

Platelet-Rich Plasma (PRP) for Orthopedic Indications, Wound Care and Other Miscellaneous Conditions

MEDICAL POLICY NUMBER: 249

Effective Date: 8/1/2024	COVERAGE CRITERIA	2
Last Review Date: 7/2024	POLICY CROSS REFERENCES.....	3
Next Annual Review: 7/2025	POLICY GUIDELINES.....	3
	REGULATORY STATUS.....	4
	CLINICAL EVIDENCE AND LITERATURE REVIEW	4
	BILLING GUIDELINES AND CODING	8
	REFERENCES.....	9
	POLICY REVISION HISTORY.....	13

INSTRUCTIONS FOR USE: Company Medical Policies serve as guidance for the administration of plan benefits. Medical policies do not constitute medical advice nor a guarantee of coverage. Company Medical Policies are reviewed annually and are based upon published, peer-reviewed scientific evidence and evidence-based clinical practice guidelines that are available as of the last policy update. The Company reserves the right to determine the application of medical policies and make revisions to medical policies at any time. The scope and availability of all plan benefits are determined in accordance with the applicable coverage agreement. Any conflict or variance between the terms of the coverage agreement and Company Medical Policy will be resolved in favor of the coverage agreement. Coverage decisions are made on the basis of individualized determinations of medical necessity and the experimental or investigational character of the treatment in the individual case. In cases where medical necessity is not established by policy for specific treatment modalities, evidence not previously considered regarding the efficacy of the modality that is presented shall be given consideration to determine if the policy represents current standards of care.

SCOPE: Providence Health Plan, Providence Health Assurance, and Providence Plan Partners as applicable (referred to individually as “Company” and collectively as “Companies”).

PLAN PRODUCT AND BENEFIT APPLICATION

Commercial

Medicaid/OHP*

Medicare**

*Medicaid/OHP Members

Oregon: Services requested for Oregon Health Plan (OHP) members follow the OHP Prioritized List and Oregon Administrative Rules (OARs) as the primary resource for coverage determinations. Medical policy criteria below may be applied when there are no criteria available in the OARs and the OHP Prioritized List.

Platelet Rich Plasma: Guideline Note 172

**Medicare Members

This *Company* policy may be applied to Medicare Plan members only when directed by a separate *Medicare* policy. Note that investigational services are considered “**not medically necessary**” for Medicare members.

COVERAGE CRITERIA

Note: This does not address platelet-derived growth factors, including recombinant growth factors (e.g., Regranex® [becaplermin gel]) and growth factors that are autologous in origin.

- I. The use of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) as an adjunct to surgery or a stand-alone treatment is considered **not medically necessary** for any indication, including, but not limited to any of the following:
 - A. Orthopedic Indications, including but not limited to (1.-9.):
 1. Achilles tendon rupture and/or tendinopathy
 2. Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) tendinopathy
 3. Lateral epicondylitis
 4. Osteoarthritis of the ankle
 5. Osteoarthritis of the hip
 6. Osteoarthritis of the knee
 7. Patellar tendinopathy
 8. Plantar fasciitis
 9. Rotator cuff tears (full and partial) and tendinopathy
 - B. Wound care, including but not limited to (1.-3.):
 1. Acute wounds
 2. Chronic leg and/or foot wounds (diabetic and non-diabetic)
 3. Pilonidal disease wounds
 - C. Other miscellaneous conditions, including but not limited to (1.-2.):
 1. Aesthetic indications, including but not limited to the following:

- a. Ageing skin and other dermatological conditions
- b. Alopecia
- c. Erectile dysfunction

Link to [Evidence Summary](#)

POLICY CROSS REFERENCES

None

The full Company portfolio of current Medical Policies is available online and can be [accessed here](#).

POLICY GUIDELINES

BACKGROUND

Platelet-Rich Plasma (PRP)

Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) is an autologous blood preparation with a high platelet concentration, and therefore is also known as autologous platelet concentrate (APC). PRP is derived from the patient's own blood and is concentrated with platelet-derived growth factors, which may be the primary contributors to the purported benefits of PRP therapy.¹ The concentration of the PRP and its growth factors occurs through specialized centrifugation systems.

Exposure of PRP to a solution of thrombin and calcium chloride results in the polymerization of fibrin from fibrinogen, creating an autologous platelet gel (APG). The platelet gel can then be applied to wounds or surgical sites with the hope of promoting hemostasis and accelerating healing for a variety of indications. An example commercially available APC, created with the patient's own blood, is Aurix® (Nuo Therapeutics, Inc.) (formerly known as Autologel).

However, it must be noted that PRP preparations are not standardized and exhibit wide variability in platelet and white blood cell concentrations and the use of thrombin activators. How these variations in PRP composition may affect clinical outcomes is unclear.

Once the PRP is prepared, it can be administered directly to the site during surgical repair of an orthopedic injury, or injected into the lesion, with or without ultrasound guidance, in the case of nonsurgical intervention.

Although the mechanism by which PRP works is not known, it is been hypothesized that the growth factors and cytokines concentrated in the PRP may stimulate regeneration and promote tissue repair by triggering stem cell recruitment, angiogenesis and fibroblast stimulation at the site of injury.

Clinical Alternatives

Orthopedic Applications

Depending on the indication and its severity, examples of nonsurgical treatment alternatives include rest, ice, physical therapy, orthotics, anti-inflammatory medications, pain medications, hyaluronic acid injections, and corticosteroid injections. Surgery may be indicated for more severe indications.¹⁻³

Chronic Wounds

Medical management of chronic wounds should involve treatment of the primary cause, such as glycemic control for people with diabetes, vascular surgery for people with chronic venous disease, or ischemic vascular disease. "Removal of necrotic or infected tissue, off-loading, compression therapy, maintenance of a moist wound environment, management of wound infection, wound cleansing, and diet," are also thought to be important.⁴

REGULATORY STATUS

U.S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION (FDA)

Approval or clearance by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) does not in itself establish medical necessity or serve as a basis for coverage. Therefore, this section is provided for informational purposes only.

The FDA regulates human cells and tissues intended for implantation, transplantation, or infusion through the Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research. Blood products such as PRP are included in these regulations. Under these regulations, blood products such as PRP are exempt and therefore, do not follow the traditional FDA regulatory pathway.⁵

Numerous PRP preparation systems have been cleared for marketing by the FDA through the 510(k) process. These devices are intended to concentrate patient plasma either at the point of care during procedures or off-site at certified laboratories. However, the use of different devices and procedures can lead to variable concentrations of active platelets and associated proteins and growth factors, increasing variability between studies.

CLINICAL EVIDENCE AND LITERATURE REVIEW

EVIDENCE REVIEW

Due to the large body of evidence published on the use of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) for a large number of indications, the evidence review below is focused on recent, high-quality systematic reviews with meta-analyses. A review of the ECRI, Hayes, Cochrane, and PubMed databases was conducted regarding the use of PRP as a treatment for wound healing and musculoskeletal/orthopedic conditions. Below is a summary of the available evidence identified through June 2024.

The use of PRP has been evaluated and reported by systematic reviews for the following indications:

- Orthopedic/musculoskeletal indications:
 - Achilles tendon rupture and/or tendinopathy^{3,6-8}
 - Anterior cruciate ligament (ACL) tendinopathy^{9,10}
 - Carpal tunnel syndrome¹¹
 - Lateral epicondylitis^{10,12-19}
 - Myofascial pain²⁰
 - Osteoarthritis of the ankle²¹
 - Osteoarthritis of the hip²²⁻²⁶
 - Osteoarthritis of the knee^{2,22,24,27-42}
 - Osteoarthrosis of the temporomandibular joint^{43,44}
 - Patellar tendinopathy^{6,9,45-47}
 - Plantar fasciitis^{3,6,48,49}
 - Rotator cuff tears (full and partial) and tendinopathy^{1,10,14,17,50-53}
 - Wound care, including:
 - Acute wounds⁵⁴
 - Chronic leg and/or foot wounds (diabetic and non-diabetic)^{4,55}
 - Other chronic wounds^{56,57}
 - Pilonidal disease wounds⁵⁸
- Other miscellaneous conditions:
 - Aesthetic indications including:
 - Ageing skin and other dermatological conditions⁵⁹⁻⁶²
 - Alopecia^{59,60,63-65}
 - Erectile dysfunction⁶⁶
 - Preventive dental treatments in people with cancer receiving radiotherapy to the head and neck⁶⁷

Overall, the body of evidence for any given indication suffers from one or more of the following limitations:

- Low-quality of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) due to methodological limitations including:
 - small sample size
 - underpowered to detect treatment effects
 - heterogeneity of comparator treatment
 - variability in PRP preparation/concentration, administration and dosing protocols
 - inconsistent data reporting
 - high risk of bias, including insufficient blinding of physicians and/or patients
 - incomplete details regarding randomization methods
- limited number of RCTs reporting outcomes for any given indication
- systematic reviews deemed of low quality, due to methodological limitations, including:
 - inclusion of nonrandomized studies
 - lack of transparency on literature search/study inclusion methodology

- high risk of bias
- conflicting or no evidence of short-term improvements in pain and/or function (first few months following treatment) when compared to placebo or non-PRP treatments
- conflicting or no evidence of long-term benefit on function or pain outcomes

CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES

Osteoarthritis

American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS)

In 2020, the AAOS published guidelines on the management of glenohumeral osteoarthritis.⁶⁸ Authors recommended against the use of platelet-rich plasma due to a lack of evidence.

In 2019, the AAOS published guidelines on the management of rotator cuff injuries.⁶⁹ Authors recommended against the use of platelet-rich plasma due to a lack of evidence.

In 2023, the AAOS published guidelines on the management of osteoarthritis of the hip.⁷⁰ The association conducted an evidence review of PRP versus other comparators, but did not identify enough high-quality evidence on PRP to formally address the treatment in their recommendations.

In 2021, the AAOS updated its guidelines on the management of osteoarthritis of the knee.⁷¹ The recommendation of the use of Platelet-Rich Plasma received a downgrade from strong to limited “heterogeneity of results and the difference in early and late stage OA results”.

American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP)

In 2019, the ASIPP published guidelines on responsible, safe, and effective use of biologics in the management of low back pain.⁷² Methods for evidence collection and grading were employed following recommendations described by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ). Regarding PRP, the authors identified on one high-quality RCT, multiple moderate-quality observational studies, a single-arm meta-analysis and evidence from a systematic review. For intradiscal injections of PRP, they assessed the evidence to be Level III (on a scale of Level I through V) using a qualitative modified approach to the grading based on best-evidence synthesis. This was the same for mesenchymal stem cells. The evidence was reported as being Level IV for lumbar facet joint, lumbar epidural, and sacroiliac joint injections of PRP. According to the qualitative modified approach to grading of evidence, Level III is considered fair, and Level IV is limited.

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

In 2019, NICE published guidance that stated the following:⁷³

- “Current evidence on platelet-rich plasma injections for osteoarthritis of the knee raises no major safety concerns; however, the evidence on efficacy is inadequate in quality.

- Clinicians wishing to undertake platelet-rich plasma injections for osteoarthritis of the knee should ... ensure that patients understand the procedure's safety and efficacy, as well as any uncertainties about these.”

Plantar Fasciitis

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

In 2013, NICE published guidance that stated the following:⁷⁴

- “The evidence on the efficacy of autologous blood injection for plantar fasciitis is inadequate in quantity and quality.
- The evidence on autologous blood injection for plantar fasciitis raises no major safety concerns.
- Clinicians wishing to undertake autologous blood injection for plantar fasciitis should ensure that patients understand the uncertainty about the procedure's efficacy and make them aware of alternative treatments.
- Further research into comparing autologous blood injection (with and without techniques to produce PRP) with established nonsurgical treatments is encouraged.”

Tendinopathies

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

In 2013, NICE published guidance for tendinopathy (including but not limited to elbow, heel and knee) that stated the following:⁷⁵

- “The evidence on efficacy of autologous blood injection for tendinopathy remains inadequate, with few studies available that use appropriate comparators.
- The evidence on autologous blood injection for tendinopathy raises no major safety concerns.
- Clinicians wishing to undertake autologous blood injection for tendinopathy should ensure that patients understand the uncertainty about the procedure's efficacy and make them aware of alternative treatments.”
- Further research into comparing autologous blood injection (with and without techniques to produce PRP) with established nonsurgical treatments is encouraged.

Wound Treatment

Association for the Advancement of Wound Care (AAWC)

In 2015, the AAWC published an updated international consolidated venous ulcer (VU) guideline which stated the following:⁷⁶

“Platelet-rich plasma has not yet been shown to significantly improve VU healing.” This was based on evidence considered to be of moderate strength (one RCT, one nonrandomized controlled study and a Cochrane systematic review).

In 2018, the AAWC published an updated international consolidated wound infection guideline which stated:⁷⁷

“Do not use platelet rich plasma to prevent infection.” This was based on evidence considered to be of moderate strength (one Cochrane systematic review).

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)

In 2015 NICE published guidelines (updated in 2019) on the management of diabetic foot problems which stated:⁷⁸

“Do not offer autologous platelet-rich plasma gel to treat diabetic foot ulcers, unless as part of a clinical trial.”

EVIDENCE SUMMARY

There is insufficient evidence that the use of platelet-rich plasma (PRP), whether as an adjunct to surgery, or as a stand-alone treatment, is effective and consistently improves health outcomes for any indication, including but not limited to orthopedic indications, wound care, and aesthetic indications. Due to heterogeneity in PRP processing and administration protocols, interpreting results and drawing conclusions about treatment efficacy is difficult. This limitation is consistently reported for the use of PRP for all indications. PRP treatment protocols must be optimized before it can be implemented into standard clinical practice. Other major limitations of PRP observed across all indications include a lack of large, well-designed randomized controlled trials, and inconsistency in terms of whether or not PRP has a beneficial effect. In addition, no clinical practice guidelines were identified that support the use of PRP as a treatment for any indication.

BILLING GUIDELINES AND CODING

CODES*		
CPT	0232T	Injection(s), platelet rich plasma, any site, including image guidance, harvesting and preparation when performed
HCPCS	G0460	Autologous platelet rich plasma for non-diabetic chronic wounds/ulcers, including phlebotomy, centrifugation, and all other preparatory procedures, administration and dressings, per treatment
	G0465	Autologous platelet rich plasma (prp) for diabetic chronic wounds/ulcers, using an fda-cleared device (includes administration, dressings, phlebotomy, centrifugation, and all other preparatory procedures, per treatment)
	P9020	Platelet rich plasma, each unit

***Coding Notes:**

- The above code list is provided as a courtesy and may not be all-inclusive. Inclusion or omission of a code from this policy neither implies nor guarantees reimbursement or coverage. Some codes may not require routine review for medical necessity, but they are subject to provider contracts, as well as member benefits, eligibility and potential utilization audit.
- All unlisted codes are reviewed for medical necessity, correct coding, and pricing at the claim level. If an unlisted code is submitted for non-covered services addressed in this policy then it will be **denied as not covered**. If an unlisted code is submitted for potentially covered services addressed in this policy, to avoid post-service denial, **prior authorization is recommended**.
- See the non-covered and prior authorization lists on the Company [Medical Policy, Reimbursement Policy, Pharmacy Policy and Provider Information website](#) for additional information.
- HCPCS/CPT code(s) may be subject to National Correct Coding Initiative (NCCI) procedure-to-procedure (PTP) bundling edits and daily maximum edits known as “medically unlikely edits” (MUEs) published by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS). This policy does not take precedence over NCCI edits or MUEs. Please refer to the CMS website for coding guidelines and applicable code combinations.

REFERENCES

1. Hayes Inc. Comparative Effectiveness Review of Platelet-Rich Plasma for Rotator Cuff Repairs, Tendinopathies, and Related Conditions: A Review of Reviews. Updated 2022. <https://evidence.hayesinc.com/report/dir.prpshoulder4306>. Accessed 6/6/2024.
2. Hayes Inc. Comparative Effectiveness Review of Platelet-Rich Plasma for Knee Osteoarthritis: A Review of Reviews. Archived 2022. <https://evidence.hayesinc.com/report/dir.plateletrich4091>. Accessed 6/6/2024.
3. Hayes Inc. Comparative Effectiveness Review of Platelet-Rich Plasma for Treatment of Conditions of the Achilles Tendon and Plantar Fascia. Archived 2023. <https://evidence.hayesinc.com/report/dir.prpfoot4297>. Accessed 6/6/2024.
4. Martinez-Zapata MJ, Marti-Carvajal AJ, Sola I, et al. Autologous platelet-rich plasma for treating chronic wounds. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2016(5):Cd006899.
5. U.S. Food & Drug Administration (FDA). Tissue and Tissue Products. 3/1/2024. <https://www.fda.gov/BiologicsBloodVaccines/TissueTissueProducts/>. Published 2024. Accessed 6/6/2024.
6. Washington State Health Care Authority. Autologous Blood or Platelet-Rich Plasma Injections: Final Evidence Report. 2016(6/6/2024).
7. Zhang YJ, Xu SZ, Gu PC, et al. Is Platelet-rich Plasma Injection Effective for Chronic Achilles Tendinopathy? A Meta-analysis. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2018;476(8):1633-1641.
8. Lin MT, Chiang CF, Wu CH, Hsu HH, Tu YK. Meta-analysis Comparing Autologous Blood-Derived Products (Including Platelet-Rich Plasma) Injection Versus Placebo in Patients With Achilles Tendinopathy. *Arthroscopy*. 2018;34(6):1966-1975 e1965.
9. Inc. H. Comparative Effectiveness Review of Platelet-Rich Plasma For Tendinopathies Or Ligament Injuries Of The Knee. Archived 2023. <https://evidence.hayesinc.com/report/dir.platelettendlig4240>. Accessed 6/6/2024.
10. Chen X, Jones IA, Park C, Vangsness CT, Jr. The Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma on Tendon and Ligament Healing: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis With Bias Assessment. *The American journal of sports medicine*. 2018;46(8):2020-2032.
11. Catapano M, Catapano J, Borschel G, Alavinia SM, Robinson LR, Mittal N. Effectiveness of Platelet-Rich Plasma Injections for Nonsurgical Management of Carpal Tunnel Syndrome: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2020;101(5):897-906.

12. Hayes Inc. Comparative Effectiveness Review of Platelet-Rich Plasma for Treatment of Lateral Epicondylitis: A Review of Reviews. Archived 2022. <https://evidence.hayesinc.com/report/dir.platelet2154>. Accessed 6/6/2024.
13. Arirachakaran A, Sukthuyat A, Sisayanarane T, Laoratanavoraphong S, Kanchanatawan W, Kongtharvonskul J. Platelet-rich plasma versus autologous blood versus steroid injection in lateral epicondylitis: systematic review and network meta-analysis. *J Orthop Traumatol*. 2016;17(2):101-112.
14. Andia I, Maffulli N. Update on Platelet-rich Plasma for Shoulder and Elbow Tendinopathy. *Techniques in Shoulder & Elbow Surgery*. 2017;18(3):91-100.
15. Ben-Nafa W, Munro W. The effect of corticosteroid versus platelet-rich plasma injection therapies for the management of lateral epicondylitis: A systematic review. *SICOT J*. 2018;4:11.
16. Mi B, Liu G, Zhou W, et al. Platelet rich plasma versus steroid on lateral epicondylitis: meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials. *Phys Sportsmed*. 2017;45(2):97-104.
17. Tsikopoulos K, Tsikopoulos I, Simeonidis E, et al. The clinical impact of platelet-rich plasma on tendinopathy compared to placebo or dry needling injections: A meta-analysis. *Phys Ther Sport*. 2016;17:87-94.
18. Li A, Wang H, Yu Z, et al. Platelet-rich plasma vs corticosteroids for elbow epicondylitis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2019;98(51):e18358.
19. ECRI Institute. Platelet-rich Plasma Therapy for Lateral Epicondylitis. <https://www.ecri.org/components/Hotline/Pages/210207.aspx>. Published 2021. Accessed 6/6/2024.
20. Al-Moraissi EA, Alradom J, Aladashi O, Goddard G, Christidis N. Needling therapies in the management of myofascial pain of the masticatory muscles: A network meta-analysis of randomised clinical trials. *J Oral Rehabil*. 2020;47(7):910-922.
21. Vannabouathong C, Del Fabbro G, Sales B, et al. Intra-articular Injections in the Treatment of Symptoms from Ankle Arthritis: A Systematic Review. *Foot Ankle Int*. 2018;1071100718779375.
22. Laver L, Marom N, Dnyanesh L, Mei-Dan O, Espregueira-Mendes J, Gobbi A. PRP for Degenerative Cartilage Disease: A Systematic Review of Clinical Studies. *Cartilage*. 2017;8(4):341-364.
23. Dzaja I, Kay J, Simunovic N, Ayeni OR. Biologic Treatments for Hip Disorders: A Focus On Platelet-Rich Plasma. *Operative Techniques in Orthopaedics*. 2016;26(2):82-88.
24. Tietze DC, Geissler K, Borchers J. The effects of platelet-rich plasma in the treatment of large-joint osteoarthritis: a systematic review. *Phys Sportsmed*. 2014;42(2):27-37.
25. Ye Y, Zhou X, Mao S, Zhang J, Lin B. Platelet rich plasma versus hyaluronic acid in patients with hip osteoarthritis: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Surg*. 2018;53:279-287.
26. Hayes Inc. Platelet-Rich Plasma for Hip Osteoarthritis. Updated 2022. <https://evidence.hayesinc.com/report/dir.plateletosteohip4282>. Accessed 6/6/2024.
27. Dai WL, Zhou AG, Zhang H, Zhang J. Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma in the Treatment of Knee Osteoarthritis: A Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Arthroscopy*. 2017;33(3):659-670 e651.
28. Kanchanatawan W, Arirachakaran A, Chaijenkij K, et al. Short-term outcomes of platelet-rich plasma injection for treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee. *Knee Surg Sports Traumatol Arthrosc*. 2016;24(5):1665-1677.
29. Knop E, Paula LE, Fuller R. Platelet-rich plasma for osteoarthritis treatment. *Rev Bras Reumatol Engl Ed*. 2016;56(2):152-164.

30. Meheux CJ, McCulloch PC, Lintner DM, Varner KE, Harris JD. Efficacy of Intra-articular Platelet-Rich Plasma Injections in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review. *Arthroscopy*. 2016;32(3):495-505.
31. Mucedzi TA, Roberts SB. A systematic review of the effects of platelet rich plasma on outcomes for patients with knee osteoarthritis and following total knee arthroplasty. *Surgeon*. 2018;16(4):250-258.
32. Newberry SJ, FitzGerald J, SooHoo NF, et al. Treatment of Osteoarthritis of the Knee: An Update Review. 2017.
33. Sadabad HN, Behzadifar M, Arasteh F, Behzadifar M, Dehghan HR. Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma versus Hyaluronic Acid for treatment of Knee Osteoarthritis: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Electron Physician*. 2016;8(3):2115-2122.
34. Xu Z, Luo J, Huang X, Wang B, Zhang J, Zhou A. Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma in Pain and Self-Report Function in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Best-Evidence Synthesis. *Am J Phys Med Rehabil*. 2017;96(11):793-800.
35. Di Y, Han C, Zhao L, Ren Y. Is local platelet-rich plasma injection clinically superior to hyaluronic acid for treatment of knee osteoarthritis? A systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Arthritis research & therapy*. 2018;20(1):128.
36. Jevsevar DS, Shores PB, Mullen K, Schulte DM, Brown GA, Cummins DS. Mixed Treatment Comparisons for Nonsurgical Treatment of Knee Osteoarthritis: A Network Meta-analysis. *The Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons*. 2018;26(9):325-336.
37. Vannabouathong C, Bhandari M, Bedi A, et al. Nonoperative Treatments for Knee Osteoarthritis: An Evaluation of Treatment Characteristics and the Intra-Articular Placebo Effect: A Systematic Review. *JBJS reviews*. 2018;6(7):e5.
38. Xing D, Wang B, Zhang W, et al. Intra-articular platelet-rich plasma injections for knee osteoarthritis: An overview of systematic reviews and risk of bias considerations. *International journal of rheumatic diseases*. 2017;20(11):1612-1630.
39. Zhang HF, Wang CG, Li H, Huang YT, Li ZJ. Intra-articular platelet-rich plasma versus hyaluronic acid in the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis. *Drug design, development and therapy*. 2018;12:445-453.
40. Shen L, Yuan T, Chen S, Xie X, Zhang C. The temporal effect of platelet-rich plasma on pain and physical function in the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Orthop Surg Res*. 2017;12(1):16.
41. Chen Z, Wang C, You D, Zhao S, Zhu Z, Xu M. Platelet-rich plasma versus hyaluronic acid in the treatment of knee osteoarthritis: A meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2020;99(11):e19388.
42. ECRI Institute. Platelet-rich Plasma for Knee Osteoarthritis. <https://www.ecri.org/components/Hotline/Pages/29494.aspx>. Published 2023. Accessed 6/6/2024.
43. Li F, Wu C, Sun H, Zhou Q. Effect of Platelet-Rich Plasma Injections on Pain Reduction in Patients with Temporomandibular Joint Osteoarthritis: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *J Oral Facial Pain Headache*. 2020;34(2):149-156.
44. Haigler MC, Abdulrehman E, Siddappa S, Kishore R, Padilla M, Enciso R. Use of platelet-rich plasma, platelet-rich growth factor with arthrocentesis or arthroscopy to treat temporomandibular joint osteoarthritis: Systematic review with meta-analyses. *J Am Dent Assoc*. 2018;149(11):940-952 e942.
45. Dupley L, Charalambous CP. Platelet-rich plasma injections as a treatment for refractory patellar tendinosis: a meta-analysis of randomised trials. *Knee surgery & related research*. 2017;29(3):165.

46. Andriolo L, Altamura SA, Reale D, Candrian C, Zaffagnini S, Filardo G. Nonsurgical Treatments of Patellar Tendinopathy: Multiple Injections of Platelet-Rich Plasma Are a Suitable Option: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *The American journal of sports medicine*. 2018;363546518759674.
47. ECRI Institute. Platelet-rich Plasma Therapy for Patellar Tendinopathy. <https://www.ecri.org/components/Hotline/Pages/210208.aspx>. Published 2021. Accessed 6/6/2024.
48. Yang WY, Han YH, Cao XW, et al. Platelet-rich plasma as a treatment for plantar fasciitis: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2017;96(44):e8475.
49. Li H, Lv H, Lin T. Comparison of efficacy of eight treatments for plantar fasciitis: A network meta-analysis. *J Cell Physiol*. 2018.
50. Hurley ET, Lim Fat D, Moran CJ, Mullett H. The Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma and Platelet-Rich Fibrin in Arthroscopic Rotator Cuff Repair: A Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *The American journal of sports medicine*. 2018;363546517751397.
51. Saltzman BM, Jain A, Campbell KA, et al. Does the Use of Platelet-Rich Plasma at the Time of Surgery Improve Clinical Outcomes in Arthroscopic Rotator Cuff Repair When Compared With Control Cohorts? A Systematic Review of Meta-analyses. *Arthroscopy*. 2016;32(5):906-918.
52. Xiao W, Luo R, Sun J, et al. Efficacy and clinical outcomes of platelet-rich plasma for arthroscopic repair rotator cuff tears: a meta-analysis. *Int J Clin Exp Med*. 2016;9(10):19831-19840.
53. ECRI Institute. Platelet-rich Plasma to Aid Healing after Rotator Cuff Surgery. <https://www.ecri.org/components/Hotline/Pages/25291.aspx>. Published 2020. Accessed 6/6/2024.
54. Wang L, Gu Z, Gao C. [Platelet-rich plasma for treating acute wounds: a meta-analysis]. *Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi*. 2014;94(28):2169-2174.
55. Burgos-Alonso N, Lobato I, Hernandez I, et al. Adjuvant Biological Therapies in Chronic Leg Ulcers. *International journal of molecular sciences*. 2017;18(12).
56. Pourmousa A, Gardner DJ, Johnson MB, Wong AK. An update and review of cell-based wound dressings and their integration into clinical practice. *Ann Transl Med*. 2016;4(23):457.
57. ECRI Institute. Platelet-rich Plasma Therapy for Chronic Wounds. <https://www.ecri.org/components/Hotline/Pages/29241.aspx>. Published 2020. Accessed 6/6/2024.
58. Mostafaei S, Norooznejhad F, Mohammadi S, Norooznejhad AH. Effectiveness of platelet-rich plasma therapy in wound healing of pilonidal sinus surgery: A comprehensive systematic review and meta-analysis. *Wound repair and regeneration : official publication of the Wound Healing Society [and] the European Tissue Repair Society*. 2017;25(6):1002-1007.
59. Frautschi RS, Hashem AM, Halasa B, Cakmakoglu C, Zins JE. Current Evidence for Clinical Efficacy of Platelet Rich Plasma in Aesthetic Surgery: A Systematic Review. *Aesthet Surg J*. 2017;37(3):353-362.
60. Leo MS, Kumar AS, Kirit R, Konathan R, Sivamani RK. Systematic review of the use of platelet-rich plasma in aesthetic dermatology. *J Cosmet Dermatol*. 2015;14(4):315-323.
61. Lynch MD, Bashir S. Applications of platelet-rich plasma in dermatology: A critical appraisal of the literature. *The Journal of dermatological treatment*. 2016;27(3):285-289.
62. Zhang M, Park G, Zhou B, Luo D. Applications and efficacy of platelet-rich plasma in dermatology: A clinical review. *J Cosmet Dermatol*. 2018.
63. Ayatollahi A, Hosseini H, Gholami J, Mirminachi B, Firooz F, Firooz A. Platelet rich plasma for treatment of non-scarring hair loss: systematic review of literature. *The Journal of dermatological treatment*. 2017;28(7):574-581.

64. Ferneini EM, Beauvais D, Castiglione C, Ferneini MV. Platelet-Rich Plasma in Androgenic Alopecia: Indications, Technique, and Potential Benefits. *Journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery : official journal of the American Association of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgeons*. 2017;75(4):788-795.
65. Cervantes J, Perper M, Wong LL, et al. Effectiveness of Platelet-Rich Plasma for Androgenetic Alopecia: A Review of the Literature. *Skin Appendage Disord*. 2018;4(1):1-11.
66. ECRI Institute. Platelet-Rich Plasma Therapy for Erectile Dysfunction. <https://www.ecri.org/components/Hotline/Pages/25957.aspx>. Published 2018. Accessed 6/6/2024.
67. El-Rabbany M, Duchnay M, Raziee HR, et al. Interventions for preventing osteoradionecrosis of the jaws in adults receiving head and neck radiotherapy. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2019;2019(11).
68. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Management of Glenohumeral Joint Osteoarthritis. <https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/glenohumeral/gjo-cpg.pdf>. Published 2020. Accessed 6/20/2023.
69. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Management of Rotator Cuff Injuries. <https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/rotator-cuff/rotator-cuff-cpg-final-12-20-19.pdf>. Published 2019. Accessed 6/6/2024.
70. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Management of Osteoarthritis of the Hip. <https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/osteoarthritis-of-the-hip/oah-cpg.pdf>. Published 2023. Accessed 6/6/2024.
71. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons. Management of Osteoarthritis of the Knee. <https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/osteoarthritis-of-the-knee/osteoarthritis-of-the-knee-2nd-edition-clinical-practice-guideline.pdf>. Published 2021. Accessed 6/6/2024.
72. Navani A, Manchikanti L, Albers SL, et al. Responsible, Safe, and Effective Use of Biologics in the Management of Low Back Pain: American Society of Interventional Pain Physicians (ASIPP) Guidelines. *Pain Physician*. 2019;22(1S):S1-S74.
73. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Platelet-rich plasma injections for knee osteoarthritis. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg637>. Published 2019. Accessed 6/6/2024.
74. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Autologous blood injection for plantar fasciitis. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg437>. Published 2013. Accessed 6/6/2024.
75. (NICE) NifHaCE. Autologous blood injection for tendinopathy. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ipg438>. Published 2013. Accessed 6/6/2024.
76. Association for the Advancement of Wound Care. International Consolidated Venous Ulcer Guideline (ICVUG) 2015 (Update of AAWC Venous Ulcer Guideline, 2005 and 2010). <https://aawconline.memberclicks.net/assets/appendix%20c%20guideline%20icvug-textformatrecommendations-final%20v42%20changessaved18aug17.pdf>. Published 2015. Accessed 6/6/2024.
77. Association for the Advancement of Wound Care. International Consolidated Wound Infection Guideline (ICWIG). <https://s3.amazonaws.com/aawc-new/pdf/ICWIGRecommendations-Feb.20.2018.pdf>. Published 2018. Accessed 6/6/2024.
78. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Diabetic foot problems: prevention and management. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng19>. Published 2019. Accessed 6/6/2024.

POLICY REVISION HISTORY

DATE	REVISION SUMMARY
2/2023	Converted to new policy template.
10/2023	Annual update. Changed denial from investigational to not medically necessary
8/2024	Annual review. No changes to policy criteria.