), 513–522. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jshs.2021.04.001
15. Lambert, C., Ritzmann, R., Akoto, R., & Büsch, D. (2022). Epidemiology of injuries in Olympic sports. International Journal of Sports Medicine, *43*(5), 473–481. https://doi.org/10.1055/a-1641-0068
16. Lee, J., Byun, H., Perikamana, S. K. M., et al. (2019). Current advances in immunomodulatory biomaterials for bone regeneration. Advanced Healthcare Materials, *8*(4), e1801106. https://doi.org/10.1002/adhm.201801106
17. Lin, C. W. C., Donkers, N. A. J., Refshauge, K. M., et al. (2012). Rehabilitation for ankle fractures in adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, *11*, CD005595. https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD005595.pub3
18. Long, F. (2018). Energy metabolism and bone. Bone, *115*, 1. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2018.08.002
19. Mandell, J. C., Khurana, B., & Smith, S. E. (2017). Stress fractures of the foot and ankle, part 2: Site-specific etiology, imaging, and treatment, and differential diagnosis. Skeletal Radiology, *46*(9), 1165–1186. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00256-017-2632-7
20. Matcuk, G. R., Jr., Mahanty, S. R., Skalski, M. R., Patel, D. B., White, E. A., & Gottsegen, C. J. (2016). Stress fractures: Pathophysiology, clinical presentation, imaging features, and treatment options. Emergency Radiology, *23*(4), 365–375. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10140-016-1390-5
21. Matheson, G. O., Clement, D. B., McKenzie, D. C., Taunton, J. E., Lloyd-Smith, D. R., & MacIntyre, J. G. (1987). Stress fractures in athletes: A study of 320 cases. The American Journal of Sports Medicine, *15*(1), 46–58. https://doi.org/10.1177/036354658701500107
22. McInnis, K. C., & Ramey, L. N. (2016). High-risk stress fractures: Diagnosis and management. PM&R, *8*(3), S113–S124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmrj.2015.09.019
23. Muñoz, M., Robinson, K., & Shibli-Rahhal, A. (2020). Bone health and osteoporosis prevention and treatment. Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology, *63*(4), 770–787. https://doi.org/10.1097/GRF.0000000000000572
24. Perracini, M. R., Kristensen, M. T., Cunningham, C., & Sherrington, C. (2018). Physiotherapy following fragility fractures. Injury, *49*(8), 1413–1417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.injury.2018.06.026
25. Pierpoint, L. A., & Collins, C. L. (2021). Epidemiology of sport-related concussion. Clinics in Sports Medicine, *40*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csm.2020.08.013
26. Reid, I. R. (2010). Fat and bone. Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics, *503*(1), 20–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abb.2010.06.027
27. Saunier, J., & Chapurlat, R. (2018). Stress fracture in athletes. Joint Bone Spine, *85*(3), 307–310. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbspin.2017.04.013
28. Tenforde, A. S., Yin, A., & Hunt, K. J. (2016). Foot and ankle injuries in runners. Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Clinics of North America, *27*(1), 121–137. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pmrj.2015.08.007
29. Varley, I., Stebbings, G., Williams, A. G., et al. (2021). An investigation into the association of bone characteristics and body composition with stress fracture in athletes. The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness, *61*(11), 1490–1498. https://doi.org/10.23736/S0022-4707.21.11871-7
30. Vitale, K., & Getzin, A. (2019). Nutrition and supplement update for the endurance athlete: Review and recommendations. Nutrients, *11*(6), 1289. https://doi.org/10.3390/nu11061289
31. Walmsley, G. G., Ransom, R. C., Zielins, E. R., et al. (2016). Stem cells in bone regeneration. Stem Cell Reviews and Reports, *12*(5), 524–529. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12015-016-9665-5
32. Warden, S. J., Davis, I. S., & Fredericson, M. (2014). Management and prevention of bone stress injuries in long-distance runners. Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy, *44*(10), 749–765. https://doi.org/10.2519/jospt.2014.5334
33. Wojda, S. J., & Donahue, S. W. (2018). Parathyroid hormone for bone regeneration. Journal of Orthopaedic Research, *36*(10), 2586–2594. https://doi.org/10.1002/jor.24075