

REVIEW ARTICLE

## Regenerative Therapies in Tendinopathy: PRP, Stem Cells, and Beyond

Dr Aamez Raja, Department of Orthopaedics, Katihar Medical College And Hospital,

[aamez.raja80@gmail.com](mailto:aamez.raja80@gmail.com)

### Abstract

Millions of people worldwide suffer from tendinopathy, which poses a serious clinical problem and contributes significantly to morbidity in both general and sporty populations. Interest in regenerative medicine techniques has grown as a result of the poor long-term effectiveness of traditional conservative therapies. With an emphasis on platelet-rich plasma (PRP), mesenchymal stem cell therapy, and new biological treatments, this review looks at the state of regenerative therapeutics for tendinopathy. We examine these therapy approaches' mechanisms of action, clinical evidence, pathophysiology justification, and potential future possibilities. Despite encouraging reports, clinical translation remains difficult due to variations in patient selection, treatment procedures, and outcome metrics. This review summarises the available data and offers suggestions for future lines of inquiry in the management of regenerated tendinopathy.

**Keywords:** Tendinopathy, platelet-rich plasma, mesenchymal stem cells, regenerative medicine, tendon healing, biological therapy

### INTRODUCTION

About 30% of people over 30 suffer from tendinopathy, which is a group of tendon illnesses marked by discomfort, swelling, and functional impairment (Kaux & Crielaard, 2013). The Achilles

tendon, lateral epicondyle, rotator cuff, and patellar tendon are among the common sites, and the condition places a heavy burden on healthcare systems around the world. Rest, physical therapy, anti-inflammatory drugs, and corticosteroid injections are examples of traditional therapeutic techniques that frequently offer short-term respite but do not address the underlying pathophysiology of tendon degeneration (Cook & Purdam, 2009).

Tendon matrix deterioration, neovascularisation, and neural ingrowth are the results of a complex interaction between mechanical, vascular, and biological variables in the pathophysiology of tendinopathy. According to histology, tendinopathic tendons show neovascularisation, hypercellularity, collagen disarray, and elevated proteoglycan content without a noticeable inflammatory infiltration (Maffulli et al., 2008). The treatment paradigm has changed as a result of this insight, moving away from anti-inflammatory methods and towards regeneration techniques meant to restore the natural architecture and function of tendons.

Regenerative medicine uses the body's own healing processes to provide viable alternatives. Mesenchymal stem cell (MSC) therapy and platelet-rich plasma (PRP) have become the most popular biological therapies, backed by increasing clinical data and mechanistic knowledge. The effectiveness, safety, and therapeutic applicability of regenerative treatments for tendinopathy are critically examined in this study.

## Pathophysiology of Tendinopathy

Comprehending the pathogenesis of tendinopathy is essential for creating focused regenerative treatments. A degenerative paradigm, which views tendinopathy as a failed healing response rather than an acute inflammatory illness, has essentially supplanted the classic inflammatory model (Cook & Purdam, 2009).

## Molecular Mechanisms

Extracellular matrix (ECM) homeostasis is dysregulated in tendinopathy, resulting in reduced collagen production and elevated matrix metalloproteinase (MMP) expression. Important pathogenic alterations consist of:

1. Changes in collagen: more type III collagen and less type I collagen, which results in worse mechanical qualities
2. Proteoglycan accumulation: The organisation of collagen fibre is disrupted by an increase in glycosaminoglycan content.
3. Cellular alterations: increased apoptosis, phenotypic alterations, and tenocyte proliferation
4. Blood vessel enlargement: Unusual vascular development combined with nerve growth

mediators of inflammation: Prostaglandin, leukotriene, and cytokine levels are elevated even when there is little infiltration of inflammatory cells.

## Mechanical Factors

The development of tendinopathy is significantly influenced by mechanical stress. Through several processes, tendon disease can be caused by both excessive and insufficient usage. While inadequate loading might result in tendon weakness and degeneration, excessive loading may surpass the tendon's adaptive ability (Magnusson et al., 2010).

## **Platelet-Rich Plasma (PRP) Therapy**

### **Mechanism of Action**

PRP is made up of concentrated platelets that are 2–8 times higher than normal levels and are full of growth factors and bioactive proteins that are vital for tissue repair. Alpha-granule contents, such as platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), are released by activated platelets.

- TGF- $\beta$ , or transforming growth factor- $\beta$

Insulin-like growth factor-1 (IGF-1) and vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF)

- FGF, or fibroblast growth factor

According to theory, these elements address the pathophysiological deficiencies in tendinopathy by promoting angiogenesis, cell proliferation, and ECM production (Andia & Maffulli, 2013).

### **Classification and Preparation**

The leukocyte composition, activation techniques, and platelet concentration of PRP preparations differ greatly. Standardising PRP characterisation is aided by the PAW (Platelet, Activation, White Blood Cell) categorisation system:

- P1 and P2 (low and high platelet concentrations, respectively)

- A+ (active) versus A- (not activated)

- Low WBC (W1) against high WBC (W2)

Clinical results vary due to the varied products produced by different preparation techniques (single versus double centrifugation, different commercial systems) (Magalon et al., 2014).

### **Clinical Evidence**

#### **Lateral Epicondylitis**

PRP has been tested in several randomised controlled trials (RCTs) for lateral epicondylitis, with largely encouraging findings. Peerbooms et al. (2010) showed that PRP produced better results during a 1-year follow-up than corticosteroid injection. PRP offers superior long-term pain relief and functional improvement over corticosteroid injections, according to a comprehensive analysis by Arirachakaran et al. (2016).

#### **Tendinopathy of the Achilles**

PRP has conflicting evidence in Achilles tendinopathy. Some research (de Vos et al., 2010) claim notable improvements in function and pain, while other studies (de Jonge et al., 2011) show little difference over a placebo. When paired with eccentric exercise, a recent meta-analysis by Xu et al. (2017) revealed moderate improvements for chronic Achilles tendinopathy.

#### **Patellar Tendinopathy**

There isn't much solid data supporting PRP in patellar tendinopathy. Although sample sizes are still modest, Vetrano et al. (2013) demonstrated better results with PRP than concentrated extracorporeal shock wave treatment.

### **Tendinopathy of the Rotator Cuff**

There is potential for using PRP to treat rotator cuff problems, especially partial-thickness tears. Compared to exercise treatment alone, Kesikburun et al. (2013) showed notable improvements in both function and pain. Results for full-thickness tears, however, continue to be uneven..

### **Safety Profile**

PRP has very little side effects and an outstanding safety profile. Temporary injection site soreness is a common side effect that usually goes away in 48 to 72 hours. Although these consequences are uncommon with appropriate practice, theoretical dangers include infection and nerve damage (Andia & Maffulli, 2013).

### **Limitations and Controversies**

Despite growing clinical use, several limitations challenge PRP therapy:

1. **Lack of standardization:** Heterogeneous preparation methods and protocols
2. **Variable quality control:** Inconsistent platelet counts and growth factor concentrations
3. **Optimal timing:** Uncertainty regarding injection frequency and timing

4. **Patient selection:** Limited understanding of which patients benefit most
5. **Placebo effects:** Difficulty in creating appropriate control groups in clinical trials

## **Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapy**

### **Biological Rationale**

Multipotent stromal cells known as mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs) have the ability to transform into a variety of mesenchymal tissues, such as fat, cartilage, bone, and tendons. MSCs have therapeutic potential through paracrine signalling, immunomodulation, and anti-inflammatory properties in addition to their capacity for differentiation (Caplan, 2017).

### **Sources and Characteristics**

MSCs can be harvested from multiple sources, each with distinct characteristics:

#### **Bone Marrow-Derived MSCs (BM-MSCs)**

- **Advantages:** Well-characterized, established protocols, strong evidence base
- **Disadvantages:** Invasive harvest, decreased potency with age, lower yield

#### **Adipose-Derived MSCs (AD-MSCs)**

- **Advantages:** Abundant source, minimally invasive harvest, higher yield
- **Disadvantages:** Potential for adipogenic differentiation, less tenogenic potential

#### **Tendon-Derived MSCs (T-MSCs)**

- **Advantages:** Tissue-specific origin, enhanced tenogenic potential
- **Disadvantages:** Limited availability, invasive harvest from healthy tendon

### **Umbilical Cord MSCs (UC-MSCs)**

- **Advantages:** Allogeneic source, high proliferation rate, strong anti-inflammatory properties
- **Disadvantages:** Regulatory challenges, immunogenicity concerns

### **Mechanisms of Action**

MSC treatment for tendinopathy works in a number of ways:

1. Direct differentiation: In the right circumstances, MSCs can develop into tenocytes.
2. Paracrine effects: Extracellular vesicles, cytokines, and growth factors are secreted.
3. Immunomodulation: promoting tissue healing and inhibiting inflammatory reactions.
4. Preventing local tenocytes from dying: anti-apoptotic effects.

ECM remodelling: Improved organisation and production of collagen.

### **Preclinical Evidence**

MSC effectiveness in tendon healing models has been repeatedly shown in animal experiments. In rats with Achilles tendon injuries, Uysal et al. (2008) demonstrated enhanced biomechanical characteristics and histological appearance following

treatment with BM-MSCs. Numerous animal models and MSC sources have shown comparable good outcomes (Chamberlain et al., 2007).

### **Clinical Evidence**

Clinical evidence for MSC therapy in tendinopathy remains limited but encouraging:

#### **Achilles Tendinopathy**

Pascual-Garrido et al. (2014) reported a case series of 12 patients with chronic Achilles tendinopathy preserved with BM-MSCs, demonstrating significant enhanced in pain and function at 2-year follow-up.

#### **Lateral Epicondylitis**

Singh et al. (2014) conducted a randomized trial comparing BM-MSCs to PRP in lateral epicondylitis, showing superior outcomes with MSC therapy at 6-month follow-up.

#### **Patellar Tendinopathy**

Limited case reports suggest potential benefits of MSC therapy for patellar tendinopathy, though controlled trials are lacking (Hernigou et al., 2014).

### **Delivery Methods**

MSC delivery methods significantly impact therapeutic outcomes:

1. **Direct injection:** Most common approach, allows targeted delivery
2. **Surgical implantation:** Combined with tendon repair procedures
3. **Scaffold-based delivery:** Enhanced cell retention and guidance

4. **Extracellular vesicle therapy:** Cell-free approach avoiding cellular risks

### Safety Considerations

In clinical settings, MSC treatment exhibits a good safety record. Possible dangers consist of:

- Infection at injection or harvest locations.
- Tumorigenesis (possible danger; no instances in tendon applications have been documented).
- Immune responses, especially when using allogeneic sources

The development of ectopic tissue.

There is still a lack of long-term safety evidence, thus ongoing monitoring is required.

### Emerging Regenerative Therapies

#### Extracellular Vesicles (EVs)

Exosomes and microvesicles are examples of extracellular vesicles, which are a cell-free therapeutic strategy. Bioactive substances (proteins, lipids, and nucleic acids) that facilitate tissue healing and intercellular communication are carried by EVs. EV is effective in tendon repair, according to preclinical research. Its possible benefits include:

- Less immunogenicity than cellular treatments.
- Improved storage stability.
- Standardisable product.
- Less regulatory burden.

Clinical uses are still in their infancy (Zhang et al., 2020).

### Gene Therapy

Gene therapy advances aim to augment tendon healing by rescuing therapeutic genes to target tissues. Strategies include:

1. **Growth factor gene delivery:** BMP, PDGF, IGF-1 overexpression
2. **Transcription factor modulation:** Scleraxis and Mohawk upregulation
3. **Anti-inflammatory gene therapy:** IL-1 receptor antagonist delivery
4. **Matrix remodeling:** MMP inhibition or collagen enhancement

While confirming in preclinical models, clinical translation faces significant regulatory and technical challenges (Lui et al., 2011).

### Tissue Engineering

Tissue engineering combines cells, scaffolds, and bioactive factors to regenerate functional tendon tissue. Key components include:

#### Scaffolds

- **Natural materials:** Collagen, silk, decellularized tendons
- **Synthetic materials:** PLA, PGA, PLGA polymers
- **Composite materials:** Combining natural and synthetic components

### Bioreactors



Mechanical stimulation during tissue culture enhances tendon-like tissue formation, mimicking physiological loading conditions.

### 3D Bioprinting

Emerging technology allowing precise spatial arrangement of cells and materials for tendon reconstruction (Lui et al., 2020).

### Combination Therapies

Combining regenerative approaches may enhance therapeutic outcomes:

1. **PRP + MSCs:** Synergistic effects on tendon healing
2. **Growth factors + scaffolds:** Enhanced delivery and retention
3. **Cell therapy + mechanical stimulation:** Optimized tissue development
4. **Biologics + rehabilitation:** Comprehensive treatment approach

### Clinical Considerations and Guidelines

#### Patient Selection

Optimal patient selection remains challenging given limited predictive factors. Considerations include:

- **Tendinopathy severity:** Chronic cases may benefit more from regenerative approaches
- **Previous treatments:** Failed conservative management indicates candidacy
- **Patient age:** Younger patients may have better regenerative potential

- **Activity level:** Athletes may justify more aggressive interventions
- **Comorbidities:** Diabetes, smoking may impair healing

### Treatment Protocols

Standardized protocols are lacking, but emerging consensus includes:

1. **Pre-treatment preparation:** Activity modification, pain management
2. **Injection technique:** Image-guided placement for accuracy
3. **Post-treatment care:** Graduated activity progression, rehabilitation
4. **Follow-up monitoring:** Serial assessments of pain, function, imaging

### Outcome Measures

Standardized outcome measures facilitate comparison across studies:

- **Patient-reported outcomes:** VISA scores, DASH, AOFAS
- **Objective measures:** Ultrasound, MRI, biomechanical testing
- **Activity-specific assessments:** Return to sport, work activities
- **Long-term follow-up:** Durability of treatment effects

### Future Directions and Research Priorities

#### Mechanistic Understanding

To clarify the exact processes of regenerative therapy in tendinopathy, more investigation is required. Important topics include:

- Dose-response interactions.
- Patient-specific factors impacting results.
- Optimal scheduling of therapies.
- Prolonged impacts on the form and function of tendons

#### Attempts at Standardisation

Collaboration between the industry and the government is crucial for:

Standardised procedures for preparation; quality assurance methods; creation of biomarkers; and harmonisation of clinical trial designs

#### Economic Factors

It is necessary to assess the cost-effectiveness of regenerative treatments by taking into account:

Expenses of direct treatment; indirect expenses (missed work, decreased productivity); comparison with surgical options; long-term use of healthcare; and quality-adjusted life years (QALYs)

Successful regeneration therapies should lower long-term healthcare burden through better results and fewer repeat procedures, even if initial costs may be greater.

#### REFERENCES

1. Andia, I., & Maffulli, N. (2013). Platelet-rich plasma for managing pain and inflammation in

#### CONCLUSION

Regenerative treatments, which provide biological remedies for a complicated pathological process, mark a paradigm shift in the treatment of tendinopathy. Although ideal procedures have not yet been established, PRP treatment has shown clinical benefit in treating a variety of tendinopathies. MSC treatment has potential, but in order to prove its effectiveness and safety, bigger, well planned clinical trials are needed. Future prospects are high thanks to emerging treatments including tissue engineering, gene therapy, and extracellular vesicles.

Standardisation of preparation techniques, treatment protocol optimisation, patient population selection, and long-term safety monitoring are among the main obstacles. Establishing evidence-based standards requires concerted efforts due to the diversity of present techniques.

The field is at a turning point where larger, more thorough studies are needed to build on early clinical results in order to establish the function of regenerative treatments in the management of tendinopathy. These biological techniques have the potential to greatly improve outcomes for the millions of individuals with chronic tendinopathy globally with more research and development.

osteoarthritis. *Nature Reviews Rheumatology*, 9(12), 721-730.



2. Arirachakaran, A., Sukthuyat, A., Sisayanarane, T., Laoratanavoraphong, S., Kanchanatawan, W., & Kongtharvonskul, J. (2016). Platelet-rich plasma versus autologous blood versus steroid injection in lateral epicondylitis: systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Journal of Orthopaedics and Traumatology*, 17(2), 101-112.
3. Caplan, A. I. (2017). Mesenchymal stem cells: time to change the name! *Stem Cells Translational Medicine*, 6(6), 1445-1451.
4. Chamberlain, G., Fox, J., Ashton, B., & Middleton, J. (2007). Concise review: mesenchymal stem cells: their phenotype, differentiation capacity, immunological features, and potential for homing. *Stem Cells*, 25(11), 2739-2749.
5. Cook, J. L., & Purdam, C. R. (2009). Is tendon pathology a continuum? A pathology model to explain the clinical presentation of load-induced tendinopathy. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 43(6), 409-416.
6. de Jonge, S., de Vos, R. J., Weir, A., van Schie, H. T., Bierma-Zeinstra, S. M., Verhaar, J. A., ... & Tol, J. L. (2011). One-year follow-up of platelet-rich plasma treatment in chronic Achilles tendinopathy: a double-blind randomized placebo-controlled trial. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 39(8), 1623-1629.
7. de Vos, R. J., Weir, A., van Schie, H. T., Bierma-Zeinstra, S. M., Verhaar, J. A., Weinans, H., & Tol, J. L. (2010). Platelet-rich plasma injection for chronic Achilles tendinopathy: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*, 303(2), 144-149.
8. Hernigou, P., Merouse, G., Duffiet, P., Chevalier, N., & Rouard, H. (2014). Reduced levels of mesenchymal stem cells at the sites of fracture nonunion. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*, 96(7), 582-588.
9. Kaux, J. F., & Crielaard, J. M. (2013). Platelet-rich plasma application in the management of chronic tendinopathies. *Acta Orthopaedica Belgica*, 79(1), 10-15.
10. Kesikburun, S., Tan, A. K., Yılmaz, B., Yaşar, E., & Yazıcıoğlu, K. (2013). Platelet-rich plasma injections in the treatment of chronic rotator cuff tendinopathy: a randomized controlled trial with 1-year follow-up. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 41(11), 2609-2616.
11. Liu, H., Lan, L., Aouad, P., Throningsson, G., Malmström, A., Delbro, D. S., & Liu, J. (2020). 3D bioprinting of musculoskeletal tissues. *Materials Today Bio*, 6, 100044.
12. Lui, P. P., Maffulli, N., Rolf, C., & Smith, R. K. (2011). What are the validated animal models for tendinopathy? *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 21(1), 3-17.
13. Maffulli, N., Longo, U. G., & Denaro, V. (2008). Novel approaches for the management of tendinopathy. *Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*, 90(11), 2717-2724.
14. Magalon, J., Bausset, O., Serratrice, N., Giraudo, L., Aboudou, H., Veran, J., ... & Sabatier, F. (2014). Characterization and comparison of 5 platelet-rich plasma preparations in a single-donor model. *Arthroscopy*, 30(5), 629-638.
15. Magnusson, S. P., Langberg, H., & Kjaer, M. (2010). The pathogenesis of tendinopathy:

- balancing the response to loading. *Nature Reviews Rheumatology*, 6(5), 262-268.
16. Pascual-Garrido, C., Rolón, A., & Makino, A. (2014). Treatment of chronic patellar tendinopathy with autologous bone marrow stem cells: a 5-year-followup. *Stem Cells International*, 2014, 248392.
17. Peerbooms, J. C., Sluimer, J., Bruijn, D. J., & Gosens, T. (2010). Positive effect of an autologous platelet concentrate in lateral epicondylitis in a double-blind randomized controlled trial: platelet-rich plasma versus corticosteroid injection with a 1-year follow-up. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 38(2), 255-262.
18. Singh, A., Gangwar, D. S., & Singh, S. (2014). Bone marrow injection: a novel treatment for tennis elbow. *Journal of Natural Science, Biology and Medicine*, 5(2), 389-391.
19. Uysal, C. A., Tobita, M., Hyakusoku, H., & Mizuno, H. (2008). Adipose-derived stem cells enhance primary tendon repair: biomechanical and immunohistochemical evaluation. *Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery*, 65(12), 1712-1719.
20. Vetrano, M., Castorina, A., Vulpiani, M. C., Baldini, R., Pavan, A., & Ferretti, A. (2013). Platelet-rich plasma versus focused shock waves in the treatment of jumper's knee in athletes. *American Journal of Sports Medicine*, 41(4), 795-803.
21. Xu, Y., Murrell, G. A., & Gao, J. (2017). Platelet-rich plasma treatment for chronic Achilles tendinopathy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine*, 5(3), 2325967117693142.
22. Zhang, S., Chu, W. C., Lai, R. C., Lim, S. K., Hui, J. H., & Toh, W. S. (2016). Exosomes derived from human embryonic mesenchymal stem cells promote osteochondral regeneration. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage*, 24(12), 2135-2140.