Platelet-Rich Plasma for Knee Pain Management: A Regenerative and Safe Treatment Option

May 8, 2025

Introduction

Knee pain is a prevalent issue among both athletes and the general population, often resulting from osteoarthritis or sports-related injuries. Conventional treatments for chronic knee pain (such as pain medications, corticosteroid or hyaluronic acid injections, physical therapy, and rest) primarily offer temporary symptomatic relief and do not halt the underlying degeneration. Consequently, many patients eventually face invasive procedures like knee surgery or joint replacement when symptoms progress. This creates a pressing need for therapies that are not only effective for symptom control but also promote healing of damaged tissues. Orthobiologic approaches, particularly platelet-rich plasma (PRP) therapy, have emerged as promising alternatives due to their **regenerative potential** and ability to possibly modify the disease process. PRP is gaining popularity as a minimally invasive treatment that may improve joint longevity by leveraging the body's own healing mechanisms.

Mechanism of Action of PRP

Platelet-rich plasma is an autologous (patient-derived) blood product obtained by drawing a small volume of the patient's blood and concentrating the platelets via centrifugation. This process yields plasma with a platelet concentration above baseline levels, typically containing **growth factors and cytokines** stored in platelet alpha-granules. When PRP is injected into an injured or degenerated area (such as a knee joint), the platelets become activated and release these growth factors – including platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), transforming growth factor-beta (TGF-β), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), fibroblast growth factor (FGF), and insulin-like growth factor (IGF). These bioactive molecules play a crucial role in tissue repair and regeneration by stimulating **cellular migration, proliferation, angiogenesis (new blood vessel formation), and matrix formation** in the damaged tissue. In the context of knee osteoarthritis, PRP's growth factors are believed to promote the regeneration of cartilage cells and extracellular matrix, while also reducing synovial inflammation and catabolic processes that drive cartilage breakdown.

Another component of PRP's mechanism is its mild inflammatory stimulus. By delivering a concentrated dose of platelets (and some leukocytes, depending on the preparation) into the joint, PRP transiently amplifies the body's natural healing response. This is thought to facilitate a "jump-start" of reparative processes in tissues that otherwise have limited healing capacity (for example, the poor intrinsic healing of cartilage or meniscal tissue). Importantly, because PRP is derived from the patient's own blood, the risk of immunologic reaction or rejection is essentially eliminated. The treatment is considered **biologically friendly and autologous**, meaning it works in harmony with the body's physiology.

Different formulations of PRP exist, such as leukocyte-rich vs. leukocyte-poor PRP, which can influence the biological effect. Leukocytes (white blood cells) in PRP can contribute additional cytokines and an immune response; some evidence suggests that *leukocyte-poor PRP* may be preferable for intra-articular use to reduce excessive inflammation in the joint. High platelet concentration within PRP also appears to correlate with better clinical outcomes – studies indicate that "high-dose" PRP (platelet counts around or above 1 million/μL) yields more significant pain relief and longer-lasting benefits than lower platelet concentrations. While the optimal PRP preparation protocol is still being studied, the overarching mechanism is clear: **PRP delivers a concentrated cocktail of the body's natural growth factors to the site of injury, thereby enhancing tissue healing and reducing pain.**

Clinical Evidence for PRP Efficacy

PRP in Knee Osteoarthritis

Knee osteoarthritis (OA) is a leading cause of chronic knee pain and disability, characterized by progressive cartilage degeneration. A growing body of clinical research, including numerous randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and meta-analyses, supports the use of PRP injections for knee OA. Overall, these studies have found that PRP can significantly reduce pain and improve joint function in patients with knee OA, often with effects lasting up to a year.

For instance, a comprehensive review of 39 systematic reviews and meta-analyses (encompassing many RCTs) concluded that intra-articular PRP provides significant relief from knee OA symptoms. Patients treated with PRP reported **reductions in pain scores (VAS and WOMAC pain)** and improvements in stiffness, physical function, and quality of life within 12 months, compared to those receiving placebo or other conservative treatments. Notably, that review also found that adverse effects of PRP were **minor and temporary**, underscoring its safety. Consistent with these findings, a 2024 meta-analysis of RCTs by Di Matteo *et al.* reported that PRP injections yielded clinically meaningful

improvements in knee pain and function at 1, 3, 6, and 12 months post-treatment, whereas placebo injections did not achieve such benefits. In that analysis, PRP's effects on the Western Ontario and McMaster Universities Osteoarthritis Index (WOMAC) and pain scales exceeded the minimum clinically important difference (MCID) at multiple time points, confirming that the improvements patients experience with PRP are not just statistically significant but actually noticeable in daily life. Importantly, the authors noted that higher platelet concentrations in PRP were associated with greater and more sustained symptom relief, suggesting a dose-response relationship in PRP therapy.

Multiple meta-analyses have compared PRP to other injectables for knee osteoarthritis. The evidence generally shows PRP outperforming or at least matching the efficacy of standard treatments. A large meta-analysis in 2024 pooled 42 studies (nearly 3,700 patients) and found that PRP injections led to superior outcomes in knee OA **pain relief and function** compared to both hyaluronic acid and corticosteroid injections at follow-ups out to 1 year. Specifically, PRP-treated patients had greater reductions in WOMAC pain scores and higher functional scores than those treated with hyaluronic acid (HA) injections. Compared to corticosteroid injections, PRP's advantages became most pronounced at around 6 months, with significantly better pain relief (e.g. PRP showed an additional >8-point improvement in WOMAC pain and ~1-point greater VAS pain reduction vs. steroids). The authors of that meta-analysis concluded that *"PRP is an effective treatment for knee OA, providing symptomatic relief and sustained effects up to 12 months, with superior pain relief and functional enhancement compared to corticosteroids and HA."* Such findings reinforce that PRP is not only effective in absolute terms, but can even be **more effective than conventional injections** for osteoarthritis.

Beyond meta-analyses, individual controlled trials also support PRP's benefits. Many RCTs have demonstrated that patients receiving PRP have greater improvements in pain and function than those receiving placebo (saline) or steroid injections, especially over the medium to long term (6-12 months post-injection). Some studies have noted that corticosteroid injections may provide slightly faster pain relief in the first few weeks (given steroids' immediate anti-inflammatory effect), but by 2-3 months and onward, PRP tends to yield longer-lasting improvement in pain, stiffness, and ability to exercise. Furthermore, PRP may have disease-modifying potential: early-stage knee OA patients treated with PRP have shown slowed radiographic progression of arthritis in some series, and symptomatic relief that can delay the need for joint replacement surgery. For example, a prospective interventional study on 100 patients with primary knee OA found that PRP significantly improved WOMAC and VAS pain scores at 6 weeks, 3 months, and 6 months compared to baseline ($p < 0.001$), particularly in mild-moderate OA cases. The authors concluded that *"PRP therapy significantly improves pain and function in patients with knee OA, particularly*

in early-stage disease… PRP presents a promising non-surgical option, especially for those seeking to delay or avoid knee arthroplasty.". Such evidence highlights PRP's role not only in relieving symptoms but potentially in altering the course of the disease by promoting tissue health.

PRP in Sports-Related Knee Injuries

PRP has also been extensively used in the treatment of acute and chronic sports injuries of the knee. Athletes are drawn to PRP because of its natural, regenerative approach and the hope of faster recovery times. Common knee injuries where PRP has been applied include meniscal tears, ligament sprains or partial tears (such as to the anterior cruciate ligament, ACL), patellar tendinopathy ("jumper's knee"), and muscle strains around the knee. The scientific evidence for PRP in sports injuries is still evolving, but several areas show promising results.

One of the most well-studied applications is PRP as an adjunct to **meniscus tear repair**. The meniscus (the cartilage cushion in the knee) has limited blood supply, especially in the inner regions, so healing after injury or surgery can be sluggish. PRP can potentially enhance meniscal healing by supplying growth factors that promote cell proliferation and new tissue formation in the repair site. A meta-analysis of 8 RCTs involving 431 patients found that adding PRP to meniscus repair surgery led to better outcomes than meniscus repair without PRP. Patients who received PRP augmentation had significantly lower pain scores and improved knee function (measured by Lysholm score) post-operatively. While the meniscal tear healing rates on MRI did not differ significantly in that analysis (borderline improvement with PRP, $p = 0.06$), the **clinical symptoms** were clearly better with PRP, and importantly **no serious adverse events** were reported in any of those studies. The authors concluded that PRP is a *"safe and effective"* augment to meniscal repair, improving pain and functional recovery. This suggests that athletes undergoing meniscus surgery could benefit from PRP injections to speed up rehabilitation and return to sport.

PRP has also been investigated for **ligament injuries**. In the case of ACL injuries, some surgeons have experimented with injecting PRP into the ACL graft during reconstruction or into a partially torn ACL to encourage healing. Results here are mixed, with some studies not showing a clear advantage of PRP in ACL reconstruction outcomes (e.g. no difference in knee stability or function), possibly due to the already robust healing environment that surgery provides. However, PRP may still play a role in improving graft maturation or reducing postoperative pain – research is ongoing. For **medial collateral ligament (MCL)** sprains (which often heal without surgery), PRP injections have been used to potentially expedite the ligament's natural healing; while high-level evidence is limited, anecdotal reports and small studies indicate it may shorten return-to-play time for athletes.

Another common issue is **patellar tendinopathy**, a degenerative tendon condition often seen in jumping athletes. Chronic patellar tendinitis has been treated with PRP injections to stimulate a healing response in the tendon. Some controlled trials in patellar tendinopathy have shown positive outcomes (improved pain and function scores) with PRP, although others have not found a significant difference versus placebo, indicating the need for further research. Despite the mixed evidence, PRP remains in use for recalcitrant tendinopathies given its safety – it can be considered when standard approaches (eccentric exercise therapy, rest, etc.) fail.

Clinicians in sports medicine have widely adopted PRP for a variety of soft tissue injuries because of its low risk profile and the potential to enhance healing. In practice, many professional athletes have received PRP injections for knee injuries or post-surgical recovery, and reports of quicker return to play have fueled interest. In fact, PRP has been used for years among elite athletes and is now increasingly offered to recreational athletes and active individuals with similar injuries. While not every sports injury will respond dramatically to PRP, the therapy has shown enough benefits in certain conditions (like meniscal repairs and some tendinopathies) to be considered a valuable tool. As research continues, we expect more clarity on which sports-related knee injuries benefit most from PRP and the optimal treatment protocols for each. In summary, early evidence is encouraging and aligns with the notion that **PRP can assist in the recovery from knee injuries by reducing pain and possibly accelerating tissue healing**, helping athletes get back to their activities sooner.

Comparative Treatment Analysis

An important consideration in advocating for PRP is how it stacks up against conventional knee pain treatments. The main alternatives for managing knee pain (aside from oral medications and physical therapy) include corticosteroid injections, viscosupplementation with hyaluronic acid, and surgical interventions in advanced cases. Here we compare these options, focusing on efficacy, duration of relief, invasiveness, and safety, to illustrate PRP's advantages.

- **PRP vs. Corticosteroid Injections:** Corticosteroid (glucocorticoid) injections have long been used to treat knee joint pain, especially in osteoarthritis or acute flare-ups, due to their potent anti-inflammatory effect. Steroid injections often provide rapid pain relief, but this relief can be short-lived, typically lasting only a few weeks to a couple of months, and repeated steroid use may carry risks. Clinical studies directly comparing PRP to steroids consistently show that while steroids might give slightly better pain relief in the first 2–4 weeks, PRP's benefits **surpass steroid injections by 2–3 months and last significantly longer**. In a systematic review of

RCTs, PRP was superior to corticosteroids in reducing knee OA symptoms at 3, 6, and 12 months after injection. Patients who received PRP reported less pain, less stiffness, and better functional scores than those who received steroid injections, and these differences were most pronounced at the 6-month mark. By 12 months, many steroid-treated knees have lost their initial improvement and often require another injection or other interventions, whereas PRP-treated knees tend to maintain significant pain reduction up to a year in a substantial portion of patients. Another critical distinction is biological effect: steroids merely suppress inflammation (and can even inhibit cartilage cell metabolism), whereas PRP actively attempts to heal and regenerate tissue. Repeated steroid injections may also have deleterious side effects on joint tissues – for example, a randomized trial noted that quarterly steroid injections over two years led to greater cartilage volume loss in the knee compared to saline injections. Due to such concerns, guidelines often limit steroid injections to a few per year. PRP, on the other hand, has no such known deleterious effect on cartilage; conversely, it may promote cartilage health. Thus, when comparing PRP with corticosteroids, **PRP offers longer-lasting relief and a regenerative approach, without the potential cartilage damage associated with steroids**. PRP does take longer to exert its effect (few weeks versus a few days for steroids), but patients willing to invest in this approach often find the trade-off worthwhile for sustained improvement.

- **PRP vs. Hyaluronic Acid (Viscosupplementation):** Hyaluronic acid injections aim to improve the viscous properties of synovial fluid and provide lubrication in an arthritic joint. HA is another common injectable for knee OA, with moderate pain relief typically lasting around 3–6 months in responders. Multiple head-to-head studies and meta-analyses indicate that PRP produces equal or greater benefits compared to hyaluronic acid. For example, one network meta-analysis ranked PRP above HA in pain reduction and functional improvement in knee osteoarthritis. Patients receiving PRP often have better pain relief at 6 and 12 months than those who received HA, in part because PRP's biological effects persist after the injected platelets have done their work (stimulating intrinsic healing), whereas HA is a more passive lubricant that eventually degrades. In practical terms, **PRP tends to have a higher responder rate and longer duration of action than HA**. A review by Mayo Clinic noted that a higher percentage of patients respond to PRP and for a longer time (6–12 months of relief common) compared to HA injections. Some studies even show structural benefits; for instance, PRP has been associated with improved cartilage thickness or morphology on imaging compared to HA in small trials, though more research is needed to confirm disease-modifying effects. Safety

profiles of PRP and HA are both favorable, but HA injections occasionally cause local reactions (pseudo-septic inflammation in a small fraction of patients) whereas PRP, being autologous, has only transient inflammatory flare as a typical side effect. In summary, when choosing between PRP and viscosupplementation, many practitioners now favor PRP for its more robust and longer-lasting pain relief in knee OA. The **regenerative potential** of PRP is an added bonus that HA lacks.

- **PRP vs. Surgical Options:** For severe knee pathology (such as advanced osteoarthritis or certain injuries), surgery may eventually be indicated (e.g. arthroscopic debridement, meniscus surgery, or total knee replacement). However, surgery is invasive, carries significant risks (infection, blood clots, anesthesia complications), and requires long recovery and rehabilitation. One of the compelling roles of PRP is as a means to **delay or avoid surgery** for knee pain sufferers. As noted earlier, early intervention with PRP in mild-to-moderate knee osteoarthritis can postpone the need for total knee arthroplasty by improving symptoms and function. Even in more advanced cases, PRP injections may provide enough relief to defer surgery until absolutely necessary. In sports injuries, PRP has occasionally reduced the need for certain surgeries; for example, injecting PRP in a partial ligament tear might heal it without requiring reconstructive surgery, or using PRP in a meniscus tear could promote healing and avoid a meniscectomy. While PRP is not a replacement for surgery when mechanical issues (like ligament ruptures or large cartilage fragments) are present, it is a very useful **step to try before resorting to surgery**. In contrast to surgery, PRP treatments are done outpatient, with minimal downtime (most patients resume normal activities by the next day, aside from strenuous exercise) and far fewer risks. If successful, PRP spares the patient the trauma of an operation and the associated rehabilitation period. Even when surgery is performed, PRP can complement it – for instance, surgeons may inject PRP during an arthroscopy to potentially speed up healing afterward. Overall, PRP stands out as a minimally invasive option that slots in between conservative care and surgery, often filling a crucial gap: it offers more than just pain masking (unlike steroid/HA shots) but is far less invasive than surgery. This favorable middle ground – **significant healing potential with low invasiveness** – makes PRP an appealing choice for many patients and doctors alike.

Safety Profile of PRP

One of the strongest arguments in favor of PRP therapy is its excellent safety profile. Because PRP is derived from the patient's own blood, the risk of allergic reactions or rejection is essentially zero. The injection procedure is similar to any other needle injection

into the joint, with standard risks like infection or bleeding being very low when done with proper technique. In clinical studies and practice, PRP injections for knee conditions have been shown to be **remarkably safe**, with most adverse events being minor, self-limited, and related to the injection process itself.

The most common side effect reported after PRP knee injections is a transient increase in pain or swelling at the injection site, often termed a post-injection inflammatory response. This is usually mild to moderate and lasts from a couple of days up to a week. It likely reflects the activation of the healing process and the inflammatory signaling that PRP triggers (which is a desired mechanism of action). Patients may use ice and mild analgesics (though typically not NSAIDs, as those might counteract the PRP effect) to manage this discomfort in the first few days. No long-term or serious complications attributable to PRP have been reported in the literature. In the meta-analyses of PRP for knee OA, researchers explicitly note that **no serious adverse events** occurred and that any side effects (like localized pain or swelling) were temporary. A systematic review on PRP for meniscus repair likewise found zero serious complications across multiple RCTs. Furthermore, in a large clinical series at the Mayo Clinic with over 1,100 patients treated with PRP for knee arthritis, physicians reported *"no serious adverse events"* and only mild post-injection discomfort in their experience – an impressive safety record for such a large cohort. This real-world data reinforces what trial data suggest: PRP is about as safe as an injection can get.

In comparison, corticosteroid injections, while generally safe, can have systemic effects (e.g. transient blood sugar elevation in diabetics, flushing, etc.) and potential joint-related adverse effects if repeated frequently (including cartilage thinning or joint infection in rare cases). Hyaluronic acid injections can occasionally lead to acute joint swelling (inflammatory reaction) in a small percentage of patients. Oral NSAIDs used for knee pain carry gastrointestinal, renal, and cardiovascular risks over the long term. PRP avoids all these systemic issues by being localized and autologous. It does not introduce any foreign chemical or drug into the body – just concentrated components of one's own blood. This makes PRP particularly appealing for athletes who must be cautious about medications (PRP is not on anti-doping banned lists as it is a natural autologous product), and for patients who may be sensitive to drugs or looking to minimize pharmaceutical use.

Another aspect of safety is that PRP, by potentially reducing pain and improving function, might decrease the need for riskier interventions. For example, if PRP provides adequate relief, a patient might be able to reduce their intake of NSAIDs or delay a joint replacement, thereby avoiding the risks associated with those alternatives. There is emerging evidence that PRP can indeed reduce the usage of other pain management modalities; some

sources note that PRP treatments can lessen the reliance on opioids or anti-inflammatory medications for chronic joint pain. This indirect safety benefit (reducing exposure to drugs and surgeries) is an important consideration when evaluating treatment options holistically.

In summary, **PRP's safety profile is excellent**. It is a natural treatment with minimal side effects, especially when compared to the side effect profiles of long-term medication use or the potential complications of surgery. Patients are generally very comfortable with the idea of using their own blood product for healing, and this positive risk-benefit balance is a major reason why PRP has gained traction in knee pain management.

Conclusion

Platelet-rich plasma has rapidly ascended as a compelling treatment for knee pain, backed by a growing body of scientific evidence and clinical success stories. For both the competitive athlete nursing an injury and the older adult struggling with knee osteoarthritis, PRP offers a unique combination of **safety, regenerative potential, and durable relief** that distinguishes it from conventional therapies. The mechanism by which PRP harnesses the body's innate healing factors represents a paradigm shift away from merely masking pain toward actually fostering tissue repair. This regenerative approach aligns with the modern goals of sports medicine and arthritis care: to improve symptoms **and** address underlying pathology.

Clinical studies have demonstrated that PRP can significantly reduce pain and improve function in knee osteoarthritis, often outperforming traditional injections like corticosteroids and hyaluronic acid in the mid- to long-term. In sports-related knee injuries, PRP has shown promise in enhancing the healing of meniscus repairs and other soft-tissue injuries, helping athletes return to activity with less pain. While research is ongoing and PRP is not a magic bullet for all patients, the overall trend in the literature is clear – **PRP is an effective and viable therapy for many causes of knee pain**. The fact that it achieves these benefits with minimal risk and in a minimally invasive manner makes it especially attractive. Patients treated with PRP can have confidence that they are using an option that is rooted in their own biology, with a low likelihood of adverse effects.

From a practical standpoint, PRP injections can be performed in an outpatient setting within a single visit, avoiding the downtime and costs associated with surgery. When considering the whole picture of knee pain management – relief duration, functional improvement, safety, and patient convenience – PRP stands out as a favorable option. It can bridge the gap between conservative care and surgical intervention, and in many

cases, it may delay or obviate the need for more aggressive treatments like joint replacement.

In conclusion, **platelet-rich plasma represents a paradigm of leveraging the body's natural healing capabilities to treat knee pain**. It is safe, with regenerative properties that can improve joint health, and it is delivered via a simple injection, making it a minimally invasive yet powerful tool. Both athletes seeking rapid recovery and individuals with degenerative knee conditions can potentially benefit from PRP therapy. As research continues to refine protocols and identify optimal candidates, the role of PRP in knee pain management is expected to expand further. Based on current evidence, clinicians and patients should consider PRP a favorable treatment modality that combines the best of efficacy and safety in the quest for lasting knee pain relief.

References

1. Mende E.M., Love R.J., Young J.L. (2024). *A Comprehensive Summary of the Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews on Platelet-Rich Plasma Therapies for Knee Osteoarthritis*. **Mil Med**, 189(1):e361-e368.
2. Di Matteo B., et al. (2024). *PRP Injections for the Treatment of Knee Osteoarthritis: The Improvement Is Clinically Significant and Influenced by Platelet Concentration – A Meta-analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials*. **Am J Sports Med**, 52(5):1317-1325.
3. Xiong Y., et al. (2023). *Efficacy and safety of platelet-rich plasma injections for the treatment of osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials*. **Front Med (Lausanne)**, 10:1204144.
4. Hou Y., et al. (2024). *Comparative effectiveness of intra-articular therapies in knee osteoarthritis: an updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials*. **Ann Med Surg (Lond)**, 86(1): 361–372.
5. Singh A., et al. (2021). *Intra-articular platelet-rich plasma vs. corticosteroid injections for symptomatic management of knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. **BMC Musculoskelet Disord**, 22(1):550.
6. Gupta A., et al. (2022). *Platelet-rich plasma versus hyaluronic acid in knee osteoarthritis: a systematic review and meta-analysis*. **J Arthroplasty**, 37(4):829-842.
7. Wang Y., et al. (2022). *Effect of platelet-rich plasma on meniscus repair surgery: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials*. **Medicine (Baltimore)**, 101(39):e31068.

8. Gorbachova M., et al. (2017). *Effect of intra-articular triamcinolone vs saline on knee cartilage volume and pain in knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial*. **JAMA**, 317(19):1967-1975.
9. Halpern B. (2024). *Platelet-Rich Plasma for Osteoarthritis – Sports Medicine Update*. **American Orthopaedic Society for Sports Medicine (AOSSM) publication**.
10. Yale Medicine. (2021). *Platelet-Rich Plasma (PRP) Injections in Sports – Fact Sheet*. **Yale Medicine**.