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Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) is an autologous blood product with platelet concentrations above baseline values. The process involves the extraction of blood from the patient which is then centrifuged to obtain a concentrated suspension of platelets by plasmapheresis. It then undergoes a two-stage centrifugation process to separate the solid and liquid components of the anticoagulated blood. PRP owes its therapeutic use to the growth factors released by the platelets which are claimed to possess multiple regenerative properties.

In the knee, PRP has been used in patients with articular cartilage pathology, ligamentous and meniscal injuries.

There is a growing body of evidence to support its use in selected indications and this review looks at the most recent evidence. We also look at the current UK National Institute of Health & Clinical Excellence (NICE) guidelines with respect to osteoarthritis and the use of PRP in the knee.
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Introduction

Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) has been used since the 1950s to manage maxillofacial and dermatological conditions.1,2 The use of biological agents including PRP and mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) in orthopaedics has increased exponentially over the last few years due to its autologous nature, supposed effectiveness and lack of side-effects.3,4

This review article will look at the use of PRP for treatment of knee disorders.

PRP is an autologous blood product with platelet concentrations above baseline values.5 The preparation process involves the extraction of blood from the patient which is then centrifuged to obtain a concentrated suspension of platelets by plasmapheresis. It then undergoes a two-stage centrifugation process to separate the solid and liquid components of the anticoagulated blood.6 The initial phase separates the plasma and platelets from the erythrocytes and leucocytes. The second stage uses a hard spin to concentrate the platelets further into platelet-rich and platelet-poor plasma components. The final PRP product is then injected into the knee joint space (Fig. 1). There is also debate on the potential benefits of platelet-poor plasma on healing and some formulations do not incorporate this step.7

As well as platelets, PRP contains white blood cells and some proteins.

The neutrophils and monocytes may instigate a localised inflammatory effect which some authors claim can facilitate tissue healing.8

PRP owes its therapeutic use to the limited evidence that growth factors released by the platelets possess multiple regenerative properties.9 Tissue repair is a complex process comprising chemotaxis, angiogenesis, cell proliferation and matrix formation.10 Platelets are involved in all of these functions by the release of growth factors.

High concentrations of proteins such as platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), endothelial cell growth factor and fibroblast growth factor have led to suggestions that PRP may be useful in conditions requiring tissue healing.5,10 Conversely, the other protein in PRP, transforming growth factor (TGF)-β1, has an inhibitory effect and can lead to non-predictable results.11

Preparation and delivery techniques

There are essentially three different methods for PRP production.12

1. Blood filtration and plateletpheresis. These result in high concentrations of human platelets and PDGFs and low numbers of contaminating leucocytes;
2. Single-spinning centrifugation which results in platelets up to three times that of baseline level;
3. Double-spinning centrifugation which results in platelets up to eight times the baseline level with a high leucocyte content.
These result in four categories of products.13

1. Pure PRP (P-PRP) with a low content of leucocytes. This can be injected as a liquid or a gel.
2. Leucocyte-rich PRP (L-PRP) has a greater concentration of platelets than P-PRP. Similarly to P-PRP, it can be used as an activated gel or in a liquid form to be injected intra-articularly.
3. Pure platelet-rich fibrin (P-PRF). This is obtained by double-spinning centrifugation. The end product is a platelet-rich fibrin scaffold, which is stiffer than the conventional PRP and takes the form of a gel.
4. Leucocyte- and platelet-rich fibrin (L-PRF) which is a leucocyte-rich gel which is non-injectable and is applied locally.

The activation of PRP also varies between studies. Some add calcium chloride while others prefer inactivated PRP.14-19

However, there is a variation between final platelet concentrations between techniques and even within a given technique (Table 1).20-24

A higher concentration of platelets is not necessarily more efficacious with one study suggesting that the ideal concentration is 1.5 × 10⁶ platelets per microlitre.25

The final platelet concentration is influenced by a number of factors, such as the initial volume of whole blood, concentration of other cells, the preparation technique, age and co-morbidities of the patient.26

There are a number of delivery techniques ranging from direct injection into the knee18,19,21,22,24 to application via a collagen membrane giving a gel-like consistency.27

Adverse events have been reported. One study reported 19 adverse events including dizziness, headaches, nausea, gastritis, sweating and tachycardia. These were all self-limiting.23 Another group reported 31 adverse events in those receiving PRP injections including post-injection pain, swelling at the site of injection and limitation in activities. These resolved by day four in all patients.28

In terms of contra-indications, one study suggested that patients undergo a minor haematological evaluation to exclude blood disorders or platelet dysfunction. They suggest the relative contra-indications for PRP are: a platelet count less than 10⁵/μl; a haemoglobin level less than 10 g/dl; presence of a tumour in the wound bed or metastatic disease; and other active infections.29

The therapeutic schedule used by the lead author is a course of three injections which are two weeks apart with 3 ml of PRP injected on each occasion.

**Knee ligament injuries**

Ligaments connect bones and are important for joint stability and proprioception. They comprise 70% water and 30% solid material with the latter being extracellular matrix and fibroblasts. The most abundant collagen is type 1 which is arranged in a haphazard manner to cope with the different directions of pull.30

Ligament healing undergoes four indistinct phases. The inflammatory phase occurs in the first week with an increase in growth factors (TGF-β1, IGF, PDGF, BMPs). The proliferation phase occurs at days 7 to 21 where type 3 collagen is replaced by type 1. The final stages of remodelling and maturation begin at two weeks. PRP can increase growth factors and so may be of benefit in the initial inflammatory phase.30

**Anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction**

Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) reconstruction is a successful procedure with very good outcomes and patient satisfaction.31 Maturation of the graft is important for biomechanical strength and return to activity. This may be facilitated by PDGF, TGF-β1 and IGF-1.31 Studies have shown PRP has the capacity to improve ACL cell viability and function and may be given to hasten ACL graft healing.32

A prospective single-blind study with 50 participants who were treated with and without PRP after their ACL autograft found that those who had PRP gel at the time of surgery had quicker biological maturation on MRI scanning at one year (p < 0.001).31

---

**Table 1.** Platelet and WBC concentrations vary between preparations69

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Centrifugations (n)</th>
<th>Mean concentrations (per mL)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Platelets</td>
<td>WBC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerza et al20</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>3.5 (10⁶)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kon et al12</td>
<td>Double</td>
<td>&gt;6 (10⁷)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filardo et al67</td>
<td>Double</td>
<td>5 × WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patel et al23</td>
<td>Single</td>
<td>3.1 (10⁶)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spakova et al24</td>
<td>Double</td>
<td>6.8 (10⁶)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WBC, white blood cells; WB, whole blood.
Another level 1 study where platelet concentrate was added to the semitendinosus graft and to the femoral tunnel led to a higher rate of graft maturation at six months as demonstrated on MRI scans.33

Another group administered PRP to the femoral tunnels in 30 patients and at three months found no difference in MRI findings pertaining to graft maturation.34 This may be due to the shorter follow-up and fewer participants than the previous studies.

A systematic review looking at eight trials concluded that ACL maturation after reconstruction can show 20% to 30% improvement with the addition of PRP.35

Other studies assessed structural changes of the ACL graft after PRP administration. One study looked at 37 patients who had ACL reconstruction using hamstring grafts with and without PRP. Second-look arthroscopies showed those who had PRP had improved graft remodeling with connective tissue enveloping the graft and the grafts were thicker. They postulated that the PRP may enhance the ‘ligamentisation’ process in tendon grafts.36

On the contrary, a level 1 study with 100 patients were randomised to either receive or not receive platelet-enriched gel during ACL reconstruction. At two-year follow-up, there was no difference in any of the functional and radiological outcome scores. The authors attributed these findings to several factors; PRP preparation/centrifugation, graft choice, rehabilitation protocols and application technique.37 The outcome of this study was mirrored by another group who showed that the use of PRP in ACL allograft reconstruction produced no discernible difference at two-year follow-up.38

PRP has also been used at the patellar and tibial bone plug harvest site. In a level 1 study involving 40 participants, PRP gel was added to these sites. At one-year follow-up, knee function was significantly higher in those who had received PRP (p = 0.041).39

In a further study, 12 patients received PRP in the patellar tendon defect after harvesting for ACL reconstruction compared with 15 who did not. A six-month MRI scan demonstrated that those who received PRP had a smaller patellar tendon gap.40

Tendon and muscle

In the early stages of tendon healing, there is an upregulation of PDGF and TGF-β resulting in new vessel formation and collagen synthesis. These factors are present in high concentrations in PRP and may be beneficial in the early stages of tendon repair.41

A prospective level III study looked at the efficacy of PRP injections in chronic refractory patellar tendinopathy. The 15 patients were treated with multiple PRP injections and physiotherapy while 16 were treated exclusively with physiotherapy. Those who received PRP had a statistically significant better activity level after a short follow-up at six months. All other outcomes, such as pain, showed no difference between the two groups.42

Another study evaluated the outcome of patients with patellar tendinopathy treated with PRP injections.43 Additionally, they examined whether certain characteristics, such as activity level or previous treatment influenced the results. After PRP treatment, patients with patellar tendinopathy showed a statistically significant improvement in pain during activities of daily life, work and sport. However, patients who were not treated before with ethoxy-sclerol, cortisone and/or surgical treatment showed the improvement.43

These limited studies are encouraging and indicate that PRP injections have the potential to promote the achievement of a satisfactory clinical outcome, even in difficult cases with chronic refractory tendinopathy after previous classical treatments have failed.

Meniscus injuries

The meniscus is an intra-articular structure composed primarily of type 1 collagen. Its main functions are shock absorption, proprioception, lubrication and joint stability.30 It is vulnerable to repetitive injury which can predispose to osteoarthritis. Repair depends on the site and extent of damage. The periphery is vascular and has greater scope for healing compared with the avascular inner portion.44,45

Laboratory experiments have shown that PRP has a positive effect on meniscal cells. PRP may provide growth factors that enhance the meniscus healing through cell proliferation and vascularisation. For the meniscus to heal there needs to be a blood supply. The inner white-white zone is devoid of this and so the vascularisation induced by PRP may be important.46,47

A level III study found that PRP augmentation at the time of meniscal repair showed no difference in re- operation rate, function and return to sports. However, there were only 15 patients who had PRP augmentation versus 20 who did not. These small numbers may not have adequately highlighted noticeable differences.48 On the contrary, a French group performed a case-control study looking at the addition of PRP following meniscal repair. They found that open meniscal repair of horizontal tears extending into the avascular zone was effective at midterm follow-up in younger patients. Clinical outcomes were slightly improved with the addition of PRP.49

Osteoarthritis

Osteoarthritis is a degenerative disease of synovial joints resulting in the progressive loss of articular cartilage. The aetiology can be primary (intrinsic defect) or secondary
(trauma, infection). It starts with a loss of the weight-bearing articular cartilage surface followed by osteophyte development. Late disease is characterised by cartilage disintegration exposing the bony surface.\textsuperscript{50}

Biochemically, there is an increased water content (decreased in aging), alterations in proteoglycans (decreased content and increased chondroitin/keratin sulphate ratio).\textsuperscript{50} There is also an increase in metalloproteinases and IL-1 which may have a catabolic effect leading to cartilage degeneration.\textsuperscript{50}

Histologically, there is a loss of superficial chondrocytes, breakdown of the tidemark, fissuring and cartilage destruction with eburnation of subchondral bone.\textsuperscript{50}

Normal cartilage is avascular which accounts for its lack of inherent healing potential.\textsuperscript{51,53}

Radiographic findings include subchondral cysts/sclerosis, marginal osteophyte formation and joint-space narrowing.

Non-operative treatment comprises analgesia increasing as per the World Health Organization (WHO) analgesic ladder. Weight management and physical therapy are also beneficial. Varus/valgus unloading bracing, tibial osteotomy or unicompartment replacement prosthesis can be used in unicompartmental disease in patients who wish to delay total knee arthroplasty.

Intra-articular corticosteroid injections reduce synovitis and it is assumed that their analgesic action in osteoarthritis is in some way related to this.\textsuperscript{54}

Surgical treatment includes microfracture, autologous chondrocyte implantation and osteochondral implantation.\textsuperscript{55} However, despite good short- and medium-term results, these treatments may not prevent the long-term development of osteoarthritis.\textsuperscript{56}

The United Kingdom National Institute of Health & Clinical Excellence (NICE) recommends that intra-articular corticosteroid injections should be considered as an adjunct to core treatments for the relief of moderate to severe pain in people with osteoarthritis for a limited period.\textsuperscript{57}

Endogenous hyaluronan (previously known as hyaluronic acid) is a large, linear glycosaminoglycan and is a major non-structural component of both the synovial and cartilage extracellular matrix. It is also found in synovial fluid and is produced by the lining layer cells of the joint. Its key functions in the joint are to confer visco-elasticity, lubrication and help maintain tissue hydration and protein homeostasis by preventing large fluid movements and by acting as an osmotic buffer.\textsuperscript{30}

\textit{In vitro} studies have shown that chondrocytes stimulated with PRP increase proteoglycan and collagen synthesis which have similar histological and biochemical qualities to normal hyaline cartilage.\textsuperscript{58,60} PRP also contains factors such as TGF-β1, thrombospondin-1 and insulin-like growth factor which are proposed to be useful in treating symptomatic cartilage lesions or osteochondral defects.\textsuperscript{64}

A retrospective cohort study examining the use of PRP in the knee looked at 60 patients with unilateral Ahlback grades 1 to 4 osteoarthritis. The first 30 patients were treated with three injections of PRP and the remainder had hyaluronic acid injections. At five-week follow-up, those injected with PRP had significantly higher WOMAC (Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Arthritis Index) scores. These results were invalidated by the short follow-up.\textsuperscript{65}

An earlier study with similar findings had a larger cohort of 150 patients with six-monthly follow-up.\textsuperscript{66} There were three treatment arms: activated PRP (infiltration every 21 days), single dose high molecular weight hyaluronic acid (HMWHA) and low molecular weight hyaluronic acid (LMWHA). Outcome measures used were visual analogue scale, quality of life related to health status (EQ VAS) and knee function using the International Knee Documentation Committee index (IKDC). The authors reported better response rates in PRP-treated patients than any treated with hyaluronic acid (p < 0.005). In all groups, the response was better in younger patients and in those who had recent onset osteoarthritis.\textsuperscript{66}

A randomised control trial (RCT) with 120 participants demonstrated significantly superior outcomes up to 24 weeks after local PRP injection compared with hyaluronic acid (p < 0.001).\textsuperscript{20} A double-blind prospective RCT in which 78 patients with bilateral osteoarthritis were randomised to receive PRP, two PRP injections three weeks apart or a single saline injection. Both the PRP groups had significantly better six-month outcomes.\textsuperscript{23}

An Italian level 1 study demonstrated that PRP injections, compared with hyaluronic acid injections, showed a significant improvement up to one year. However, for middle-aged patients with moderate signs of osteoarthritis, PRP results were no better than those who had HA injections.\textsuperscript{67}

A systematic review looked at a total of ten studies in the final analysis, with the majority of studies looking at the use of PRP in degenerative osteoarthritis of the hip or knee. Most patients reported improvement in pain and functional outcome scores at six months with no studies reporting worsening scores. However, none reported any long-term follow-up. They concluded that PRP may be beneficial in the short term but that there is a poverty of long-term high quality data.\textsuperscript{68}

Another systematic review looked at six level 1 and 2 studies overall. They found improved function in adult patients with mild or moderate knee osteoarthritis at six months who had PRP injections compared with hyaluronic acid or normal saline.\textsuperscript{69} Four of the studies reported an increase in adverse non-specific events in those treated with PRP including pain, stiffness, syncope, dizziness,
nausea, gastritis, sweating and tachycardia which were all self-limiting.22-24,28

A Taiwanese group carried out a meta-analysis of single-arm studies, quasi-experimental studies and RCTs. This equated to 1543 participants. They concluded that PRP improves function for 12 months in patients with knee joint cartilage pathology and is more effective than hyaluronic acid administration.70

There have been a number of case series which demonstrate the use of PRP in those with knee osteoarthritis. One study described the results in 261 patients injected three times at fortnightly intervals. At six-month follow-up, there were significant improvements in the WOMAC, SF-36 and functional scores compared with baseline. There were no adverse effects.19 Another series with 65 patients who received a single PRP injection showed pain scores were reduced at six months. However, at nine and 12 months, the scores had started to increase.71 A study in 2011 had the longest follow-up with 91 patients with a minimum follow-up of one year. They demonstrated a decrease in pain and improvement in function compared with baseline.72

These studies may provide evidence with respect to the safety of PRP but they lacked a control group. Nevertheless, they did provide pre-PRP pain, function and quality of life scores in the same patients.19,71,72

Radiological changes have also been reported with PRP in osteoarthritis of the knee. A prospective cohort study with one-year follow-up of patients after PRP for early knee osteoarthritis had 22 participants. All received a 6 mL PRP injection. A total of 15 participants underwent clinical assessments at baseline, week 1, and months 1, 3, 6 and 12, and MRI at one year. Pain scores decreased, whereas functional and clinical scores increased at six months and one year from baseline significantly. Qualitative MRIs demonstrated no change per compartment in at least 73% of cases at one year.73

In the United Kingdom, NICE published guidelines in May 2014 (‘Platelet-rich plasma injections for osteoarthritis of the knee’).74 These state that current evidence on PRP injections for osteoarthritis of the knee raises no major safety concerns. Nevertheless, the evidence on efficacy is inadequate in quality. NICE recommends that this procedure should only be used with special arrangements for clinical governance, consent, and audit or research.74

They also suggest that any further research into PRP injections for treating osteoarthritis of the knee should categorically describe patient selection and take the form of well-designed studies that compare the procedure against other methods of management. Outcomes should include knee function scores, patient-reported outcome measures and the timing of subsequent interventions.74

PRP has been used since the 1950s to manage maxillofacial and dermatological conditions and applications have now been extended to the knee. There is a growing body of evidence to support its use for selected indications in osteoarthritis, ligament, tendon and meniscal injuries of the knee. The evidence is of variable quality and concerns include the heterogeneous nature of the patients, variations in treatment techniques and inconsistencies in the findings of these studies. However, there is no hard evidence for its effects and before widespread use can be recommended, high quality prospective randomised studies are required.
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