



Published in final edited form as:

*Curr Sports Med Rep.* 2020 June ; 19(6): 209–216. doi:10.1249/JSR.0000000000000719.

## Role of Mechanical Loading for Platelet-Rich Plasma Treated Achilles Tendinopathy

Alyssa Neph, MD<sup>1</sup>, Allison Schroeder, MD<sup>1</sup>, Keelen R. Enseki, MS, PT<sup>2</sup>, Peter A. Everts, PhD<sup>3</sup>, James H-C. Wang, PhD<sup>4</sup>, Kentaro Onishi, DO<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation at University of Pittsburgh Medical Center

<sup>2</sup>University of Pittsburgh Medical Center Centers for Rehab Services

<sup>3</sup>Scientific and Research Department at Gulf Coast Biologics

<sup>4</sup>Department of Orthopedic Surgery at University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine

### Abstract

There is no consensus on the optimal rehabilitation protocol after platelet-rich plasma (PRP) treatment for tendinopathy despite basic science studies showing the critical role of mechanical loading in the restoration of tendon structure and function post-treatment. In this article, we will review tendon mechanobiology, platelet biology, and review level I-II Achilles tendon clinical studies paying particular attention to the role of mechanical loading in rehabilitation of injured tendons.

### Summary statement:

Animal studies emphasize the synergistic effect of mechanical tendon loading and PRP to treat tendon injury while clinical studies described minimal details on loading protocols.

### Keywords

PRP; mechanical loading; prehabilitation; rehabilitation; tendinopathy

### Introduction

Tendinopathies are common debilitating tendon conditions, in both the athletic and aging populations, which reduce a patient's ability to work and participate in sports (1). Treatment options traditionally have been palliative and include non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), extracorporeal shockwave therapy (ESWT), corticosteroids, and surgery. Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) injections have emerged as an alternate to these traditional treatments. PRP belongs to a class of interventions called orthobiologics, which use biological substances aimed to foster healing in injured musculoskeletal tissues. Orthobiologics have since expanded to include the use of tissues harvested from bone

marrow, adipose tissue, and placenta, amongst others, but many physicians still regard PRP as the “original” orthobiologic. PRP for tendinopathy involves an injection of concentrated autologous or allogenic platelets to boost one’s tendon healing capacity (2–7). While animal investigations generally show the efficacy of PRP treatment for tendinopathy, clinical results have been variable (8–12). Variations in PRP preparation, cellular content, frequency and number of injections, and subtypes of treated tendon injuries may account for the variability in clinical studies. This manuscript will review both the role of mechanical loading and PRP biology for tendon, and will appraise level I-II clinical studies for PRP-treated Achilles tendinopathy, paying specific attention to the post-PRP rehabilitation program. Achilles tendinopathy was chosen as this tendon is subject to heavy mechanical loading, and a large portion of Achilles tendon injuries fail conservative management and become chronic (13).

To find level I and II studies on PRP for Achilles tendinopathy, a search was conducted on PubMed on December 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018 using the terms: (tendon OR tendinopathy OR tendinosis OR tendinitis) AND (platelet-rich plasma OR PRP OR autologous conditioned plasma OR ACP). Titles and abstracts were screened, and the following inclusion criteria were used: human studies, randomized controlled trials, and prospective or retrospective cohort studies using PRP or ACP products for the treatment of Achilles tendinopathy using ultrasound guidance. Studies using PRP combined with surgery and those that did not use ultrasound guidance were excluded. The 88 full texts were read and relevant data on mechanical loading rehabilitation was extracted. This yielded 5 publications for the review. There were 35 level I and II studies pertaining to other tendons (20 on common wrist extensor tendon, 8 on patellar tendon, 3 on rotator cuff tendon, 2 each on gluteal and proximal hamstring tendons).

## Discussion

### Tendon Mechanobiology

Healthy tendon tissue displays parallel collagen fibers (65% to 80% of the dry mass is type 1 collagen) among cellular components including mature tendon cells or tenocytes and tendon-specific stem/progenitor cells (TSCs) within a well-organized extra-cellular matrix (ECM) composed of proteoglycans, glycoproteins, and elastin (14–19). The highly organized structural components and cellular organization are vital for the optimal function of tendon to act as load bearing units. The mechanical signals are transferred to tendon cells, which, in turn, are transduced to intracellular biochemical responses known as mechano-transduction (20–22). Tendon cells play a vital role in mechano-transduction and maintain tendon tissue homeostasis. Although tendon structure is optimized to support tensile load, excessive loading, defined as a mismatch between load capacity and load placed on the tendon, results in overuse tendinopathy which presents as varying degrees of pain and loss of functional capacity. The tendon cells sense changes in the load and biochemical factors, resulting in a cascade of cellular and matrix responses that initiate pathological consequences (23–27). The mechanisms of tendon injury and repair have been reviewed extensively (5, 28–33). According to the pathoetiology of the inflammatory model of tendinopathy, when injured, tendon healing typically progresses through three stages. The first stage is the inflammatory phase which is characterized by acute inflammation as

pro-inflammatory cytokines attract blood cells to begin repair of injured tissue (34). This stage generally lasts for 5 to 7 days. The second stage is the proliferative phase where the tendon attempts to heal itself via synthesizing reparative, smaller diameter type III collagen and proteoglycans (35). This is believed to take place starting one week after the injury and lasting for approximately six weeks. The third stage is the remodeling phase where healed tendon undergoes re-organization and crosslinking of mature collagen fibers (36). The remodeling phase is essential for restoring normal tendon mechanical properties. However, healing can fail. When this occurs, the tendon can go into a state of “tendinosis”, characterized by a combination of increased mucoid ground substance, collagen disarray, increased type III to type I collagen ratio, neovascularization, and decreased tenocyte density and dysmorphism (19, 33, 37, 38). Cook et al. has proposed a continuum model for tendon patho-etiology that explains most clinical presentations (29, 30). This model has three stages featured as reactive tendinopathy, tendon disrepair, and degenerative tendinopathy. The first stage is the proliferative response in the cell and matrix, the second describes an attempt to heal with matrix breakdown, and the third with a progression of changes in matrix and cells. Regardless of the school of thoughts regarding tendon healing, the failed tendon is characterized by non-tenogenic tissue types such as lipoid, fibrinoid, fibrocartilaginous, or calcified material and is colloquially referred as scarred (35, 39). Tendons with non-tenogenic tissue have been known to exhibit inferior mechanical properties such as tensile strength, and they can become chronically painful (40, 41) (Table 1).

Tendon is a biological structure that transmits mechanical loads for joint movements. Controlled mechanical loading on tendon, typically accomplished with physical therapy (PT) for clinical patients, benefits tendon healing, presumably through its effect on both TSCs and ECM. The effect of mechanical loading on TSCs is magnitude-dependent. In an *in vitro* mechanical loading model, it has been shown that small mechanical stretching (~ 4%) induces TSCs to differentiate into tenocytes, whereas large mechanical stretching (~8%) results in differentiation of TSCs into non-tenocytes; these findings may explain the development of tendinosis (39). In rat, the benefit of mechanical loading on tendon appears to take place as early as 4 weeks after initiation of the tendon loading program (42). Specific mechanisms involve decreased non-tenogenic transformation and increased TSC activities evidenced by down-regulation of non-tenocyte genes (collagen II, PPAR $\gamma$ , SOX-9, and Runx-2) and by up regulation of tenocyte-related genes (collagen I and III) (43). Mechanical tendon loading also benefits the ECM via activation of fibroblasts that increase the secretion of transforming growth factor-  $\beta$ 1 (TGF- $\beta$ 1), connective tissue growth factor, and insulin-like growth factor-I (39, 42, 44). These growth factors ultimately aid collagen cross-linking and help to restore pre-injury tendon tensile strength (42). Hence, placing tendons under moderate mechanical loading is beneficial for tendon healing. It is important to keep in mind that as compared to young adult tendons, aging tendons may not respond similarly to mechanical loading as they have inherently reduced mechanical strength (36) and a decline in the number and quality of TSCs (45), which likely make aging tendons more susceptible to impaired or slower healing and tendon homeostasis that favors development of tendinosis (38, 46).

## Effect of Platelets on Tendon Remodeling

Platelets (PLTs) are formed from megakaryocytes through hematopoiesis and are synthesized in bone marrow by pinching off from their progenitor cell (47). Thereafter, they are released in a non-thrombogenic state into the peripheral circulation as anucleate, small discoid blood cells. The average platelet count in adults ranges from  $150$  to  $350 \times 10^6/\text{mL}$  of circulating blood and platelets have been recognized for their pivotal roles in the healing cascade (48). PLTs have a number of intracellular structures, including alpha-granules, comprised of platelet derived growth factors (PDGFs) and angiogenesis regulators, and dense granules containing ADP, ATP, serotonin, histamine, calcium, and mitochondria. Other complex platelet biological components include adhesins and coagulants as well as immunological molecules (47). These molecules serve a multitude of functions, first within the clotting cascade and finally as initiators of tissue healing processes. PLTs are able to detect injuries via endothelial-driven cellular reactions and are able to access bodily tissues including tendon via vascular flow. Following an injury, PLTs are activated, releasing the alpha granular contents including PDGF, TGF- $\beta$ , vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), epidermal growth factor (EGF-1), fibroblastic growth factor (FGF), connective tissue growth factor (CTGF), and hepatocyte growth factor (HGF) (39, 49). The biological activities and the individual specific functions of the various PGFs have been described extensively (47–51).

PLTs also contribute to many adjunctive and supportive activities that result in increased angiogenesis and vascular remodeling through release of several chemokines and cytokines, via paracrine, autocrine, and endocrine modes of action (51, 52). Because of these unique modes of action, PDGFs are also capable of exerting morphometric and mitogenic effects on multiple cell types and they play important roles in tendon repair (47, 49). Chemokines and cytokines also play vital roles in tendon regeneration and tendon pain modulation although the discussion of these is beyond the scope of this article (50).

## Platelet Rich Plasma in Animal Tendons

While a clear definition is not currently available, platelet-rich plasma (PRP) is most simply defined as “a preparation of a small volume of plasma with an increased concentration of PLT from autologous or allogenic hosts” (53). In animal studies, PRP infiltration in acutely injured tendons promoted shortening of the inflammatory phase, with additional benefits during the proliferative phase, such as collagen maturation noted by increased type I to type III collagen ratio and increased ECM synthesis, resulting in faster healing (7, 10, 43). PRP’s ability to promote angiogenesis has been studied extensively showing that PRP infiltration results in increased vessel density as early as 2 weeks after the intervention (54). Since reduced vascularity of tendons is a major factor in their limited healing capacity, PRP-associated angiogenesis also contributes to accelerated tendon healing (54).

Two studies by Zhang et al. are insightful in this regard (53, 54). For example, after acute tendon injury, PRP induced tenogenic differentiation of TSCs and suppressed non-tenocyte differentiation. However, when PRP was applied to TSCs from tendons that had already undergone non-tenogenic differentiation, PRP was unable to reverse the undesirable differentiation that had already occurred. These findings imply that PRP may not be

effective in repairing tissues once injury has progressed to the chronic stage, and it may not be indicated in treating tendinosis (53, 54).

### **Optimum PRP Formulation: Platelet concentration, white cell inclusion, and timing of injection**

Optimal PLT concentration is a frequently discussed topic amongst practicing clinicians. This likely depends on both 1) the biology specific to the target tendon and 2) tendon injury type, in terms of severity and chronicity. One recent study out of Japan revealed that  $1.0 \times 10^6/\mu\text{L}$  PLT concentration was more effective in both pain control and tendon regeneration in rat patellar tendons than  $5.0 \times 10^5/\mu\text{L}$ , supporting the notion that higher PLT concentration is more effective (55). On the other hand, an extremely high concentration of PLT has been shown to result in detrimental effects on tendon proliferation; therefore, continued investigations are necessary to elucidate the optimum PLT concentration (56).

Leukocytes have a great impact on the intrinsic biology of tendons because of their immune and host-defense mechanisms. The presence of various leukocytes in PRP can have a significant effect on tendon healing. In PRP, lymphocytes, which produce insulin-like growth factors that support tissue remodeling (57) are more concentrated than other leukocytes.

Monocytes are non-inflammatory leukocytic cells and are the precursors to macrophages, which are important cells of the immune system, similar to neutrophils. A distinct difference between the cells is that monocytes do not lead to a prolonged inflammatory condition but instead play important roles in tissue healing. M1 macrophages are responsible for producing several inflammatory cytokines that support host defense through pathogen clearance, necrotic tissue clearance, and reactive oxygen species (58). Additionally, the M1 macrophage phenotype produces VEGF and FGF (58). M2 macrophages have anti-inflammatory capacities and generate precursors for collagen and fibroblast stimulating factor, thus supporting their role in ECM deposition (58). Monocytes/macrophages release additional pro-regenerative growth factors that lead to neovascularization, proliferation of myogenic precursor cells, and play key roles in wound repair and inflammatory control (59). Therefore, the presence of high concentrations of monocytes/macrophages in PRP is likely to contribute to better tendon healing.

Neutrophils play a key role in various healing cascades by forming a dense barrier against invading pathogens and counteracting infections (60). Their presence in PRP can be desirable within specific treatment protocols that require higher levels and longer periods of inflammation such as fracture healing (61), while it can be harmful and not indicated in other applications. In fact, animal studies demonstrated that the use of neutrophil-rich PRP resulted in a higher collagen type III/collagen type I ratio, leading to fibrosis and decreased tendon strength (62).

Another frequently discussed topic amongst clinicians is the timing of PRP application and the exact clinical indications. Two studies by Zhang et al. are insightful in this regard (63, 64). For example, after acute tendon injury, PRP induced tenogenic differentiation of TSCs and suppressed non-tenocyte differentiation. However, when PRP was applied to TSCs

from tendons that had already undergone non-tenogenic differentiation, PRP was unable to reverse the undesirable differentiation that had already occurred. These findings imply that PRP may not be effective in repairing tissues once injury has progressed to the chronic stage, and it may not be indicated in treating tendinosis (63, 64).

The differences in PRP composition and quality among numerous preparation methods remain unclear. Specifically, the benefit of including leukocytes in the PRP product remains controversial, and few studies have evaluated the effects of the interaction between platelets and leukocytes on the growth factor concentrations, proinflammatory effects and cellular effects. Several studies, mainly in the orthopedic field and sports-related injuries, support the use of leukocyte-poor (LP) PRP, whereas leukocyte rich (LR) PRP had a leading role in biological processes associated with healing, including angiogenesis and matrix remodeling. Kobayashi et al. concluded that the leukocyte concentration positively correlated with PDGF-BB and the VEGF concentration, while it negatively correlated with FGF-b (65).

In a study by Yan and co-workers, it was revealed that LP-PRP in a rabbit chronic tendinopathy model lead to larger collagen fibril diameters than when LR-PRP was used. Whereas in both the LP-PRP and LR-PRP groups significantly lower matrix metalloproteinase (MMP)-1 and MMP-3 expression levels were seen than in the control group (66). Stronger chemotactic and proliferative properties of PRP seem to be present with LR-PRP, with tendinopathic cells migrating at a higher velocity under LP-PRP conditions, although this formulation is more pro-inflammatory in terms of IL-6 secretion (67).

Based on different PRP formulation profiles and measurable effects in LP and LR-PRP, emphasis should be placed on the temporal needs and biological characteristics of injured tendons, and PRP formulations should be tailored accordingly, using versatile PRP devices, allowing for the preparation of different PRP formulations.

### **Data Summary of Combining Mechanical Loading and PRP**

The efficacy of PRP is shown to depend on mechanical loading. Injection of PRP alone without mechanical loading was found to improve mechanical properties of rat tendons including stiffness and increased stress at failure by day 3 to 5 (11). However, mechanical loading was required for this effect to continue to 14 days. The unloaded tendons were less than one third as strong as the tendons that were loaded normally; without differences in tendon size, stiffness, force, or stress to failure at 14-day follow-up (11).

### **Clinical Study Review of PRP Injection for Achilles Tendon**

Six studies met the initial search criteria as detailed in the introduction section. The study by Kearney et al. was excluded from our review on the basis of lack of guided injection (68). Details of the five remaining included studies are found in Table 2 (69–73). Four studies treated a total of 98 cases of mid-portion Achilles tendinopathy while one study by Erroi et al. treated 21 cases of insertional Achilles tendinopathy (72). PRP cellular profiles were not available in any of these studies despite the recent consensus statement on the minimum reporting requirement for orthobiologic trials (74). Based on the PRP kits used, however, injected PRP was likely leukocyte-poor formulation with PRP concentration ranging between 1.6 to 5 times the physiological platelet concentrations (75). Two earlier

studies by DeVos and Krogh used a single PRP injection while studies by Boesen, Erroi, and Abate used multiple (two to four) PRP injections one to two weeks apart. Four studies employed tenotomy (3 to 10 passes) in addition to PRP as the intervention (69, 71–73). Boesen’s study was the only study that employed four bi-weekly peri-tendinous PRP infiltrations without tenotomy (70). PRP plus tenotomy was found to be superior to tenotomy alone at week 24 (69), while PRP plus tenotomy was equal to normal saline injection (71, 73) and 2 bi-weekly PRP plus tenotomy treatments were equal to 3 weekly ESWT treatments at 24 weeks (72). As for peri-tendinous PRP injections, PRP was superior to saline injection at week 6 and week 12 but not at week 24 (70). In the same study, high volume image guided injection, where a combination of a local anesthetic and corticosteroid was injected to the space between Kager’s fatpad and Achilles tendon was more effective than PRP at week 6 and 12, and equally as effective at week 24 (70).

### **The Trend in Clinical Studies: Mechanical Loading Programs**

During the post-PRP phase, duration of relative rest or protected loading varied significantly amongst studies and ranged from Erroi’s no rest protocol (72) to 4 days’ relative rest. All except for one study recommended in the “2–4 days” range (69–71, 73). Erroi et al. returned subjects to activity with no rest following an intra-tendinous Achilles tendon PRP injections (72). With this protocol, one concern is the risk of tendon rupture due to the mechanical stress from intra-tendinous injection. In some subjects, tendon loading may not be feasible due to procedure-related pain. The first day of formal rehabilitation fell on day 4 to 8 after the last PRP intervention, and it most commonly involved Alfredson’s (76) progressive eccentric tendon loading program at its core; although, they were all unsupervised home exercise programs. Of our interest was that 10 studies out of 36 non-Achilles tendinopathy PRP level I-II trials (mainly common extensor tendinopathy) had no mention on the post-PRP rehabilitation program (77–86), highlighting the possibility that researchers might not have fully appreciated the rehabilitation program as an integral part of clinical trial protocol involving regenerative strategy.

### **Conclusions**

Animal studies have pointed out that mechanical loading is regenerative to tendons, and the load is synergistic to PRP injections for tendon healing. While Achilles tendon PRP trials have done well in incorporating mechanical loading/post-PRP rehabilitation as part of regenerative strategy in the studies, the lack of supervision leaves something to be desired. Supervised rehabilitation programs seem to result in increased exercise compliance (87) and improved outcomes, and it also allows for improved ability to monitor for exercise “dosing” (88–91). Although no evidence exists, pre-PRP mechanical loading can also be considered as another method to optimize the regenerative benefit from PRP injections. Implementation of a structured, formal loading program might promote activation of TSCs and potentially improve the outcomes from the subsequent interventions if patients are able to tolerate the program (39, 42, 44).

In summary, efficacy of PRP injection for tendon injuries might be potentiated when it is used as a part of the spectrum of care where mechanical loading is combined with PRP.

## References

1. De Vries AJ, Koolhaas W, Zwerver J, et al. The impact of patellar tendinopathy on sports and work performance in active athletes. *Res Sports Med.* 2017;25(3):253–65. Epub 2017/04/11. doi: 10.1080/15438627.2017.1314292. [PubMed: 28391723]
2. Andia I, Maffulli N. Platelet-rich plasma for muscle injury and tendinopathy. *Sports Med Arthrosc Rev.* 2013;21(4):191–8. Epub 2013/11/12. doi: 10.1097/JSA.0b013e318299972b. [PubMed: 24212366]
3. Andia I, Martin JI, Maffulli N. Advances with platelet rich plasma therapies for tendon regeneration. *Expert Opin Biol Ther.* 2018;18(4):389–98. Epub 2018/01/05. doi: 10.1080/14712598.2018.1424626. [PubMed: 29300106]
4. Baraniak PR, McDevitt TC. Stem cell paracrine actions and tissue regeneration. *Regen Med.* 2010;5(1):121–43. Epub 2009/12/19. doi: 10.2217/rme.09.74. [PubMed: 20017699]
5. Halpern BC, Chaudhury S, Rodeo SA. The role of platelet-rich plasma in inducing musculoskeletal tissue healing. *HSS J* 2012;8(2):137–45. Epub 2013/07/23. doi: 10.1007/s11420-011-9239-7. [PubMed: 23874254]
6. Middleton KK, Barro V, Muller B, Terada S, Fu FH. Evaluation of the effects of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) therapy involved in the healing of sports-related soft tissue injuries. *Iowa Orthop J* 2012;32:150–63. Epub 2012/01/01. [PubMed: 23576936]
7. Yuan T, Zhang CQ, Wang JH. Augmenting tendon and ligament repair with platelet-rich plasma (PRP). *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J.* 2013;3(3):139–49. Epub 2013/12/25. [PubMed: 24367773]
8. Komatsu DE, King L, Gurevich M, Kahn B, Paci JM. The In Vivo impact of leukocyte injections on normal rat achilles tendons: Potential detriment to tendon morphology, cellularity, and vascularity. *Am J Orthop (Belle Mead NJ).* 2018;47(10). Epub 2018/11/28. doi: 10.12788/ajo.2018.0085.
9. Schnabel LV, Mohammed HO, Miller BJ, et al. Platelet rich plasma (PRP) enhances anabolic gene expression patterns in flexor digitorum superficialis tendons. *J Orthop Res.* 2007;25(2):230–40. Epub 2006/11/16. doi: 10.1002/jor.20278. [PubMed: 17106885]
10. Takamura M, Yasuda T, Nakano A, Shima H, Neo M. The effect of platelet-rich plasma on Achilles tendon healing in a rabbit model. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc.* 2017;51(1):65–72. Epub 2016/12/29. doi: 10.1016/j.aott.2016.12.001. [PubMed: 28027872]
11. Virchenko O, Aspenberg P. How can one platelet injection after tendon injury lead to a stronger tendon after 4 weeks? Interplay between early regeneration and mechanical stimulation. *Acta Orthop.* 2006;77(5):806–12. Epub 2006/10/28. doi: 10.1080/17453670610013033. [PubMed: 17068715]
12. Witte S, Dedman C, Harriss F, Kelly G, Chang YM, Witte TH. Comparison of treatment outcomes for superficial digital flexor tendonitis in National Hunt racehorses. *Vet J* 2016;216:157–63. Epub 2016/10/01. doi: 10.1016/j.tvjl.2016.08.003. [PubMed: 27687944]
13. Maffulli N, Sharma P, Luscombe KL. Achilles tendinopathy: aetiology and management. *J R Soc Med.* 2004;97(10):472–6. Epub 2004/10/02. doi: 10.1258/jrsm.97.10.472. [PubMed: 15459257]
14. Kastelic J, Galeski A, Baer E. The multicomposite structure of tendon. *Connect Tissue Res.* 1978;6(1):11–23. Epub 1978/01/01. [PubMed: 149646]
15. Neph A, Onishi K, Wang JH. Myths and facts of in-office regenerative procedures for tendinopathy: Literature review. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil.* 2018. Epub 2018/11/16. doi: 10.1097/PHM.0000000000001097.
16. Nourissat G, Berenbaum F, Duprez D. Tendon injury: from biology to tendon repair. *Nat Rev Rheumatol.* 2015;11(4):223–33. Epub 2015/03/04. doi: 10.1038/nrrheum.2015.26. [PubMed: 25734975]
17. Screen HR, Berk DE, Kadler KE, Ramirez F, Young MF. Tendon functional extracellular matrix. *J Orthop Res.* 2015;33(6):793–9. Epub 2015/02/03. doi: 10.1002/jor.22818. [PubMed: 25640030]
18. Thorpe CT, Screen HR. Tendon structure and composition. *Adv Exp Med Biol.* 2016;920:3–10. Epub 2016/08/19. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-33943-6\_1. [PubMed: 27535244]
19. Voleti PB, Buckley MR, Soslowsky LJ. Tendon healing: repair and regeneration. *Annu Rev Biomed Eng.* 2012;14:47–71. Epub 2012/07/20. doi: 10.1146/annurev-bioeng-071811-150122. [PubMed: 22809137]



20. Lavagnino M, Wall ME, Little D, Banes AJ, Guilak F, Arnoczky SP. Tendon mechanobiology: Current knowledge and future research opportunities. *J Orthop Res.* 2015;33(6):813–22. Epub 2015/03/13. doi: 10.1002/jor.22871. [PubMed: 25763779]
21. Wang JH. Mechanobiology of tendon. *J Biomech.* 2006;39(9):1563–82. Epub 2005/07/08. doi: 10.1016/j.jbiomech.2005.05.011. [PubMed: 16000201]
22. Wang JH, Guo Q, Li B. Tendon biomechanics and mechanobiology--a minireview of basic concepts and recent advancements. *J Hand Ther.* 2012;25(2):133–40; quiz 41. Epub 2011/09/20. doi: 10.1016/j.jht.2011.07.004. [PubMed: 21925835]
23. Cook JL, Feller JA, Bonar SF, Khan KM. Abnormal tenocyte morphology is more prevalent than collagen disruption in asymptomatic athletes' patellar tendons. *J Orthop Res.* 2004;22(2):334–8. Epub 2004/03/12. doi: 10.1016/j.orthres.2003.08.005. [PubMed: 15013093]
24. Cook JL, Purdam C. Is compressive load a factor in the development of tendinopathy? *Br J Sports Med.* 2012;46(3):163–8. Epub 2011/11/25. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090414. [PubMed: 22113234]
25. Hamilton B, Purdam C. Patellar tendinosis as an adaptive process: a new hypothesis. *Br J Sports Med.* 2004;38(6):758–61. Epub 2004/11/25. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2003.005157. [PubMed: 15562176]
26. Hyman J, Rodeo SA. Injury and repair of tendons and ligaments. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am.* 2000;11(2):267–88, v. Epub 2000/05/16. [PubMed: 10810761]
27. Jelinsky SA, Rodeo SA, Li J, Gulotta LV, Archambault JM, Seeherman HJ. Regulation of gene expression in human tendinopathy. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2011;12:86. Epub 2011/05/05. doi: 10.1186/1471-2474-12-86. [PubMed: 21539748]
28. Andarawis-Puri N, Flatow EL, Soslowsky LJ. Tendon basic science: Development, repair, regeneration, and healing. *J Orthop Res.* 2015;33(6):780–4. Epub 2015/03/13. doi: 10.1002/jor.22869. [PubMed: 25764524]
29. Cook JL, Purdam CR. Is tendon pathology a continuum? A pathology model to explain the clinical presentation of load-induced tendinopathy. *Br J Sports Med.* 2009;43(6):409–16. Epub 2008/09/25. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2008.051193. [PubMed: 18812414]
30. Cook JL, Rio E, Purdam CR, Docking SI. Revisiting the continuum model of tendon pathology: what is its merit in clinical practice and research? *Br J Sports Med.* 2016;50(19):1187–91. Epub 2016/04/30. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-095422. [PubMed: 27127294]
31. Lipman K, Wang C, Ting K, Soo C, Zheng Z. Tendinopathy: injury, repair, and current exploration. *Drug Des Devel Ther.* 2018;12:591–603. Epub 2018/03/30. doi: 10.2147/DDDT.S154660.
32. Sharma P, Maffulli N. Biology of tendon injury: healing, modeling and remodeling. *J Musculoskelet Neuronal Interact.* 2006;6(2):181–90. Epub 2006/07/20. [PubMed: 16849830]
33. Thomopoulos S, Parks WC, Rifkin DB, Derwin KA. Mechanisms of tendon injury and repair. *J Orthop Res.* 2015;33(6):832–9. Epub 2015/02/03. doi: 10.1002/jor.22806. [PubMed: 25641114]
34. Ambrosio F, Rando TA. The regenerative rehabilitation collection: a forum for an emerging field. *NPJ Regen Med.* 2018;3:20. Epub 2018/10/31. doi: 10.1038/s41536-018-0058-z. [PubMed: 30374410]
35. James R, Kesturu G, Balian G, Chhabra AB. Tendon: biology, biomechanics, repair, growth factors, and evolving treatment options. *J Hand Surg Am* 2008;33(1):102–12. Epub 2008/02/12. doi: 10.1016/j.jhsa.2007.09.007. [PubMed: 18261674]
36. Wu F, Nerlich M, Docheva D. Tendon injuries: Basic science and new repair proposals. *EFORT Open Rev.* 2017;2(7):332–42. Epub 2017/08/23. doi: 10.1302/2058-5241.2.160075. [PubMed: 28828182]
37. Sharma P, Maffulli N. Tendon injury and tendinopathy: healing and repair. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2005;87(1):187–202. Epub 2005/01/07. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.D.01850. [PubMed: 15634833]
38. Snedeker JG, Foolen J. Tendon injury and repair - A perspective on the basic mechanisms of tendon disease and future clinical therapy. *Acta Biomater.* 2017;63:18–36. Epub 2017/09/05. doi: 10.1016/j.actbio.2017.08.032. [PubMed: 28867648]
39. Zhang J, Wang JH. Mechanobiological response of tendon stem cells: implications of tendon homeostasis and pathogenesis of tendinopathy. *J Orthop Res.* 2010;28(5):639–43. Epub 2009/11/18. doi: 10.1002/jor.21046. [PubMed: 19918904]

40. Maffulli N, Wong J, Almekinders LC. Types and epidemiology of tendinopathy. *Clin Sports Med.* 2003;22(4):675–92. Epub 2003/10/17. [PubMed: 14560540]
41. Dakin SG, Newton J, Martinez FO, Hedley R, Gwilym S, Jones N, et al. Chronic inflammation is a feature of Achilles tendinopathy and rupture. *Br J Sports Med.* 2018;52(6):359–67. Epub 2017/11/10. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2017-098161. [PubMed: 29118051]
42. Heinemeier KM, Olesen JL, Haddad F, et al. Expression of collagen and related growth factors in rat tendon and skeletal muscle in response to specific contraction types. *J Physiol.* 2007;582(Pt 3):1303–16. Epub 2007/06/02. doi: 10.1113/jphysiol.2007.127639.
43. Zhang J, Yuan T, Wang JH. Moderate treadmill running exercise prior to tendon injury enhances wound healing in aging rats. *Oncotarget.* 2016;7(8):8498–512. Epub 2016/02/18. doi: 10.18632/oncotarget.7381. [PubMed: 26885754]
44. Chiquet M, Gelman L, Lutz R, Maier S. From mechanotransduction to extracellular matrix gene expression in fibroblasts. *Biochim Biophys Acta.* 2009;1793(5):911–20. Epub 2009/04/03. doi: 10.1016/j.bbamcr.2009.01.012. [PubMed: 19339214]
45. Dudhia J, Scott CM, Draper ER, Heinegard D, Pitsillides AA, Smith RK. Aging enhances a mechanically-induced reduction in tendon strength by an active process involving matrix metalloproteinase activity. *Aging Cell.* 2007;6(4):547–56. Epub 2007/06/21. doi: 10.1111/j.1474-9726.2007.00307.x. [PubMed: 17578513]
46. Zhou Z, Akinbiyi T, Xu L, et al. Tendon-derived stem/progenitor cell aging: defective self-renewal and altered fate. *Aging Cell.* 2010;9(5):911–5. Epub 2010/06/24. doi: 10.1111/j.1474-9726.2010.00598.x. [PubMed: 20569237]
47. Golebiewska EM, Poole AW. Platelet secretion: From haemostasis to wound healing and beyond. *Blood Rev.* 2015;29(3):153–62. Epub 2014/12/04. doi: 10.1016/j.blre.2014.10.003. [PubMed: 25468720]
48. Everts PA, Knappe JT, Weibrich G, et al. Platelet-rich plasma and platelet gel: a review. *J Extra Corpor Technol.* 2006;38(2):174–87. Epub 2006/08/23. [PubMed: 16921694]
49. Alsousou J, Ali A, Willett K, Harrison P. The role of platelet-rich plasma in tissue regeneration. *Platelets.* 2013;24(3):173–82. Epub 2012/06/01. doi: 10.3109/09537104.2012.684730. [PubMed: 22647081]
50. Pavlovic V, Ciric M, Jovanovic V, Stojanovic P. Platelet rich plasma: a short overview of certain bioactive components. *Open Med (Wars).* 2016;11(1):242–7. Epub 2017/03/30. doi: 10.1515/med-2016-0048. [PubMed: 28352802]
51. Trippel SB. Growth factors as therapeutic agents. *Instr Course Lect.* 1997;46:473–6. Epub 1997/01/01. . [PubMed: 9143989]
52. Barnes GL, Kostenuik PJ, Gerstenfeld LC, Einhorn TA. Growth factor regulation of fracture repair. *J Bone Miner Res.* 1999;14(11):1805–15. Epub 1999/11/26. doi: 10.1359/jbmr.1999.14.11.1805. [PubMed: 10571679]
53. Dhurat R, Sukesh M. Principles and methods of preparation of platelet-rich plasma: A review and author's perspective. *J Cutan Aesthet Surg.* 2014;7(4):189–97. Epub 2015/02/28. doi: 10.4103/0974-2077.150734. [PubMed: 25722595]
54. Lyras DN, Kazakos K, Verettas D, et al. The influence of platelet-rich plasma on angiogenesis during the early phase of tendon healing. *Foot Ankle Int.* 2009;30(11):1101–6. Epub 2009/11/17. doi: 10.3113/FAL.2009.1101. [PubMed: 19912722]
55. Yoshida M, Funasaki H, Marumo K. Efficacy of autologous leukocyte-reduced platelet-rich plasma therapy for patellar tendinopathy in a rat treadmill model. *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J.* 2016;6(2):205–15. Epub 2016/12/03. doi: 10.11138/mltj/2016.6.2.205. [PubMed: 27900294]
56. Giusti I, D'Ascenzo S, Manco A, et al. Platelet concentration in platelet-rich plasma affects tenocyte behavior in vitro. *Biomed Res Int.* 2014;2014:630870. Epub 2014/08/26. doi: 10.1155/2014/630870.
57. Gordon J, Ley SC, Melamed MD, English LS, Hughes-Jones NC. Immortalized B lymphocytes produce B-cell growth factor. *Nature.* 1984;310(5973):145–7. Epub 1984/07/12. . [PubMed: 6610833]

58. Laskin DL, Sunil VR, Gardner CR, Laskin JD. Macrophages and tissue injury: agents of defense or destruction? *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol.* 2011;51:267–88. Epub 2010/10/05. doi: 10.1146/annurev.pharmtox.010909.105812.. [PubMed: 20887196]
59. Das A, Sinha M, Datta S, et al. Monocyte and macrophage plasticity in tissue repair and regeneration. *Am J Pathol.* 2015;185(10):2596–606. Epub 2015/06/30. doi: 10.1016/j.ajpath.2015.06.001.. [PubMed: 26118749]
60. Cook-Mills JM, Deem TL. Active participation of endothelial cells in inflammation. *J Leukocyte Biol.* 2005;77(4):487–95. Epub 2005/01/05. doi: 10.1189/jlb.0904554.. [PubMed: 15629883]
61. Kovtun A, Bergdolt S, Wiegner R, Radermacher P, Huber-Lang M, Ignatius A. The crucial role of neutrophil granulocytes in bone fracture healing. *Eur Cells Materials.* 2016;32:152–62. Epub 2016/07/28.
62. Zhou Y, Zhang J, Wu H, Hogan MV, Wang JH. The differential effects of leukocyte-containing and pure platelet-rich plasma (PRP) on tendon stem/progenitor cells - implications of PRP application for the clinical treatment of tendon injuries. *Stem Cell Res Ther.* 2015;6:173. Epub 2015/09/17. doi: 10.1186/s13287-015-0172-4. [PubMed: 26373929]
63. Zhang J, Middleton KK, Fu FH, Im HJ, Wang JH. HGF mediates the anti-inflammatory effects of PRP on injured tendons. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(6):e67303. Epub 2013/07/11. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0067303. [PubMed: 23840657]
64. Zhang J, Wang JH. PRP treatment effects on degenerative tendinopathy - an in vitro model study. *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J.* 2014;4(1):10–7. Epub 2014/06/17. [PubMed: 24932441]
65. Kobayashi Y, Saita Y, Nishio H, et al. Leukocyte concentration and composition in platelet-rich plasma (PRP) influences the growth factor and protease concentrations. *J Orthop Sci.* 2016;21(5):683–9. Epub 2016/08/10. doi: 10.1016/j.jos.2016.07.009. [PubMed: 27503185]
66. Yan R, Gu Y, Ran J, et al. Intratendon delivery of leukocyte-poor platelet-rich plasma improves healing compared with leukocyte-rich platelet-rich plasma in a rabbit achilles tendinopathy model. *Am J Sports Med.* 2017;45(8):1909–20. Epub 2017/03/17. doi: 10.1177/0363546517694357.. [PubMed: 28301205]
67. Rubio-Azpeitia E, Bilbao AM, Sanchez P, Delgado D, Andia I. The properties of 3 different plasma formulations and their effects on tendinopathic cells. *Am J Sports Med.* 2016;44(8):1952–61. Epub 2016/05/11. doi: 10.1177/0363546516643814. [PubMed: 27161868]
68. Kearney RS, Parsons N, Costa ML. Achilles tendinopathy management: A pilot randomised controlled trial comparing platelet-rich plasma injection with an eccentric loading programme. *Bone Joint Res.* 2013;2(10):227–32. Epub 2013/10/19. doi: 10.1302/2046-3758.210.2000200. [PubMed: 24135556]
69. Abate M, Di Carlo L, Salini V. Platelet rich plasma compared to dry needling in the treatment of non-insertional Achilles tendinopathy. *Phys Sportsmed* 2018:1–6. Epub 2018/11/15. doi: 10.1080/00913847.2018.1548886.
70. Boesen AP, Hansen R, Boesen MI, Malliaras P, Langberg H. Effect of high-volume injection, platelet-rich plasma, and sham treatment in chronic midportion Achilles tendinopathy: A randomized double-blinded prospective study. *Am J Sports Med.* 2017;45(9):2034–43. Epub 2017/05/23. doi: 10.1177/0363546517702862.. [PubMed: 28530451]
71. de Vos RJ, Weir A, van Schie HT, et al. Platelet-rich plasma injection for chronic Achilles tendinopathy: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* 2010;303(2):144–9. Epub 2010/01/14. doi: 10.1001/jama.2009.1986.. [PubMed: 20068208]
72. Erroi D, Sigona M, Suarez T, et al. Conservative treatment for insertional Achilles tendinopathy: platelet-rich plasma and focused shock waves. A retrospective study. *Muscles Ligaments Tendons J.* 2017;7(1):98–106. Epub 2017/07/19. doi: 10.11138/mltj/2017.7.1.098. [PubMed: 28717617]
73. Krogh TP, Ellingsen T, Christensen R, Jensen P, Fredberg U. Ultrasound-guided injection therapy of Achilles tendinopathy with platelet-rich plasma or saline: A randomized, blinded, placebo-controlled trial. *Am J Sports Med.* 2016;44(8):1990–7. Epub 2016/06/04. doi: 10.1177/0363546516647958. [PubMed: 27257167]
74. Murray IR, Geeslin AG, Goudie EB, Petrigliano FA, LaPrade RF. Minimum information for studies evaluating biologics in orthopaedics (MIBO): Platelet-rich plasma and mesenchymal stem

- cells. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* 2017;99(10):809–19. Epub 2017/05/17. doi: 10.2106/JBJS.16.00793. [PubMed: 28509821]
75. Fitzpatrick J, Bulsara MK, McCrory PR, Richardson MD, Zheng MH. Analysis of platelet-rich plasma extraction: Variations in platelet and blood components between 4 common commercial kits. *Orthop J Sports Med* 2017;5(1):2325967116675272. Epub 2017/02/18. doi: 10.1177/2325967116675272.
  76. Alfredson H, Pietila T, Jonsson P, Lorentzon R. Heavy-load eccentric calf muscle training for the treatment of chronic Achilles tendinosis. *Am J Sports Med.* 1998;26(3):360–6. Epub 1998/06/09. doi: 10.1177/03635465980260030301. [PubMed: 9617396]
  77. Creaney L, Wallace A, Curtis M, Connell D. Growth factor-based therapies provide additional benefit beyond physical therapy in resistant elbow tendinopathy: a prospective, single-blind, randomised trial of autologous blood injections versus platelet-rich plasma injections. *Br J Sports Med.* 2011;45(12):966–71. Epub 2011/03/17. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2010.082503. [PubMed: 21406450]
  78. Davenport KL, Campos JS, Nguyen J, Saboeiro G, Adler RS, Moley PJ. Ultrasound-guided intratendinous injections with platelet-rich plasma or autologous whole blood for treatment of proximal hamstring tendinopathy: A double-blind randomized controlled trial. *J Ultrasound Med.* 2015;34(8):1455–63. Epub 2015/07/25. doi: 10.7863/ultra.34.8.1455. [PubMed: 26206832]
  79. Gautam VK, Verma S, Batra S, Bhatnagar N, Arora S. Platelet-rich plasma versus corticosteroid injection for recalcitrant lateral epicondylitis: clinical and ultrasonographic evaluation. *J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong).* 2015;23(1):1–5. Epub 2015/04/30. doi: 10.1177/230949901502300101. [PubMed: 25920633]
  80. Khaliq A, Khan I, Inam M, Saeed M, Khan H, Iqbal MJ. Effectiveness of platelets rich plasma versus corticosteroids in lateral epicondylitis. *J Pak Med Assoc* 2015;65(11 Suppl 3):S100–4. Epub 2016/02/16. [PubMed: 26878497]
  81. Levy GM, Lucas P, Hope N. Efficacy of a platelet-rich plasma injection for the treatment of proximal hamstring tendinopathy: A pilot study. *J Sci Med Sport* 2018. Epub 2018/08/27. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2018.08.001.
  82. Mishra AK, Skrepnik NV, Edwards SG, et al. Efficacy of platelet-rich plasma for chronic tennis elbow: a double-blind, prospective, multicenter, randomized controlled trial of 230 patients. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42(2):463–71. Epub 2013/07/05. doi: 10.1177/0363546513494359. [PubMed: 23825183]
  83. Palacio EP, Schiavetti RR, Kanematsu M, Ikeda TM, Mizobuchi RR, Galbiatti JA. Effects of platelet-rich plasma on lateral epicondylitis of the elbow: prospective randomized controlled trial. *Rev Bras Ortop.* 2016;51(1):90–5. Epub 2016/03/11. doi: 10.1016/j.rboe.2015.03.014. [PubMed: 26962506]
  84. Schoffl V, Willauschus W, Sauer F, et al. Autologous conditioned plasma versus placebo injection therapy in lateral epicondylitis of the elbow: A double blind, randomized study. *Sportverletz Sportschaden.* 2017;31(1):31–6. Epub 2017/02/22. doi: 10.1055/s-0043-101042. [PubMed: 28222465]
  85. Stenhouse G, Sookur P, Watson M. Do blood growth factors offer additional benefit in refractory lateral epicondylitis? A prospective, randomized pilot trial of dry needling as a stand-alone procedure versus dry needling and autologous conditioned plasma. *Skeletal Radiol.* 2013;42(11):1515–20. Epub 2013/08/06. doi: 10.1007/s00256-013-1691-7. [PubMed: 23912197]
  86. Yadav R, Kothari SY, Borah D. Comparison of local injection of platelet rich plasma and corticosteroids in the treatment of lateral epicondylitis of humerus. *J Clin Diagn Res.* 2015;9(7):RC05–7. Epub 2015/09/24. doi: 10.7860/JCDR/2015/14087.6213.
  87. Stasinopoulos D, Stasinopoulos I, Pantelis M, Stasinopoulou K. Comparison of effects of a home exercise programme and a supervised exercise programme for the management of lateral elbow tendinopathy. *Br J Sports Med.* 2010;44(8):579–83. Epub 2009/11/06. doi: 10.1136/bjism.2008.049759. [PubMed: 19887440]
  88. Bang MD, Deyle GD. Comparison of supervised exercise with and without manual physical therapy for patients with shoulder impingement syndrome. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther.* 2000;30(3):126–37. Epub 2000/03/18. doi: 10.2519/jospt.2000.30.3.126. [PubMed: 10721508]

89. Bek N, Simsek IE, Erel S, Yakut Y, Uygur F. Home-based general versus center-based selective rehabilitation in patients with posterior tibial tendon dysfunction. *Acta Orthop Traumatol Turc.* 2012;46(4):286–92. Epub 2012/09/07. . [PubMed: 22951761]
90. Lisinski P, Huber J, Wilkosz P, et al. Supervised versus uncontrolled rehabilitation of patients after rotator cuff repair-clinical and neurophysiological comparative study. *Int J Artif Organs.* 2012;35(1):45–54. Epub 2012/01/31. doi: 10.5301/ijao.5000037. [PubMed: 22287203]
91. Roe C, Brox JI, Bohmer AS, Vollestad NK. Muscle activation after supervised exercises in patients with rotator tendinosis. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2000;81(1):67–72. Epub 2000/01/19. [PubMed: 10638879]

Tendon healing cascade, which is re-initiated after PRP injection, and the goals and methods implemented during rehabilitation to optimize tendon healing

**Table 1:**

Phase of Tendon Healing	Timeline (post injury)	Pathophysiology	Rehabilitation Goals	Rehabilitation Methods
<b>Inflammatory</b>	Days 1–7	Migration of erythrocytes and inflammatory cells (monocytes and macrophages predominate). Necrotic debris removed. Tenocytes migrate to the wound.	Pain control Tissue protection	Absolute or relative rest Cryotherapy* NSAIDS*
<b>Proliferative</b>	Weeks 1–4	Proteolytic degradation. Increased neovascularization. Stimulation of fibroblasts synthesizing type III collagen.	Mechanical stimulation in controlled tendon loading Neuromuscular re-education	Stretching Strengthening (isometric, eccentric, concentric) Proprioceptive training
<b>Remodeling</b>	Begins at ~4–6 weeks.	Functional tissue laid down (type I collagen replaces type III collagen).	Return to normal activity	Sport-specific training
<b>Unsuccessful Healing</b>	Can begin at any point	Normal tendon tissues are replaced with non-tenogenic tissues including lipid, fibrinoid, fibrocartilaginous, or calcified material resulting in scar.	Avoid this phase	Difficult to treat

\* = often discouraged after a regenerative medicine procedure to allow the inflammatory cascade to occur

**Table 2:** Detailed description of pre-habilitation and rehabilitation protocols after PRP for included level I and II Achilles tendinopathy studies.

Ad Article, type of study (year)	Tendon	n	Procedure details	Pre-PRP	Post-procedure meds	Rest period	Rehab initiation	Supervised program?	Rehab protocol	Outcome
<b>De Vos (71), RCT (2010)</b>	Achilles	PRP: 27 Saline: 27	1 PRP injection vs 1 saline injection Intra-tendinous	No prior PRP injections. No prior heavy load eccentric exercise program.	Acetaminophen encouraged	2 days	Day 8	No	1 week of stretching exercises. Daily eccentric training (180 reps) for 12 weeks. Gradual return to sports at 4 weeks.	VISA-A significantly improved in both PRP and placebo groups after 24 weeks without a significant difference between groups.
<b>Krogh (73), RCT (2016)</b>	Achilles	PRP 12 Saline: 12	1 PRP injection vs 1 saline injection Intra-tendinous	No prior Achilles tendon surgery	N/a	4 days	Day 5	No	Eccentric strengthening, stretching, and coordination	No statistically significant difference in VISA-A between groups at 3 months. Large drop out rate after 3 months.
<b>Boesen (70), RCT (2017)</b>	Achilles (midportion, avg duration= 27.5 mos)	PRP: 20 HVI: 20 Placebo: 20	4 PRP injections vs 1 HVI and 3 SubQ saline injections vs 4 SubQ saline injections, all 2 weeks apart Peri-tendinous	No steroid or blood product injection within previous 6 months. No use of quinolones within previous 6 months.	N/a	3 days	Day 4	No but PT consulted on days 1, 14, 28, and 42 to make adjustments	Twice daily eccentric training (180 reps) for 12 weeks. Maintenance eccentric exercises 3 times per week (weeks 12–24).	VISA-A improved in all groups, greatest in HVI at 6 & 12 weeks and HVI and PRP at 24 weeks. VAS improved in all groups, greatest in HVI and PRP groups. Tendon thickness decreased in HVI and PRP groups only. Muscle function (via Heel Rise test) improved in all groups.
<b>Erroi (72) retrospective cohort (2017)</b>	Achilles (insertional, avg duration= 14 mos)	PRP: 21 ESWT: 24	2 PRP injection (2 weeks apart) vs 3 sessions of ESWT Intra-tendinous	No foot surgery or CSI within previous 3 months. No anti-coagulant or anti-platelet medication within previous 3 months.	Acetaminophen encouraged Avoid NSAIDs	None	N/a	No	5 phase daily eccentric training: 1) Calf stretching, 2) eccentric exercises, 3) foot proprioceptive exercises, 4) calf stretching, 5) icing for 8 weeks. Maintenance protocol as above twice weekly (weeks 8–12). Return to sport after 4 weeks if minimal or no pain.	VISA-A improved in both groups up to 6-month follow up. No differences between groups at 2 or 6 month follow up but ESWT showed better improvement than PRP at 4 month follow up. VAS improved in both groups without a difference between groups. Patient satisfaction progressively improved in both groups at all time points.

Ad Article, type of study (year)	Tendon	n	Procedure details	Pre-PRP	Post-procedure meds	Rest period	Rehab initiation	Supervised program?	Rehab protocol	Outcome
Abate (69), <i>retrospective observational (2018)</i>	Achilles (non-insertional, avg duration= 12.7 mos)	PRP: 46 Dry Needling: 38	3 weekly PRP injections vs dry needling Intra-tendinous	No PT modalities or eccentric training within previous 3 months. No steroid or hyaluronic acid injection within previous 3 months	Acetaminophen encouraged Avoid NSAIDs	3-4 days	Day 5	No	Daily eccentric training and stretching (3 sets of 15 reps) for at least 3 months. Gradual return to sport.	No differences in pain and function between groups at 3 and 6-month follow up. Patient satisfaction was higher in PRP group at 6 months (41.3% vs 26.3%).

ACP= autologous conditioned plasma, avg= average, CSI= corticosteroid injection, DASH= Disability of the Arm, Shoulder, and Hand score, ESWT= extracorporeal shockwave therapy, HV= high volume injection, hx= history, MCID= minimal clinically important difference, mHHS= modified Hip Harris Score, min= minutes, mos= months, n= number of subjects, N/A= not applicable, NSAIDs=Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, Prehab= prehabilitation, PRP= platelet-rich plasma, PT= physical therapy, Rehab= rehabilitation, SubQ= Subcutaneous, VAS= Visual Analogue Score, VISA-A= Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Achilles, VISA-P= Victorian Institute of Sport Assessment-Patellar.