RESEARCH ARTICLE

RUNNING HEAD: Skin surface biomarkers detect mobility changes post-massage

Strain-based biomarkers at the skin surface detect changes in soft tissue mobility linked to myofascial pain following soft tissue manipulation intervention

Anika R. Kao,[1] M. Terry Loghmani,[2] Gregory J. Gerling[1,3]

[1]Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering, School of Engineering and Applied Science, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, USA
[2] Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health and Human Sciences, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana, USA
[3] Systems and Information Engineering, School of Engineering and Applied Science, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, USA

Correspondence: *Gregory J. Gerling (gg7h@virginia.edu)*

ABSTRACT

Soft tissue manipulation is a widely used massage-based intervention in treating myofascial pain, yet its efficacy in increasing tissue mobility is evaluated primarily through subjective observations. To establish objective measures of tissue mobility, this study captures patterns of skin surface deformation during hands-on clinician assessment using digital image correlation. Nineteen participants underwent an established soft tissue manipulation (STM) intervention protocol targeting the cervicothoracic region. Tissue mobility was assessed bilaterally (left v. right) and directionally (superior v. inferior) before and after the STM intervention using eleven strain-based biomarkers. Post-intervention, those biomarkers associated with tissue deformation and glide exhibited systematic changes, indicating increased mobility. Notably, 88% of participants demonstrated improved tissue mobility, especially on the more restricted body side. Among participants reporting more pain on one side of the body, 90% exhibited greater post-intervention improvement on the more painful side. Moreover, distinctions in the strain-based biomarkers well aligned with self-reported pain, supporting their potential for objective assessment of myofascial dysfunction. This study highlights the feasibility of optical skin surface tracking as a tool for evaluating the efficacy of STM intervention, offering a quantitative, low-cost, and realistic clinical approach.

NEW & NOTEWORTHY

This study demonstrates that optical capture of skin surface movements provides a robust and clinically compatible approach for assessing the mobility of soft tissue. Strain-based biomarkers derived from digital image correlation systematically distinguish post-intervention changes in soft tissue, with mobility improvements strongly aligning with self-reported pain—an association existing quantitative methods have struggled to establish.

Keywords: manual therapy; soft tissue manipulation; massage; skin mechanics; digital image correlation

INTRODUCTION

Myofascial pain, a prevalent and debilitating condition, is characterized by localized discomfort and restricted tissue mobility, often due to myofascial trigger points (1, 2). To relieve pain and restore function, clinicians perform soft tissue manipulation (STM) interventions using techniques such as massage, myofascial release, and trigger point therapy (3–6). However, the efficacy of these interventions is primarily assessed through subjective, nonspecific, and qualitative descriptors (7, 8). While clinical outcomes, such as patient self-reported pain ratings and headache intensity, often indicate symptom relief, the underlying mechanisms driving such improvements remain unclear. Without robust quantification of tissue properties, the mechanical effects of hands-on interventions will remain uncertain. Objective methods are needed to rigorously evaluate soft tissue mobility and establish the therapeutic efficacy of soft tissue treatments (9).

The gold standard for assessing soft tissue mobility currently relies on STM mechanotherapy performed by trained clinicians (10, 11). Using manual and instrument-assisted palpation, clinicians evaluate tissue tenderness, hardness, restrictions, inflammation, and multidirectional mobility to identify myofascial restrictions. While efforts have aimed to standardize STM assessment, inconsistencies arise from differences in the prior experience and preferred techniques of clinicians, and the nature of subjective feedback derived from participants (12). In contrast, objective methods like myotonometry and shear wave elastography (SWE) attempt to assess and characterize tissue stiffness by measuring tension, elasticity, and shear wave propagation (13–16). However, they sample only small areas of tissue, can be overly sensitive to tissue anisotropy, and generate significant levels of variance due to an operator's control of the probe (17). On the other hand, optical imaging approaches, such as depth and RGB cameras (18–21), offer the ability to track skin surface movement with a broader field of view and without disrupting clinical workflow. However, these methods capture a field of surface displacements at discrete time points, rather than local stretch and strain in the tissue over time—key factors in evaluating soft tissue mobility.

Unlike other optical imaging methods, digital image correlation (DIC) tracks unique pixel patterns over time, enabling the derivation of tissue strain. Additionally, DIC can merge the input of multiple 3D surfaces, from multiple camera angles, to capture large anatomical regions (tens of centimeters) and complex curvatures at high resolution (microns) while minimizing occlusions (22–24). Our prior work has demonstrated that strain-based biomarkers derived from skin surface deformation systematically identify directional and side-to-side asymmetries in tissue mobility within an individual, with side differences aligning with self-reported pain discrepancies in 84.2% of participants (25).

Expanding on the prior effort, the present study evaluates whether strain-based biomarkers can distinguish changes in tissue mobility before and after an established soft tissue manipulation intervention. To maximize the likelihood of capturing measurable effects, the STM intervention is delivered by an expert clinician using both manual and instrument-assisted STM techniques. The first hypothesis is that, following STM intervention, strain-based biomarkers will reflect changes in tissue mobility consistent with clinical improvements. The second hypothesis is that, in participants with asymmetric pain, strain-based biomarkers will reflect greater changes on the more painful side, consistent

with greater initial restriction and treatment response. Ultimately, this work advances the development of quantitative, clinician-compatible tools for evaluating soft tissue mobility in practice. By integrating these biomarkers with participant-reported pain, this study aims to establish objective measures of STM intervention efficacy and refine quantitative tools for assessing and treating myofascial dysfunction.

METHODS

This study quantifies skin surface mobility before and after STM intervention using 3D digital image correlation, synchronized input from three camera angles, and biosafe skin speckling techniques. From raw DIC data, eleven strain-based biomarkers are derived to assess tissue mobility in response to clinician-applied skin stretching of the cervicothoracic region. Mobility differences are evaluated across nineteen participants, examining changes related to factors of intervention (pre- v. post-intervention), participant bilateral anatomy (left v. right body sides), and participant skin pull direction (superior v. inferior pull directions). Also recorded was participant self-reported pain. Note that to provide for control factors, two participants did not receive STM intervention, just two soft tissue manipulation assessments with an interval of time between.

STM Stretch Assessment

The STM stretch assessment involved the clinician applying a controlled pull to the tissue at a 45-degree angle relative to the myofascial plane. This maneuver included a gradual force ramp over 3 seconds to maximum intensity and was performed bilaterally (left and right sides) and directionally (superior toward the neck and inferior away from the neck) from a central reference point, such as a tender spot (13, 26) (Fig. 1a). Key parameters assessed included the distance and velocity of tissue displacement as the force propagated outward, the force magnitude and deformation at which discomfort occurred, the maximum force required to achieve full myofascial stretch, and any observed restrictions or barriers to motion. In a healthy, mobile state, superficial skin and subcutaneous tissues shift smoothly over deeper structures. In contrast, tissues affected by MTrPs may resist this movement, resulting in a noticeably reduced propagation distance of the applied pull, as observed clinically (Fig. 1b,d).

Soft Tissue Manipulation Intervention

To ensure consistency within this study, a single clinician delivered manual and instrument-assisted techniques to the cervicothoracic region using a controlled and repeatable approach. The procedure incorporated a total intervention time of 15 minutes, with a combination of manual soft tissue techniques (5 minutes) and instrument-assisted STM (IASTM; 8 minutes) (Fig. 2(b)), followed by a 2-minute wrap-up phase to gradually taper off the applied force. All STM intervention remained within the subject's comfort level. The STM intervention was performed bilaterally, with the clinician standing on the same side of the subject as the intervention region. Emollient was applied to facilitate smooth and effective gliding over the tissue.

The manual STM phase began with effleurage (a series of light, gliding strokes to warm up the tissue and progressively build up force). This was followed by cross-fiber strokes, applied perpendicularly to muscle fibers, and sweeping strokes, applied parallel to fiber alignment, to target different layers of fascia. Deeper techniques, such as petrissage (kneading motions to lift and roll soft tissues), skin rolling (mobilizing the skin and subcutaneous layers by lifting and rolling), and localized strumming strokes or sustained pressure (focused application of force to tender spots for up to one minute), were used to address deeper myofascial structures (27).

The IASTM portion employed a quantifiable soft tissue manipulation (QSTM, Precision Care Technologies, Inc., Indianapolis, IN) device (28, 29), using sweeping and strumming strokes to address localized tender or restricted tissues. Strokes were applied in multiple directions, including inferior-to-superior, superior-to-inferior, and curved medial-lateral patterns, with a stroke length of approximately 1–3 inches (30, 31). The session concluded with effleurage strokes, reducing applied force and restoring baseline tissue tension in preparation for the post-intervention assessment. The average peak force applied during IASTM sweeping and strumming strokes was 12.12 N (SD = 2.18), with a range of 9.78 to 16.12 N. The average stroke frequency was 1.46 Hz (SD = 0.29), ranging from 0.96 to 1.86 Hz. The angle of application averaged 54.75° (SD = 20.15), with a range of 40.5° to 69°.

Equipment Setup and Participants

A portable massage table was equipped for participants to assume a prone position for the STM assessment and intervention. The table's face cradle was carefully adjusted to ensure the neck remained strain-free. Three cameras, mounted on a rotating arm affixed to the table, were positioned to capture images for the DIC analysis. Comprehensive details of this setup have been described in prior work (25).

In total, 19 healthy participants were recruited (mean age 34.1 years, range 20–67 years; 9 males and 10 females). All participants provided written consent, as approved by the University of Virginia Institutional Review Board of Social and Behavioral Sciences (Protocol #6201; Approved October 25th, 2023). This study was conducted as part of the clinical trial, "Optical Measurements of the Skin Surface to Infer Distinctions in Myofascial Tissue Stiffness (OptMeasSkin)," registered at ClinicalTrials.gov (ID: NCT06390085). All surfaces were sanitized regularly.

Experimental Procedure

Approximately 24 hours before the scheduled session, participants completed consent forms and underwent the speckling procedure on both bilateral cervicothoracic regions (~15 minutes). The study session began with a qualitative intake assessment (~20 minutes), during which participants provided demographic and medical history information and reported baseline pain levels for their left and right upper back regions using a 0–10 numeric rating scale (with 0 for no pain, 10 for one's worst pain). The self-reported pain ratings were used as a proxy assumption for perceived tissue stiffness, rather than clinician assessment, to eliminate any bias that might be introduced by our study procedural constraints (e.g., the clinician nearby hearing a participant give a pain rating out loud). Following the intake assessment, participants were positioned on a massage table in a standardized prone position, with their arms at their sides (palms up) and feet resting on a bolster. The cervicothoracic junction (C7/T1), superior medial border of the scapulae, and distal insertion of the levator scapulae were palpated and marked with a black dot, bilaterally. For the pre-intervention assessment, STM stretch was applied in two directions (superior and inferior) first on the right side of the body, then on the left. Each maneuver was repeated three times for a total of three trials per direction per body side for a total of 12 stretch experiments per participant pre-intervention, over a session duration of ~20 minutes.

After the pre-intervention assessment, participants received a 5-minute break before undergoing the STM intervention protocol, which was performed bilaterally following the procedure described previously. A second 5-minute break was provided before the post-intervention STM assessment, which followed the same protocol as the pre-intervention assessment. After the post-intervention assessment, the clinician conducted a ~10-minute qualitative outtake session, during which participants reported final pain levels

for their left and right upper back on a 0-10 numeric rating scale (0 = no pain, 10 = worst pain) and provided any additional qualitative feedback.

3D Digital Image Correlation and Semi-Permanent Speckling Method

This study utilizes 3D digital image correlation (DIC), a non-contact optical tracking technique, to measure skin surface displacements and strain fields during soft tissue manipulation. DIC works by dividing an image into localized subsets, allowing detailed analysis of movement and deformation through cross-correlation of pixel patterns from multiple stereo camera angles. Calibration of the stereo camera setup ensures accurate 3D reconstruction, stitching multiple surfaces together to avoid occlusions and account for curved regions.

To achieve high-resolution displacement fields for digital image correlation, a semi-permanent ink tattoo method was developed to create consistent, high-contrast speckle patterns. Four custom high-density speckle pattern stickers (~1.5 mm speckle diameter) were applied bilaterally to the cervicothoracic region, covering an area of 231.0 cm^2 per participant. After one hour, the tattoos stained the skin with blue speckles that darkened over 24 hours, enhancing contrast for optimal DIC tracking. The formula worked across all skin tones, with patterns remaining visible for up to ten days before naturally fading. The detailed procedure has been published previously (25).

Data were collected using the open-source MultiDIC software (32), which builds on the Ncorr platform (33). Synchronous video recording was performed with three cameras at 30 frames per second and 1920x1080 resolution (~5 pixels/mm), later down-sampled to 15 frames per second for processing. Grayscale images were analyzed using subsets of 20-pixel radius and 10-pixel spacing, optimized for the speckle pattern and deformation characteristics. The DIC pipeline provided key metrics, including 3D displacement and principal strain fields, which formed the basis for the eleven biomarkers. Full details of the DIC methodology can be found in prior work (25).

Strain-Based Biomarkers

A suite of eleven biomarkers was defined to quantify soft tissue mobility by capturing both the spatial and temporal characteristics of tissue response during a clinician-applied pull. These biomarkers assessed two primary aspects of tissue behavior: tissue glide, which reflected how far the tissue moved in response to the applied force, and tissue deformation, which indicated how much the tissue stretched and compressed under load.

Tissue glide was characterized by maximum pull (mm), representing the peak displacement at the point nearest force application, and far region displacement (mm), which quantified movement in the area farthest from the pull site. Pull propagation (%) described the extent to which motion traveled across the tissue surface, calculated as the ratio of far region displacement to near region displacement (maximum pull). A higher pull propagation value indicated that more of the applied motion traveled across the tissue region, suggesting greater mobility, whereas a lower value reflected motion localized near the point of contact, often observed in restricted tissue.

Tissue deformation was quantified using tensile and compressive strain (both unitless), representing principal strains along the directions of greatest expansion and contraction relative to the initial state. Strain at 5 mm (unitless) and strain-to-pull ratio at maximum pull (1/mm) provided standardized comparisons of tissue response under initial and peak loading, respectively. Strain gradient (1/mm) described how rapidly strain accumulated per millimeter of applied pull, offering insight into the tissue's

responsiveness to mechanical input. To further assess tissue behavior over time, ramp-on pull velocity (mm/s) and ramp-on duration (s) characterized how quickly and for how long the tissue moved at the onset of the maneuver. Finally, total gross deformation (mm) integrated strain over the full pull distance to summarize cumulative tissue deformation.

These biomarkers provide a comprehensive framework for assessing soft tissue mobility, distinguishing between restricted and mobile tissue states, and identifying differences across body sides, pull directions, and pre- to post-intervention changes. Full methodological details for deriving these biomarkers have been reported previously (25).

Statistical Analysis

A linear mixed-effects (LME) model was used to evaluate systematic trends while accounting for individual variability and repeated measurements. For population-level analyses, the model was applied as unpaired to estimate pre-to-post intervention effects and post-intervention trends across pull direction and body side. For within-participant analyses, the model was applied as paired to assess changes across pull direction, body side, or intervention condition. Prior to model application, assumptions of linearity, homoscedasticity, and normality of residuals were validated using residual plots and Q-Q plots. Statistical significance was determined at $\alpha = 0.01$.

To evaluate individual-level mobility, biomarker means were calculated across three trials per pull direction, body side, and intervention condition, and percent differences (Eq. 1) were computed for three comparison types: directional (superior minus inferior), bilateral (left minus right), and pre-to-post intervention (post minus pre).

$$\text{Difference (\%)} = \frac{A-B}{\max(|A|,|B|)} \cdot 100 \qquad (1)$$

A 25% threshold was applied to determine whether a given biomarker exhibited a meaningful difference, consistent with prior research (34–36). Any biomarker with an absolute percent difference ≥25% was considered significantly different. To classify whether an individual exhibited a directional, bilateral, or intervention-related difference, the same 25% threshold was applied to the number of biomarkers exceeding this criterion. Specifically, participants were classified as different across pull direction or body side if at least six of 22 comparisons (11 biomarkers x 2 sides or directions) exceeded threshold, and as exhibiting post-intervention change per body side if at least six of 22 comparisons (11 biomarkers x 2 directions) did so.

Self-reported pain ratings collected at intake were used to assess perceived bilateral asymmetries, with a ≥2-point difference on the 0–10 pain scale indicating a bilateral discrepancy. While subjective, prior studies have correlated pain ratings with tissue stiffness (37–39)**,** supporting their clinical relevance. These pain asymmetries were compared to DIC-derived mobility classifications to evaluate the relationship between subjective pain and objective tissue mobility.

Defining the Mobility-Enhancing Direction

Soft tissue manipulation interventions have been shown to improve mobility by increasing tissue glide and reducing stiffness (40–43), yet no established mechanical ground truth exists for what constitutes "more mobile" tissue. To address this, we empirically defined the mobility-enhancing direction using the sign of systematic changes observed following STM intervention. Only biomarkers that changed

significantly and consistently across both the unpaired and paired LME models—capturing overall and within-participant effects—were used for subsequent mobility classification. These high-sensitivity biomarkers formed the basis for determining which body side was more mobile pre-intervention and whether a given side improved post-intervention. This approach anchors individual-level assessments in observed population-level trends while accounting for anatomical asymmetries and inter-individual variability.

RESULTS

Pre-to-Post Intervention Population Trends

Soft tissue manipulation intervention led to greater tissue displacement across participants, suggesting improved mobility. To evaluate systematic intervention effects, biomarker values were aggregated across pull directions and body sides and analyzed using the unpaired LME model. Four biomarkers—maximum pull, maximum far region displacement, ramp-on pull velocity, and total gross deformation—exhibited significant pre-to-post increases. These biomarkers constituted the high-sensitivity subset applied in subsequent classification analyses, where the systematic direction of change for each biomarker defined the mobility-enhancing direction.

In specific, maximum pull increased by 3.4 mm (29.7 ± 9.7 mm pre, 33.1 ± 10.2 mm post; $t(342) = 3.18$, $p < 0.01$) (Fig. 3(a)), and maximum far region displacement rose by 2.7 mm (18.7 ± 9.3 mm pre, 21.4 ± 9.7 mm post; $t(342) = 3.03$, $p < 0.01$) (Fig. 3(b)), consistent with enhanced tissue glide. Pull propagation remained stable at approximately 65% ($t(341) = 2.00$, $p > 0.01$) (Supp. Fig. S1(c)), suggesting that the additional displacement was distributed proportionally across the tracked region.

Tissue responded faster to loading after STM intervention, suggesting lower resistance. Ramp-on pull velocity climbed from 33.2 ± 16.0 mm/s to 42.1 ± 14.9 mm/s (Δ = 8.4 mm/s; $t(341) = 4.29$, $p < 0.01$) (Fig. 3(c)). Maximum tensile strain remained unchanged ($t(342) = 0.99$, $p > 0.01$) (Supp. Fig. S1(a)), but total gross deformation increased from 3.1 ± 1.7 mm to 3.7 ± 2.0 mm (Δ = 0.6 mm; $t(342) = 3.35$, $p < 0.01$) (Fig. 3(d)), demonstrating a greater overall deformation response.

When analyzed by pull direction, greater changes were observed during superior pulls: maximum pull, ramp-on pull velocity, and total gross deformation each increased significantly ($t(170) = 2.72$–3.15, $p < 0.01$) (Fig. 3(e), (g), and (h)). Maximum compressive strain also became more negative ($t(170) = -3.10$, $p < 0.01$) (Supp. Fig. S1(i)), pointing to increased transverse contraction. For inferior pulls, ramp-on pull velocity was the only biomarker that changed significantly (35.5 mm/s pre, 45.8 mm/s post; $t(170) = 3.06$, $p < 0.01$) (Fig. 3(k)), highlighting directional differences in tissue response.

Taken together, these findings show that the STM intervention increased both tissue glide and deformation while reducing resistance. Directional differences suggest that baseline anatomical factors may modulate the extent of mobility improvements.

Post-Intervention Population Trends by Pull Direction and Body Side

To evaluate whether anatomical variation in tissue mobility persisted following treatment, post-intervention data were compared across pull directions and body sides at the population level. Directional trends observed post-intervention mirrored pre-intervention patterns exactly (25): the same five biomarkers were significantly higher in the inferior pull direction, the same three were significantly higher in the superior direction, and the remaining three consistently showed no difference.

Glide-related biomarkers including maximum pull, pull propagation, and ramp-on pull velocity remained elevated in the inferior direction ($t(194) = 3.07$, $p < 0.01$; $t(194) = 7.82$, $p < 0.01$; $t(194) = 3.63$, $p < 0.01$) (Supp. Fig. S2(l), (r), and (n)). In contrast, maximum compressive strain (absolute value), strain at 5 mm, and strain-to-pull ratio were significantly higher in the superior direction ($t(194) = 7.69$, $p < 0.01$; $t(194) = -4.49$, $p < 0.01$; $t(194) = -3.97$, $p < 0.01$) (Supp. Fig. S2(q), (u), and (v)), consistent with more localized tissue deformation. Although maximum compressive strain values were numerically higher (i.e., less negative) in the inferior direction, the greater negative magnitude observed during superior pulls indicates increased transverse contraction.

These persistent directional differences reflect structural asymmetries between pull locations: superior pulls engage regions with overlapping musculature—including the trapezius, rhomboids, and erector spinae—that may resist displacement, whereas inferior pulls span less constrained tissue, allowing broader motion. Tissue mobility remained symmetrical across body sides ($p > 0.01$) (Supp. Fig. S2(w)-(g1)), aligning with expectations based on anatomical symmetry along the spine.

Pre-to-Post Intervention Participant Mobility Change

Post-intervention mobility change was assessed per body side per participant using all 11 strain-based biomarkers. Comparisons were performed for each biomarker and pull direction, totaling 22 comparisons per side. A body side was classified as exhibiting mobility change if at least six of the 22 comparisons exceeded the predefined threshold, regardless of whether the biomarker increased or decreased (Supp. Table S1-2). This direction-agnostic criterion captures whether the STM intervention produced a mechanical effect on the soft tissue, independent of the direction of change

As an illustrative example (see Methods—Statistical Analysis), Fig. 4(a) presents time-series data for participant 13 during a superior pull on the left side. After intervention, the clinician applied 12.1 mm more pull (24.2 ± 1.5 mm pre, 36.3 ± 3.1 mm post) and achieved a 22.2 mm/s increase in ramp-on pull velocity (25.0 ± 3.1 mm/s pre, 47.2 ± 11.1 mm/s post). In total, six biomarkers exceeded threshold (Fig. 4(b)), classifying this body side as exhibiting post-intervention change.

Across the 17 participants who received STM intervention (excluding P5 and P10, who served as untreated controls), 13 (76.5%) were classified as exhibiting post-intervention change on at least one body side (Fig. 5). Among the four participants who showed no change, two were the untreated controls (red boxes in Fig. 5). Notably, these changes aligned with self-reported pain asymmetry in 90% of cases. Nine of the ten participants who reported bilateral pain differences exhibited change on at least one body side, and eight showed greater change on their more painful side. Figure 5 summarizes the number of biomarkers exceeding threshold per participant, with dashed lines marking the change threshold. For those with bilateral pain, an "X" below the left or right bar denotes the more painful side. These findings build on prior results (25), where pre-intervention bilateral mobility differences corresponded to self-reported pain in 84.2% of participants.

Biomarker Sensitivity

To evaluate which metrics most effectively captured differences in soft tissue mobility, we conducted a sensitivity analysis across three comparison categories: directional, bilateral, and pre-post (Fig. 6). Sensitivity was defined as the number of participant-level comparisons in which a biomarker exceeded the predefined threshold. Each biomarker had up to 228 opportunities to detect a difference, based on 19 participants, four comparisons per category, and three categories. Across all biomarkers, 753

threshold-crossing detections were recorded: 388 were directional (51.5%), 192 bilateral (25.5%), and 173 pre-post (23.0%). This distribution emphasizes the dominant role of anatomical direction on detectable differences in tissue mobility.

Among the 11 biomarkers evaluated, total gross deformation and ramp-on pull velocity demonstrated the highest overall sensitivity, exceeding threshold in 117 (51.3%) and 93 (40.8%) comparisons, respectively. Both responded across all three comparison types: total gross deformation identified 53 directional, 28 bilateral, and 36 pre-post detections, while ramp-on pull velocity identified 39, 21, and 33, respectively. These two biomarkers were the most balanced and broadly responsive, making them strong candidates for classifying both post-intervention change and improvement.

Additional metrics such as maximum far region displacement (86 detections, 37.7%) and maximum tensile strain (69 detections, 30.3%) also showed moderate sensitivity, with most detections driven by directional comparisons. In contrast, ramp-on duration exhibited a distinct pattern: although its total sensitivity was similar (63 detections, 27.6%), the majority occurred in bilateral (22) and pre-post (23) comparisons, suggesting unique utility for detecting asymmetries and intervention effects. At the lower end of the sensitivity spectrum were pull propagation and strain at 5 mm, each with only 43 detections (18.9%), underscoring the importance of tailoring biomarker selection to the specific construct of interest.

Pre-Intervention Participant Mobility Difference

Pre-intervention bilateral mobility was assessed per participant using the subset of high-sensitivity biomarkers: maximum pull, maximum far region displacement, ramp-on pull velocity, and total gross deformation. Bilateral comparisons were performed on pre-intervention data for each biomarker and pull direction, totaling eight comparisons per participant. A body side was classified as more mobile if at least two of the eight comparisons exceeded threshold in mobility-enhancing direction—that is, higher values, as defined by the systematic post-intervention trends (Results—Pre-to-Post Intervention Population Trends).

Ten of the 19 participants met the criteria for bilateral mobility differences (Fig. 7, Supp. Table S4). Of these, eight reported pre-intervention bilateral pain discrepancies, and in all eight cases, the more mobile side corresponded to the less painful side. Several participants exhibited asymmetries in only one pull direction—P1, P14, and P16 in the inferior direction, and P8 and P10 in the superior direction. Two participants (P6 and P10) showed bilateral differences despite reporting symmetric pain, indicating that mechanical asymmetries may exist independently of pain perception.

Pre-to-Post Intervention Participant Mobility Improvement

Post-intervention improvement was assessed per body side per participant using the same subset of high-sensitivity biomarkers. Comparisons were made for each biomarker and pull direction, totaling eight comparisons per side. A body side was classified as improving if at least two of the eight comparisons exceeded threshold in the mobility-enhancing direction (i.e., higher values; Results—Pre-to-Post Intervention Population Trends). This direction-specific criterion distinguishes clinically beneficial mobility improvements from the broader set of post-intervention changes.

Fifteen of 17 treated participants were classified as exhibiting post-intervention improvements (Fig. 8, Supp. Table S5). This group included all ten participants who reported bilateral pain asymmetries, nine of whom showed greater improvement on their more painful side. One participant (P9) showed a decline in mobility on the left side, with five biomarkers decreasing post-intervention. The two untreated control

participants (P5 and P10) exhibited no improvements, further supporting the interpretation that observed mobility gains were attributable to the STM intervention rather than measurement noise or spontaneous change.

DISCUSSION

This study investigated whether strain-based biomarkers at the skin surface could quantify changes in soft tissue mobility following an established STM intervention protocol. While soft tissue mobility is critical to musculoskeletal health and function, its relationship with pain and response to manual therapy remains poorly understood. We hypothesized that these biomarkers would (1) detect post-intervention changes consistent with improved mobility, and (2) exhibit greater improvement on the more painful body side in participants reporting bilateral pain asymmetries. Both hypotheses were supported. At the population level, four biomarkers increased consistently following STM intervention. At the individual level, 88.2% of treated participants showed improved mobility on at least one body side (blue section, Fig. 9), and 90% of those with bilateral pain discrepancies improved on their more painful side. These findings demonstrate that strain-based biomarkers are sensitive to clinically meaningful changes in tissue mobility and offer a promising framework for evaluating STM intervention efficacy in both research and clinical settings.

Sensitivity of Strain-Based Biomarkers in Measuring Soft Tissue Mobility

The strain-based biomarkers developed in this study effectively captured both population-level and individual-level changes in soft tissue mobility following soft tissue manipulation intervention. At the aggregate level, STM increased skin displacement and pull velocity, consistent with improved tissue glide and reduced resistance to clinician-applied loading (Fig. 3). These outcomes reflect improved extensibility at the tissue surface, aligning with hypothesized effects of STM on reducing inter-fascial stiffness.

Notably, the biomarkers also identified individual post-intervention responses, indicating their potential to assess personalized treatment effects. Among participants who received STM intervention, 76.5% (13 of 17) showed mobility changes that exceeded the predefined response threshold (Fig. 5, Supp. Tables S1-2). For example, participant P13 exhibited a 12.1 mm increase in maximum pull and a 22.2 mm/s increase in ramp-on pull velocity, with six biomarkers indicating a significant shift (Fig. 4). Such individualized responses demonstrate that these biomarkers are not only robust to population-level effects, but also sensitive to person-specific changes—a critical requirement for guiding clinical decision-making and tracking therapeutic efficacy over time.

Although the displacements observed may appear small, they exceed thresholds that have previously been linked to meaningful clinical outcomes. For instance, submillimeter increases in cervical facet joint gap during manipulation (0.9 ± 0.40 mm) were associated with improved intervertebral mobility and reduced pain (44). In comparison, the soft tissue displacements captured here frequently surpassed 3 mm, supporting their clinical relevance as markers of tissue mobility.

Despite its widespread clinical use, STM is primarily assessed using subjective outcomes such as pain ratings (41, 45–47), range of motion (ROM) (47, 48), or task-based metrics like grip strength or headache frequency (49, 50). While informative, these measures are often confounded by perception bias and do not directly reflect the biomechanical properties of soft tissue. Objective methods such as ROM and grip strength tests also offer only limited insight, capturing specific functional capabilities rather than providing a continuous or region-specific assessment of tissue mobility. Existing quantitative tools such as myotonometry and shear wave elastography (SWE) offer some promise but face well-documented

limitations. Myotonometry depends heavily on probe angle, examiner technique, and participant muscle tone, resulting in variable reliability across studies (51, 52). SWE, which estimates tissue stiffness, is susceptible to inaccuracies caused by tissue anisotropy, probe misalignment, and operator variability, often producing inconsistent post-intervention findings (53, 54). Moreover, both tools focus on elastic properties rather than mobility or deformation behavior, limiting their relevance to clinical scenarios involving dynamic soft tissue motion.

By contrast, the optical, strain-based biomarkers introduced here provide a non-invasive, task-independent, and highly sensitive means of quantifying soft tissue mobility. They are capable of capturing subtle changes across a broad field of view during real clinical maneuvers, offering an objective alternative that bridges the gap between subjective assessments and unreliable mechanical surrogates.

Physiological Mechanisms Underlying Soft Tissue Manipulation

An in-depth discussion is beyond the scope of this paper; however, several potential physiological mechanisms exist relevant to study findings. Restricted soft tissue mobility, often associated with myofascial trigger points, collagen cross-linking, and local neuromuscular dysfunction, can reduce interlayer glide, increase tissue stiffness, and impair function, contributing to both pain and movement limitations (55, 56). This aligns with models of fascial densification, which propose that immobility and overload lead to structural changes such as collagen cross-linking and reduced hydration that compromise tissue mechanics (57, 58). In our study, ten of nineteen participants showed bilateral mobility differences, and in eight with corresponding pain discrepancies, the more mobile side was consistently less painful (Fig. 7, Supp. Table S4). This relationship between reduced mobility and greater discomfort supports a mechanical contribution to localized pain and underscores the clinical value of identifying and targeting areas of restricted tissue mobility.

To address such restrictions, soft tissue manipulation is widely used and is thought to exert its effects through a combination of shear, distraction, and compressive forces that disrupt fascial adhesions, reorient collagen, and facilitate fluid exchange within the extracellular matrix, reducing viscosity and resistance to motion (59–61). These physiological effects are linked to functional outcomes observed in previous studies, including reductions in passive stiffness, increased range of motion, and improved neuromuscular coordination, collectively contributing to pain relief and functional improvement (62, 63). In animal models, STM has been shown to stimulate fibroblast activity, promote collagen remodeling, and accelerate tendon healing (61), as well as improve ligament strength and alignment (64). Clinical studies also support the use of STM alongside rehabilitation in treating chronic tissue restrictions, with improved outcomes reported for insertional Achilles tendinopathy and lateral epicondylopathy (65, 66).

Our post-intervention results align with these proposed mechanisms. A total of 88.2% of participants demonstrated increased mobility following treatment, and among those with bilateral pain discrepancies, nine of ten showed greater improvement on their more painful side (Fig. 8, Supp. Table S5). This preferential response suggests that tissue with greater initial restriction, and potentially more cross-linking or nociceptive activity, responds more readily to STM. We also observed consistent increases in skin displacement and velocity (3.4 mm increase in maximum pull, 8.4 mm/s increase in ramp-on pull velocity; Fig. 3), indicating enhanced extensibility and reduced resistance at the tissue surface. Although our measurements reflect only superficial skin motion, they are consistent with prior studies showing that STM can affect both superficial and deeper mechanics, including increased blood flow and improved fiber alignment in forearm muscles (60), and immediate reductions in joint stiffness (67). Although the breadth

and depth of the tissue response remains unknown, given the mechanical continuity between skin, fascia, and muscle, we interpret these strain-based surface biomarkers as meaningful indicators of underlying soft tissue mobility. They offer a non-invasive objective method for quantifying localized treatment response and support the physiological rationale for mobility-based STM intervention.

Considerations for Clinical Translation

Strain-based biomarkers offer several advantages for clinical use. They directly quantify tissue mobility, demonstrate high sensitivity to treatment effects, and can be integrated seamlessly into real-world clinical workflows. Unlike stiffness-based techniques, these biomarkers measure displacement and strain across extended tissue regions, enabling a more comprehensive assessment of soft tissue mechanics. Their ability to consistently detect post-intervention changes underscores their potential for objectively tracking treatment outcomes.

However, certain limitations must be addressed prior to clinical implementation. First, this study included only nineteen participants, restricting generalizability. Future work should involve larger, more diverse cohorts to determine how demographic and clinical factors such as age, sex, BMI, and specific musculoskeletal conditions influence biomarker performance. Second, all data collection was performed by a single clinician to ensure consistency, but this precludes assessment of inter-rater reliability. Notably, even palpation-based assessments often show limited reproducibility across clinicians (68, 69), underscoring the need to establish reliability before broader clinical adoption.

Optimizing biomarker selection is another important step toward clinical feasibility. Our analysis identified total gross deformation and ramp-on pull velocity as the most consistent and responsive indicators (Fig. 6). Their reliability across participants and conditions suggests that a streamlined set of core biomarkers could simplify implementation without sacrificing diagnostic sensitivity. The method's non-interfering compatibility with clinical procedures and its capacity to quantify tissue behavior objectively position strain-based biomarkers as promising tools for evaluating soft tissue mobility, guiding soft tissue manipulation interventions, and improving outcomes in musculoskeletal care.

DATA AVAILABILITY

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

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Supplemental Figures S1 and S2 and Supplemental Tables S1-S5 can be found in the file *Supplemental.pdf*.

GRANTS

This work was supported in part by the U.S. National Institutes of Health under Grants R01AT013186, R21AT011980, U24AT011969, and U24AT011970.

DISCLOSURES

No conflicts of interest, financial or otherwise, are declared by the authors.

DISCLAIMERS

The authors have no disclaimers to declare.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

A.R.K, M.T.L, and G.J.G conceived and designed research; A.R.K and M.T.L performed experiments; A.R.K. analyzed data; A.R.K, M.T.L, and G.J.G interpreted results of experiments; A.R.K prepared figures and drafted manuscript; A.R.K, M.T.L, and G.J.G edited and revised manuscript and approved final version of manuscript.

REFERENCES

1. **Lucas JW**, **Sohi I**. Chronic Pain and High-impact Chronic Pain Among U.S. Adults, 2023. National Center for Health Statistics (U.S.).

2. **Nahin RL**, **Rhee A**, **Stussman B**. Use of Complementary Health Approaches Overall and for Pain Management by US Adults. *JAMA* 331: 613–615, 2024. doi: 10.1001/jama.2023.26775.

3. **Pawlukiewicz M**, **Kochan M**, **Niewiadomy P**, **Szuścik-Niewiadomy K**, **Taradaj J**, **Król P**, **Kuszewski MT**. Fascial Manipulation Method Is Effective in the Treatment of Myofascial Pain, but the Treatment Protocol Matters: A Randomised Control Trial—Preliminary Report. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 11: 4546, 2022. doi: 10.3390/jcm11154546.

4. **van den Dolder PA**, **Ferreira PH**, **Refshauge KM**. Effectiveness of Soft Tissue Massage for Nonspecific Shoulder Pain: Randomized Controlled Trial. *Phys Ther* 95: 1467–1477, 2015. doi: 10.2522/ptj.20140350.

5. **Bingölbali Ö**, **Taşkaya C**, **Alkan H**, **Altındağ Ö**. The effectiveness of deep tissue massage on pain, trigger point, disability, range of motion and quality of life in individuals with myofascial pain syndrome. *Somatosens Mot Res* 41: 11–17, 2024. doi: 10.1080/08990220.2023.2165054.

6. **Raja G P**, **Bhat S**, **Gangavelli R**, **Prabhu A**, **Stecco A**, **Pirri C**, **Jaganathan V**, **Fernández-de-Las-Peñas C**. Effectiveness of Deep Cervical Fascial Manipulation® and Sequential Yoga Poses on Pain and Function in Individuals with Mechanical Neck Pain: A Randomised Controlled Trial. *Life* 13: 2173, 2023. doi: 10.3390/life13112173.

7. American Physical Therapy Association [Online]. *APTA*: [date unknown]. https://www.apta.org/ [8 Feb. 2022].

8. **Keter DL**, **Bent JA**, **Bialosky JE**, **Courtney CA**, **Esteves JE**, **Funabashi M**, **Howarth SJ**, **Injeyan HS**, **Mazzieri AM**, **Glissmann Nim C**, **Cook CE**. An international consensus on gaps in mechanisms of forced-based manipulation research: findings from a nominal group technique. *J Man Manip Ther* 32: 111–117, 2024. doi: 10.1080/10669817.2023.2262336.

9. **Adams R**, **White B**, **Beckett C**. The Effects of Massage Therapy on Pain Management in the Acute Care Setting. *Int J Ther Massage Bodywork* 3: 4–11, 2010.

10. **Karels CH**, **Polling W**, **Bierma-Zeinstra SMA**, **Burdorf A**, **Verhagen AP**, **Koes BW**. Treatment of arm, neck, and/or shoulder complaints in physical therapy practice. *Spine (Phila Pa 1976)* 31: E584-589, 2006. doi: 10.1097/01.brs.0000229229.54704.77.

11. **Cheatham SW**, **Baker R**, **Kreiswirth E**. Instrument Assisted Soft Tissue Mobilization: A commentary on clinical practice guidelines for rehabilitation professionals. *Int J Sports Phys Ther* 14: 670–682, 2019.

12. **Berger SE**, **Baria AT**. Assessing Pain Research: A Narrative Review of Emerging Pain Methods, Their Technosocial Implications, and Opportunities for Multidisciplinary Approaches. *Front Pain Res (Lausanne)* 3: 896276, 2022. doi: 10.3389/fpain.2022.896276.

13. **Engell S**, **Triano JJ**, **Fox JR**, **Langevin HM**, **Konofagou EE**. Differential displacement of soft tissue layers from manual therapy loading. *Clinical Biomechanics* 33: 66–72, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.clinbiomech.2016.02.011.

14. **Vappou J**, **Maleke C**, **Konofagou EE**. Quantitative viscoelastic parameters measured by harmonic motion imaging. *Phys Med Biol* 54: 3579–3594, 2009. doi: 10.1088/0031-9155/54/11/020.

15. **Chuang L**, **Wu C**, **Lin K**. Reliability, Validity, and Responsiveness of Myotonometric Measurement of Muscle Tone, Elasticity, and Stiffness in Patients With Stroke. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 93: 532–540, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.apmr.2011.09.014.

16. **Leonard CT**, **Deshner WP**, **Romo JW**, **Suoja ES**, **Fehrer SC**, **Mikhailenok EL**. Myotonometer Intra- and Interrater Reliabilities1. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 84: 928–932, 2003. doi: 10.1016/S0003-9993(03)00006-6.

17. **Romano A**, **Staber D**, **Grimm A**, **Kronlage C**, **Marquetand J**. Limitations of Muscle Ultrasound Shear Wave Elastography for Clinical Routine-Positioning and Muscle Selection. *Sensors (Basel)* 21: 8490, 2021. doi: 10.3390/s21248490.

18. **Hauser SC**, **McIntyre S**, **Israr A**, **Olausson H**, **Gerling GJ**. Uncovering Human-to-Human Physical Interactions that Underlie Emotional and Affective Touch Communication. In: *2019 IEEE World Haptics Conference (WHC)*. 2019 IEEE World Haptics Conference (WHC). 2019, p. 407–412.

19. **Xu S**, **Xu C**, **McIntyre S**, **Olausson H**, **Gerling GJ**. 3D Visual Tracking to Quantify Physical Contact Interactions in Human-to-Human Touch [Online]. *Frontiers in Physiology* 13, 2022. https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fphys.2022.841938 [28 Feb. 2023].

20. **Lo C**, **Chu ST**, **Penney TB**, **Schirmer A**. 3D Hand-Motion Tracking and Bottom-Up Classification Sheds Light on the Physical Properties of Gentle Stroking. .

21. **Sridhar S**, **Mueller F**, **Oulasvirta A**, **Theobalt C**. Fast and robust hand tracking using detection-guided optimization. In: *2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*. 2015 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR). 2015, p. 3213–3221.

22. **Kao AR**, **Xu C**, **Gerling GJ**. Using Digital Image Correlation to Quantify Skin Deformation With Von Frey Monofilaments. *IEEE Transactions on Haptics* 15: 26–31, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TOH.2021.3138350.

23. **Solav D**, **Moerman KM**, **Jaeger AM**, **Herr HM**. A Framework for Measuring the Time-Varying Shape and Full-Field Deformation of Residual Limbs Using 3-D Digital Image Correlation. *IEEE Transactions on Biomedical Engineering* 66: 2740–2752, 2019. doi: 10.1109/TBME.2019.2895283.

24. **Xu Z**, **Cruz JD**, **Fthenakis C**, **Saliou C**. A novel method to measure skin mechanical properties with three-dimensional digital image correlation. *Skin Research and Technology* 25: 60–67, 2019. doi: 10.1111/srt.12596.

25. **Kao AR**, **Loghmani MT**, **Gerling GJ**. Strain-based biomarkers at the skin surface differentiate asymmetries in soft tissue mobility associated with myofascial pain. medRxiv: 2024.12.18.24319267, 2024.

26. **Morgan D**. Principles of Soft Tissue Treatment. *Journal of Manual & Manipulative Therapy* 2: 63–65, 1994. doi: 10.1179/jmt.1994.2.2.63.

27. AMTA [Online]. *American Massage Therapy Association*: [date unknown]. https://www.amtamassage.org/ [8 Feb. 2022].

28. **Bhattacharjee A**, **Chien SYP**, **Anwar S**, **Loghmani MT**. Quantifiable Soft Tissue Manipulation (QSTM™) - A novel modality to improve clinical manual therapy with objective metrics. *Annu Int Conf IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc* 2021: 4961–4964, 2021. doi: 10.1109/EMBC46164.2021.9629616.

29. **Bhattacharjee A**, **Anwar S**, **Chien S**, **Loghmani MT**. A Handheld Quantifiable Soft Tissue Manipulation Device for Tracking Real-Time Dispersive Force-Motion Patterns to Characterize Manual Therapy Treatment. *IEEE Trans Biomed Eng* PP, 2022. doi: 10.1109/TBME.2022.3222124.

30. **Burke J**, **Buchberger DJ**, **Carey-Loghmani MT**, **Dougherty PE**, **Greco DS**, **Dishman JD**. A Pilot Study Comparing Two Manual Therapy Interventions for Carpal Tunnel Syndrome. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics* 30: 50–61, 2007. doi: 10.1016/j.jmpt.2006.11.014.

31. **Carey-Loghmani M**. *Graston Technique Training Manual: Module 1*. Editions 1-4. 1998.

32. **Solav D**, **Moerman KM**, **Jaeger AM**, **Genovese K**, **Herr HM**. MultiDIC: An Open-Source Toolbox for Multi-View 3D Digital Image Correlation. *IEEE Access* 6: 30520–30535, 2018. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2843725.

33. **Blaber J**, **Adair B**, **Antoniou A**. Ncorr: Open-Source 2D Digital Image Correlation Matlab Software. *Exp Mech* 55: 1105–1122, 2015. doi: 10.1007/s11340-015-0009-1.

34. **Pourahmadi M**, **Dommerholt J**, **Fernández-de-Las-Peñas C**, **Koes BW**, **Mohseni-Bandpei MA**, **Mansournia MA**, **Delavari S**, **Keshtkar A**, **Bahramian M**. Dry Needling for the Treatment of Tension-Type, Cervicogenic, or Migraine Headaches: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Physical Therapy* 101: pzab068, 2021. doi: 10.1093/ptj/pzab068.

35. **Kelley MJ**, **Shaffer MA**, **Kuhn JE**, **Michener LA**, **Seitz AL**, **Uhl TL**, **Godges JJ**, **McClure P**. Shoulder Pain and Mobility Deficits: Adhesive Capsulitis. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 43: A1–A31, 2013. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2013.0302.

36. **DeVocht JW**, **Pickar JG**, **Wilder DG**. Spinal Manipulation Alters Electromyographic Activity of Paraspinal Muscles: A Descriptive Study. *Journal of Manipulative and Physiological Therapeutics* 28: 465–471, 2005. doi: 10.1016/j.jmpt.2005.07.002.

37. **Bernal-Utrera C**, **Gonzalez-Gerez JJ**, **Anarte-Lazo E**, **Rodriguez-Blanco C**. Manual therapy versus therapeutic exercise in non-specific chronic neck pain: a randomized controlled trial. *Trials* 21: 682, 2020. doi: 10.1186/s13063-020-04610-w.

38. **Nadal-Nicolás Y**, **Rubio-Arias JÁ**, **Martínez-Olcina M**, **Reche-García C**, **Hernández-García M**, **Martínez-Rodríguez A**. Effects of Manual Therapy on Fatigue, Pain, and Psychological Aspects in Women with Fibromyalgia. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 17: 4611, 2020. doi: 10.3390/ijerph17124611.

39. **Hvedstrup J**, **Kolding LT**, **Ashina M**, **Schytz HW**. Increased neck muscle stiffness in migraine patients with ictal neck pain: A shear wave elastography study. *Cephalalgia* 40: 565–574, 2020. doi: 10.1177/0333102420919998.

40. **Loghmani M T**, **Bane S**. Instrument-assisted Soft Tissue Manipulation: Evidence for its Emerging Efficacy. *J Nov Physiother* s3, 2016. doi: 10.4172/2165-7025.S3-012.

41. **Abu Taleb W**, **Rehan Youssef A**, **Saleh A**. The effectiveness of manual versus algometer pressure release techniques for treating active myofascial trigger points of the upper trapezius. *J Bodyw Mov Ther* 20: 863–869, 2016. doi: 10.1016/j.jbmt.2016.02.008.

42. **Kablan N**, **Alaca N**, **Tatar Y**. Comparison of the Immediate Effect of Petrissage Massage and Manual Lymph Drainage Following Exercise on Biomechanical and Viscoelastic Properties of the Rectus Femoris Muscle in Women. *J Sport Rehabil* 30: 725–730, 2021. doi: 10.1123/jsr.2020-0276.

43. **Mahmood T**, **Abrar A**, **Atif MM**, **Mahmood W**, **Batool F**. Effect of instrument-assisted soft tissue mobilization versus myofascial release therapy for pain, mobility, and disability in chronic low backache patients: a quasi-experimental study. *Anaesthesia, Pain & Intensive Care* 28: 452–458, 2024. doi: 10.35975/apic.v28i3.2459.

44. **Anderst WJ**, **Gale T**, **LeVasseur C**, **Raj S**, **Gongaware K**, **Schneider M**. Intervertebral kinematics of the cervical spine before, during, and after high-velocity low-amplitude manipulation. *Spine J* 18: 2333–2342, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2018.07.026.

45. **Reeves JL**, **Jaeger B**, **Graff-Radford SB**. Reliability of the pressure algometer as a measure of myofascial trigger point sensitivity. *Pain* 24: 313–321, 1986. doi: 10.1016/0304-3959(86)90117-X.

46. **Coulter ID**, **Crawford C**, **Hurwitz EL**, **Vernon H**, **Khorsan R**, **Suttorp Booth M**, **Herman PM**. Manipulation and mobilization for treating chronic low back pain: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Spine J* 18: 866–879, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.spinee.2018.01.013.

47. **Coppieters MW**, **Stappaerts KH**, **Wouters LL**, **Janssens K**. The Immediate Effects of a Cervical Lateral Glide Treatment Technique in Patients With Neurogenic Cervicobrachial Pain. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 33: 369–378, 2003. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2003.33.7.369.

48. **Anwer S**, **Alghadir A**, **Zafar H**, **Brismée J-M**. Effects of orthopaedic manual therapy in knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Physiotherapy* 104: 264–276, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.physio.2018.05.003.

49. **Fernández-de-las-Peñas C**, **Cleland J**, **Palacios-Ceña M**, **Fuensalida-Novo S**, **Pareja JA**, **Alonso-Blanco C**. The Effectiveness of Manual Therapy Versus Surgery on Self-reported Function, Cervical Range of Motion, and Pinch Grip Force in Carpal Tunnel Syndrome: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 47: 151–161, 2017. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2017.7090.

50. **Bini P**, **Hohenschurz-Schmidt D**, **Masullo V**, **Pitt D**, **Draper-Rodi J**. The effectiveness of manual and exercise therapy on headache intensity and frequency among patients with cervicogenic headache: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Chiropractic & Manual Therapies* 30: 49, 2022. doi: 10.1186/s12998-022-00459-9.

51. **Wu Z**, **Zhu Y**, **Xu W**, **Liang J**, **Guan Y**, **Xu X**. Analysis of Biomechanical Properties of the Lumbar Extensor Myofascia in Elderly Patients with Chronic Low Back Pain and That in Healthy People. *BioMed Research International* 2020: 7649157, 2020. doi: 10.1155/2020/7649157.

52. **Lee Y**, **Kim M**, **Lee H**. The Measurement of Stiffness for Major Muscles with Shear Wave Elastography and Myoton: A Quantitative Analysis Study. *Diagnostics (Basel)* 11: 524, 2021. doi: 10.3390/diagnostics11030524.

53. **Vuorenmaa AS**, **Siitama EMK**, **Mäkelä KS**. Inter-operator and inter-device reproducibility of shear wave elastography in healthy muscle tissues. *J Appl Clin Med Phys* 23: e13717, 2022. doi: 10.1002/acm2.13717.

54. **Valera-Calero JA**, **Sánchez-Jorge S**, **Buffet-García J**, **Varol U**, **Gallego-Sendarrubias GM**, **Álvarez-González J**. Is Shear-Wave Elastography a Clinical Severity Indicator of Myofascial Pain Syndrome? An Observational Study. *Journal of Clinical Medicine* 10: 2895, 2021. doi: 10.3390/jcm10132895.

55. **Simons DG**, **Travell JG**, **Simons LS**. *Travell & Simons' myofascial pain and dysfunction: the trigger point manual*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins, 1999.

56. **Dommerholt J**, **Bron C**, **Franssen J**. Myofascial Trigger Points: An Evidence-Informed Review. *Journal of Manual & Manipulative Therapy* 14: 203–221, 2006. doi: 10.1179/106698106790819991.

57. **Langevin HM**, **Stevens-Tuttle D**, **Fox JR**, **Badger GJ**, **Bouffard NA**, **Krag MH**, **Wu J**, **Henry SM**. Ultrasound evidence of altered lumbar connective tissue structure in human subjects with chronic low back pain. *BMC Musculoskeletal Disorders* 10: 151, 2009. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-10-151.

58. **Schleip R**, **Müller DG**. Training principles for fascial connective tissues: scientific foundation and suggested practical applications. *J Bodyw Mov Ther* 17: 103–115, 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.jbmt.2012.06.007.

59. **Jiménez-del-Barrio S**, **Cadellans-Arróniz A**, **Ceballos-Laita L**, **Estébanez-de-Miguel E**, **López-de-Celis C**, **Bueno-Gracia E**, **Pérez-Bellmunt A**. The effectiveness of manual therapy on pain, physical function, and nerve conduction studies in carpal tunnel syndrome patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Orthopaedics (SICOT)* 46: 301–312, 2022. doi: 10.1007/s00264-021-05272-2.

60. **Speicher TE**, **Selkow NM**, **Warren AJ**. Manual Therapy Improves Immediate Blood Flow and Tissue Fiber Alignment of the Forearm Extensors. *J Phys Med Rehabil* Volume 4: 28–36, 2022. doi: 10.33696/rehabilitation.4.029.

61. **Davidson CJ**, **Ganion LR**, **Gehlsen GM**, **Verhoestra B**, **Roepke JE**, **Sevier TL**. Rat tendon morphologic and functional changes resulting from soft tissue mobilization. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 29: 313–319, 1997. doi: 10.1097/00005768-199703000-00005.

62. **Iwatsuki H**, **Ikuta Y**, **Shinoda K**. Deep Friction Massage on the Masticatory Muscles in Stroke Patients Increases Biting Force. *Journal of Physical Therapy Science* 13: 17–20, 2001. doi: 10.1589/jpts.13.17.

63. **Coronado RA**, **Gay CW**, **Bialosky JE**, **Carnaby GD**, **Bishop MD**, **George SZ**. Changes in pain sensitivity following spinal manipulation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Electromyogr Kinesiol* 22: 752–767, 2012. doi: 10.1016/j.jelekin.2011.12.013.

64. **Loghmani MT**, **Warden SJ**. Instrument-Assisted Cross-Fiber Massage Accelerates Knee Ligament Healing. *Journal of Orthopaedic & Sports Physical Therapy* 39: 506–514, 2009. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2009.2997.

65. **McCormack JR**, **Underwood FB**, **Slaven EJ**, **Cappaert TA**. Eccentric Exercise Versus Eccentric Exercise and Soft Tissue Treatment (Astym) in the Management of Insertional Achilles Tendinopathy: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Sports Health* 8: 230–237, 2016. doi: 10.1177/1941738116631498.

66. **Papa JA**. Two cases of work-related lateral epicondylopathy treated with Graston Technique® and conservative rehabilitation. *J Can Chiropr Assoc* 56: 192–200, 2012.

67. **IKEDA N**, **OTSUKA S**, **KAWANISHI Y**, **KAWAKAMI Y**. Effects of Instrument-assisted Soft Tissue Mobilization on Musculoskeletal Properties. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 51: 2166–2172, 2019. doi: 10.1249/MSS.0000000000002035.

68. **Gerwin RD**, **Shannon S**, **Hong CZ**, **Hubbard D**, **Gevirtz R**. Interrater reliability in myofascial trigger point examination. *Pain* 69: 65–73, 1997. doi: 10.1016/s0304-3959(96)03248-4.

69. **Rathbone ATL**, **Grosman-Rimon L**, **Kumbhare DA**. Interrater Agreement of Manual Palpation for Identification of Myofascial Trigger Points: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Clin J Pain* 33: 715–729, 2017. doi: 10.1097/AJP.0000000000000459.



Figure 1. Conceptual overview of the clinical STM stretch assessment procedure and predicted changes to soft tissue mobility following intervention. (a) Schematic representation of STM stretch assessment, applied bilaterally (left and right sides of the body) and directionally (superior and inferior pulls) in the cervicothoracic region. (b) Cross-sectional schematic of tissue layers (skin, superficial fascia, deep fascia, and muscle) highlighting restricted tissue mobility due to myofascial trigger points, which resist clinician-applied pull, reducing tissue glide and propagation distance. (c) Predicted changes in motion along the body plane pre- and post-intervention. Pre-intervention (red), restricted tissue is characterized by limited glide and increased deformation under clinician-applied pull. Post-intervention (yellow), tissue is anticipated to exhibit improved mobility with increased glide and reduced deformation. (d) Predicted changes in biomarker behavior pre- and post-intervention. Post-intervention (yellow), tissues are expected to demonstrate reduced resistance, allowing clinicians to pull faster and farther, with decreased reliance on tissue deformation (strain).



Figure 2. Equipment setup and STM intervention. (a) The clinician assesses the tissue mobility of the right cervicothoracic region of a participant while the skin surface is imaged with three overhead cameras mounted to a rotating arm. (b) DIC Speckle pattern is applied with the semi-permanent tattoo method. Clinician performs instrument-assisted STM (IASTM) intervention on the left cervicothoracic region. (C)-(D) Colormap overlaid on raw image showing the change in skin surface displacement during pull applied manually by clinician's fingers in the superior (towards neck) direction pre-intervention (c) and post-intervention (d). Blue to yellow color hues indicate greater movement, including rigid body motion, in all three directions (X, Y, Z) as compared to the tissue's resting state. (e)-(f) Colormap overlaid on raw image showing the change in skin surface compressive strain over the time duration pull. Maximum compressive strain (blue) is focused near the area in contact with the clinician's fingers and diminishes away from contact towards zero (red). More compression is observed post-intervention compared to pre-intervention for this participant.



Figure 3. Pre-to-post intervention population trends. (a)-(d) Biomarker distribution across all participants with sides and directions aggregated and separated by intervention condition. After STM intervention, (a) the clinician delivered 3.34 mm more of maximum pull (29.74 ± 9.74 mm to 33.08 ± 10.16 mm, median ± SD), which in (b) produced 2.68 mm more of maximum far region displacement. Similarly, in (c), the clinician's ramp-on pull velocity increased 8.35 mm/s (33.72 ± 16.00 mm/s to 42.07 ± 14.89 mm/s) and in (d), total gross deformation increased 0.64 mm (3.11 ± 1.74 mm to 3.73 ± 2.04 mm). (e)-(h) Aggregate data isolated for the superior pull direction, separated by intervention condition, and analyzed using linear mixed-effects models (α = 0.01). Significant differences in the superior direction post-intervention were observed in four biomarkers (three shown: (e), (g), and (h)). Specifically, (e) maximum pull, (g) ramp-on pull velocity, and (h) total gross deformation were greater post-intervention. (i)-(l) Aggregate data isolated for the inferior pull direction, separated by intervention condition, and analyzed using linear mixed-effects models (α = 0.01). Significant differences post-intervention in the inferior direction were only observed in one biomarker, (k) ramp-on pull velocity. Specifically, post-intervention, ramp-on pull velocity increased by 8.11 mm/s in the superior direction (30.55 ± 15.66 mm/s to 38.66 ± 16.38 mm/s) and 10.29 mm/s in the inferior direction (35.50 ± 15.71 mm/s to 45.79 ± 12.70 mm/s).

A



B

Participant	13
DIC Metric	% change
Maximum tensile strain	29.1
Maximum pull	33.2
Maximum compressive strain	43.5
Maximum far region displacement	27.4
Pull propagation	8.3
Ramp-on pull velocity	47.0
Ramp-on strain gradient	10.7
Ramp-on duration	23.9
Strain at 5 mm	16.9
Strain-to-pull at maximum pull	6.6
Total gross deformation	54.8
# metrics above 25%	6

Figure 4. Pre-to-post intervention mobility change for a representative participant (P13) in the superior pull direction on the left body side. (a) Time-series data of applied pull are shown for three trials pre-intervention (red) and post-intervention (blue). Post-intervention, the clinician applied 12.1 mm more maximum pull and executed the maneuver 22.2 mm/s faster. Percent differences in biomarker values indicate a 33.2% increase in average maximum pull and a 47.0% increase in average ramp-on pull velocity post-intervention. (b) Analysis of the remaining nine biomarkers revealed that six exceeded the threshold outlined in Methods—Statistical Analysis, suggesting a measurable change in tissue mobility following the intervention.



Figure 5. Pre-to-post intervention participant mobility change (all biomarkers, any direction) versus pre-intervention pain asymmetry. Bars show the number of biomarkers exceeding the threshold for each participant on the left (green) and right (purple) body sides. A body side was classified as exhibiting mobility change if at least six of the 22 comparisons exceeded the predefined threshold (Methods—Statistical Analysis), regardless of whether the biomarker increased or decreased; indicated by the dashed line. An "X" beneath each bar denotes the more painful side reported pre-intervention. Thirteen of 17 treated participants were classified as exhibiting post-intervention change on at least one body side (left: 8, right: 5). Nine of the ten participants who reported bilateral pain differences exhibited change on at least one body side, and eight showed greater change on their more painful side. The two boxed participants (P5, P10) were untreated controls and exhibited no change.



Figure 6. Biomarker sensitivity across directional, bilateral, and pre-to-post comparison categories. For each of the 11 biomarkers, the number of participant-level comparisons in which the predefined threshold was exceeded is shown, separated by comparison category (directional in blue, bilateral in orange, pre-to-post in purple). Each biomarker had up to 228 opportunities to detect a difference (19 participants x 4 comparisons per category x 3 categories). Total gross deformation demonstrated the highest overall sensitivity, exceeding threshold in 117 comparisons (51.3%), followed by ramp-on velocity with 93 detections (40.8%). Of the 753 total detections across all biomarkers and categories, directional comparisons accounted for 388 (51.5%), bilateral for 192 (25.5%), and pre-to-post for 173 (23.0%). Most biomarkers showed the greatest sensitivity in directional comparisons, though ramp-on duration was more responsive in bilateral and pre-to-post contexts. Pull propagation and strain at 5 mm exhibited the lowest overall sensitivity (43 detections each, 18.9%), with limited detection outside directional comparisons.



Figure 7. Pre-intervention participant mobility difference (subset of biomarkers, mobility-enhancing direction) versus pre-intervention pain asymmetry. Bars show the number of high-sensitivity biomarkers (maximum pull, maximum far region displacement, ramp-on pull velocity, total gross deformation) that exceeded the threshold for each participant in the superior (blue) and inferior (green) pull directions. Values are calculated as right minus left, such that positive values indicate greater mobility on the right body side and negative values indicate greater mobility on the left. A body side was classified as more mobile if at least two of the eight comparisons exceeded threshold in the mobility-enhancing direction (Results—Pre-to-Post Intervention Population Trends); indicated by the dashed lines. An "X" marks the more painful side as reported pre-intervention. Ten participants exhibited a bilateral mobility difference, including eight who also reported pain asymmetry—all of whom were more mobile on their less painful side.



Figure 8. Pre-to-post intervention participant mobility improvement (subset of biomarkers, mobility-enhancing direction) versus pre-intervention pain asymmetry. Bars show the number of high-sensitivity biomarkers (maximum pull, maximum far region displacement, ramp-on pull velocity, total gross deformation) that exceeded the threshold in the mobility-enhancing direction for each participant on the left (green) and right (purple) body sides (Results—Pre-to-Post Intervention Population Trends). A body side was classified as improving if at least two of the eight comparisons exceeded threshold in the mobility-enhancing direction (i.e., higher values); indicated by the dashed line. An "X" beneath each bar denotes the more painful side self-reported pre-intervention. Fifteen of the 17 treated participants were classified as exhibiting post-intervention improvements on at least one body side, including all ten participants who reported bilateral pain asymmetries. In nine of those ten, the greater improvement occurred on the more painful side. One participant (P9) exhibited a decline in mobility post-intervention, with five biomarkers decreasing on the left side. The two boxed participants (P5, P10) were untreated controls and showed neither improvement nor decline.



Figure 9. Summary of study results for 19 participants. Participants were categorized based on self-reported pain ratings pre-intervention (pink section), mobility differences pre-intervention (yellow section), and mobility improvements post-intervention (blue section). The majority of results aligned with our hypotheses (solid icons). Specifically, of the ten participants who reported bilaterally different pain, eight were identified as more mobile on their less painful side. Post-intervention, nine of these participants improved more on their more painful side. Additionally, the two untreated controls (red icons) exhibited no change post-intervention. Unexpected results (empty icons) included one participant showing a decline in mobility post-intervention on one body side and one participant receiving intervention but showing no improvement. Overall, these findings validate the utility of the biomarkers as quantitative tools for assessing tissue mobility, providing evidence that tissue mobility aligns with self-reported pain discrepancies and improves following intervention. The flowchart highlights the promise of this method for objectively evaluating mobility changes and its potential clinical relevance in linking tissue mobility to pain during STM stretch assessments.