Comparative Analysis of Health Care Use and Costs for Orthobiologic versus Surgical Treatments in Economically High-Impact Knee Conditions

Trevor A. Lentz[1,2,3]

Joshua Burrows, MS[4]

Amanda Brucker, PhD[4]

A. Ian Wong, MD, PhD[2,5]

Laura Qualls[2]

Rekha Divakaran, PharmD[2]

Chris Centeno[6]

Tim Suther

Laine Thomas, PhD[2,4]

[1]Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA

[2]Duke Clinical Research Institute, Durham, North Carolina, USA

[3]Duke-Margolis Institute for Health Policy, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA

[4]Duke Department of Biostatistics and Bioinformatics, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA

[5]Duke Department of Medicine, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, USA

[6]Regenexx, Des Moines, Iowa, US

ABSTRACT

Background

Total knee arthroplasty (TKA), partial knee arthroplasty (pKA), and arthroscopic meniscectomy are among the most commonly performed procedures for knee osteoarthritis and degenerative meniscal tears in the United States, yet concerns persist regarding overuse, variable clinical benefit, and high costs. Orthobiologic treatments, including platelet-rich plasma (PRP) and bone marrow aspirate concentrate (BMAC), have emerged as less invasive alternatives, but downstream health care resource use (HCRU) and costs associated with these treatments relative to surgery are not well established.

Methods

We conducted a retrospective, observational cohort study using linked commercial insurance claims data and a national orthobiologic treatment registry to compare downstream HCRU and costs following orthobiologic versus surgical treatment of knee conditions. Two comparisons were evaluated separately: (1) PRP versus arthroscopic meniscectomy among patients with degenerative meniscal pathology and minimal osteoarthritis, and (2) BMAC with or without PRP versus TKA or pKA among patients with knee osteoarthritis. Eligible procedures occurred between 2016 and 2023. Propensity score matching was used to balance demographic and clinical confounders. Co-primary outcomes were total health care costs at 12 and 24 months post-procedure, with exploratory analyses at 36 and 48 months. Costs were estimated using multiple approaches, including Medicare-based estimates, commercial payer estimates, and aggregate allowed amounts. HCRU outcomes included outpatient visits, physical therapy, imaging, opioid use, repeat injections, and subsequent surgery.

Results

After matching, analyses included 167 PRP-treated patients matched to 1,670 meniscectomy patients and 165 BMAC/PRP-treated patients matched to 1,650 TKA/pKA patients, with good balance across

pre-specified confounders. Progression to subsequent surgery after orthobiologic treatment was rare at 12 and 24 months in both cohorts. Compared with TKA/pKA, BMAC/PRP was associated with lower overall health care use for several services, including outpatient visits, physical therapy, knee radiographs, and opioid prescriptions, although magnetic resonance imaging was more frequent following orthobiologic treatment. Total costs at 12 and 24 months were consistently higher for TKA/pKA than for BMAC/PRP across all costing methods. In the PRP versus meniscectomy comparison, differences in health care use were modest, and costs were similar or lower for PRP depending on the costing approach. Exploratory analyses through 48 months showed similar patterns, with persistently low rates of subsequent surgery after orthobiologic treatment and generally higher cumulative costs following surgical intervention.

Conclusions

In this real-world, propensity-matched analysis of commercially insured patients, orthobiologic treatments with PRP or BMAC were associated with similar or lower downstream health care costs compared with commonly performed surgical alternatives for selected patients with degenerative meniscal tears or knee osteoarthritis. Progression to surgery following orthobiologic treatment was uncommon through two years and remained low in longer-term exploratory analyses. These findings support the consideration of orthobiologic therapies as potentially lower-cost alternatives to surgery for appropriately selected patients and may inform shared decision-making and payer policy.

BACKGROUND

Total knee arthroplasty (TKA) and arthroscopic meniscectomy are among the most common surgical procedures for knee pathology in the United States.[4,27,36,38,40] Although both procedures remain widely accepted for managing advanced osteoarthritis and meniscal tears, respectively, their use has come under increasing scrutiny.[1,21,34,35] Concerns are focused on the appropriateness and overuse of these interventions, particularly when less invasive options have not been fully exhausted or where clinical benefit may be limited. Research indicates that up to one-third of total knee arthroplasty (TKA) procedures may be unnecessary[34], and nearly 25% of patients report bothersome or high-impact chronic pain following surgery[14]. For people with degenerative meniscal tears, meniscectomy has been shown to be no more beneficial than sham surgery[37] or exercise[3,30]. These findings have prompted calls for a more judicious approach to surgical intervention for many degenerative joint conditions, particularly as efforts intensify to reduce musculoskeletal care costs.

Surgical procedures such as TKA and meniscectomy carry inherent risks, including infection, thromboembolic events, and prolonged recovery, and impose substantial financial burdens on patients and payers.[17,39,41] As a result, there is increasing interest in less costly, nonsurgical alternatives that may offer symptom relief with reduced risk. Orthobiologic therapies are one such option. Two types of orthobiologics, platelet-rich plasma (PRP) and bone marrow aspirate concentrate (BMAC), have demonstrated strong potential for the safe and effective treatment of various musculoskeletal conditions.[2,7,10,18,19,29] Platelets and cells concentrated in PRP and BMAC release cytokines, exosomes, and growth factors that are believed to initiate intercellular signaling and promote tissue repair.[9,23] BMAC contains mesenchymal stem cells (MSCs), hematopoietic cells, and anti-inflammatory cytokines which support skeletal tissue healing.[16] As multipotent cells, MSCs have the capacity to differentiate into cartilage and bone, contributing to cartilage regeneration and subchondral bone remodeling.[5,22,43]

Although PRP and BMAC are most commonly used to treat cartilage-related and meniscal conditions, their overall use in managing musculoskeletal conditions remains low (5.9 to 7.9 per 1000 patients).[42] Preliminary evidence suggests these therapies can improve pain and function in patients with degenerative meniscal pathology and osteoarthritis, though their long-term impact on disease progression and health care use remains unclear.[2,10–12] Orthobiologic treatments have been proposed as alternatives to surgery for some conditions; however, few studies have directly compared orthobiologic therapies with surgical intervention, with most comparisons instead limited to other non-surgical treatments.[8,15,20,25,32]

The primary value proposition of orthobiologic treatment is its potential to offer a less costly and lower risk alternative to surgery for degenerative joint conditions, but this hypothesis has not been rigorously tested. Although orthobiologic treatment may offer an effective alternative to surgery for some conditions, it may also increase downstream costs related to repeat injections, additional imaging, or eventual surgical intervention, raising concerns about overall economic feasibility. As payer policies evolve and musculoskeletal care costs continue to rise, understanding how orthobiologics perform from a cost and health care use standpoint relative to surgery is essential for informed decision-making.

This study compares downstream health care use and costs among patients with knee osteoarthritis and/or degenerative meniscal tears that meet diagnostic criteria for orthopedic surgery or who are otherwise functionally disabled and elect to undergo either BMAC/PRP injection or surgical intervention (arthroplasty or meniscectomy, respectively). Co-primary endpoints are 12 and 24 months with exploratory analyses at 36- and 48-months post procedure. By analyzing real-world data, we aim to understand if PRP and BMAC procedures serve as a less costly alternative to surgery or contribute to increased health care burden. These insights are critical for guiding clinical decision-making, shaping payer coverage policies, and reducing low-value care in musculoskeletal health.

METHODS

Study design and population

This is a retrospective, observational study using health care billing and claims data to compare cost and resource utilization outcomes after knee BMAC/PRP injection or knee surgery. Two study populations were evaluated separately: those undergoing 1) PRP injection versus meniscectomy in patients eligible for both; and 2) autologous BMAC injection (with or without PRP) versus TKA or partial knee arthroplasty (pKA) for management of knee osteoarthritis. All procedures occurred between 2016 and 2023. All patients were enrolled in a commercial health insurance plan.

Data sources

Health care use including facility, profession and pharmacy claims and financial fields for all associated claims data was provided by a nationwide commercial insurance provider, through their research data platform. Information on BMAC and PRP procedures was extracted from the Regenexx patient registry and included procedure date, joint treated, location treated and type of injection. Other than these specific procedural variables, all data including covariates and outcomes were obtained consistently from the commercial claims data source for all comparator arms. The procedural information from Regenexx was linked to the commercial claims data base using a privacy-preserving, token-based method performed by Datavant, Inc. No identifiable information, except dates of health care services, was shared across organizations, and the combined analytic dataset was de-identified by expert determination. Analyses were conducted within a secure cloud-based analytic enclave that prevents data exfiltration; only privacy-screened summary results are permitted to leave the environment. This study was approved by the Duke University IRB Pro00116431.

Eligibility criteria

Procedures were eligible if 1) they received an eligible orthobiologic treatment of the knee (BMAC, PRP, or BMAC plus PRP; Regenexx, Des Moines, IA) or underwent unilateral surgery (TKA, pKA, meniscectomy).; 2) procedure occurs between 2016 and 2023; 3) patient was age 18 years or older at the time of the procedure; 4) the patient had commercial coverage from 12 months prior to

procedure to at least 12 months after procedure; 5) patient had at least one outpatient encounter (claim) in the 12 months prior to the procedure and at least one outpatient encounter (claim) in the 12 months after the procedure; and 6) procedure was elective and preceded by a relevant clinical diagnosis (Appendix A). Surgical CPT codes were used to identify procedures (Appendix B). Complicated cases involving multiple, distinct types of surgery on the same encounter were not included (e.g. quadriceps repair and TKA)

Exclusion criteria were: 1) patients who had multiple birthdates or sexes in the commercial payer data; 2) patients with ineligible diagnoses (Appendix C), e.g., inflammatory syndrome diagnosis, infectious arthropathies, or bone cancer in the 12 months prior to the procedure; 3) previous knee surgery in the 12 months prior to the procedure, or 4) evidence of receiving a Monoclonal Antibody (MAb) drug in the three months prior to the procedure. We excluded patients with evidence of corticosteroids (oral or injection) within 2 months prior to the procedure, as this is contra-indicated for either PRP or BMAC/PRP. If there were multiple eligible procedures for a patient, we took the first that met the eligibility criteria.

Cohorts and comparators

The comparators of interest were: (1) TKA/pKA versus BMAC with or without PRP (BMAC/PRP) in patients who would have been a good candidate for both TKA/pKA and BMAC/PRP (2) Meniscectomy versus PRP in patients who would have been a good candidate for both meniscectomy and PRP. Details of BMAC/PRP and PRP treatments, including their preparation and administration, are provided elsewhere.[6,13] In practice, whether a patient is a good candidate for these procedures is based on objective criteria as well as subjective judgement. Specifically, each orthobiologic procedure (BMAC/PRP or PRP) predominantly corresponds to an alternative surgical procedure that could have theoretically been chosen instead. PRP injections are most commonly used for treatment of meniscal tears (meniscectomy comparator), while autologous BMAC/PRP is typically used for treatment of osteoarthritis (TKA/pKA comparator).

Based on this contextual information, we used two strategies to define comparable cohorts and minimize confounding. First, we applied relevant inclusion/exclusion criteria. To be included in the comparison of TKA/pKA versus BMAC/PRP, patients had to meet study eligibility criteria and have a knee osteoarthritis diagnosis (Appendix B) in the 12 months prior to procedure. This aligns with the expectation that osteoarthritis plus BMAC, rather than PRP alone, are minimally necessary for potential comparability to TKA/PKA. To be included in the meniscectomy surgery versus PRP cohort, patients had to meet study eligibility criteria and have no evidence of major osteoarthritis defined as ≤ 1 visit for osteoarthritis in the 12 months prior to procedure (Appendix B). Second, we used propensity score matching to refine comparability (as described below).

Confounders

We pre-specified a list of confounders that were thought to directly impact outcomes or potentially be a surrogate for direct causal factors. For confounders that involve diagnosis or procedures codes, we included all such in the 12-month period prior to the date of the index procedure (excluding the date of the index procedure itself). Demographic information included age, sex, and geographic region. Health related characteristics included injury to the treated knee, orthopedic diagnoses, other musculoskeletal conditions not exclusive to the treated knee, comorbidities, pain medication prescriptions, intervention history, health seeking behavior, and other severity proxies (e.g., number of outpatient encounters due to OA). We extracted as many potential covariates as possible and included them in descriptive tables. Confounders were pre-specified, prior to seeing any analysis of outcome data, based on the definition of confounding. That is, we prioritized variables that were different between the treatment groups and had a plausible impact on post-procedural cost outcomes (list in Appendix D). Variables that were rare, already well-balanced, or highly correlated with an included variable were not included in the set of confounders, due to the finite sample size. Diagnostic procedures, like X-ray an MRI, were part of preoperative work up for surgery and diagnoses required for surgical reimbursement (meniscal for meniscectomy) were almost perfectly

correlated with surgery. These variables were bundled with the choice of surgery (reserves causation) and were not treated as confounders.

Health care resource use (HCRU)

We measured HCRU by interactions with the healthcare system, i.e. claims for healthcare encounters in the large commercial data (cumulative count data where appropriate). HCRU was captured longitudinally from the day after the procedure end date until 12, 24, 36, and 48 months after the procedure start date. Encounter types included: outpatient (non-physical therapy) visits, outpatient physical therapy, radiology, surgical procedures (on the same knee), subsequent BMAC or PRP procedures, emergency or inpatient care, and opioid medications. Subsequent HCRU encounters were linked to the index procedure using relevant ICD-10 codes. Details of HCRU attribution and episode definitions are in Appendix E.

Cost outcomes

Co-primary outcomes were costs 12- and 24-months post-procedure. Due to low sample size of patients with extended commercial payer coverage, we assessed cost outcomes out to 36- and 48-months post-procedure as an exploratory aim. We obtained cost estimates for each type of health encounter under two payment models, Medicare and private payer. Medicare costs were estimated using previously published values from external sources (See Appendix F for a table of costs and associated references). To estimate private payer costs, we applied three methods. First, Medicare-based costs were multiplied by 2, which is an approximate conversion of Medicare to private payer costs based on an average of multipliers across different cost settings.[26] Second, we used the available private payer cost data and computed average allowed amounts per episode of care (day for outpatient services, and full episode of care for inpatient/emergency). Each HCRU was assigned a cost value, based on this average.

Total aggregate costs were a sum of all HCRU interactions multiplied by their associated cost (medicare or private payer estimates), within the discrete time frame of interest. The cost of the initial

procedure was also estimated and included in the sum. When calculating Medicare costs, reimbursement for inpatient procedures is typically based on a bundled payment program (lump sum that covers all related costs for 90 days) rather than fee for service (or individual service costs). This impacted the published estimates of costs for TKA/pKA which is frequently an inpatient service. The literature on TKA/pKA reports a bundled payment. Therefore, we used that bundled payment amount for the cost of TKA/pKA (in the Medicare framework) and did not accrue any additional costs until after 90 days, when costing TKA/pKA. Overlapping records of identical visit types were treated as a single health care use (and counted towards more expensive/acute visit type) and all applied costs were summed; e.g. two outpatient visits on same day counted once towards the tally of outpatient visit HCRU type, and the associated cost of this single tally was the sum of any costs at either visit. A lack of utilization data was treated as zero (0) utilization and thus attributed $0 in costs.

A final private-payer method did not assign a fixed cost to services but summed all eligible costs of those patients who were compared in the matched analysis. This last approach introduced some outlying costs that appeared likely to be data errors. We therefore added a truncated version of this approach by truncating the costs at the 5th and 95th percentile prior to making comparisons.

Statistical analysis

Descriptive data were reported overall and separately for the TKA/pKA surgical cohort and meniscectomy surgical cohort, including frequency counts and percentages for categorical variables and mean, standard deviation, median, interquartile range, minimum and maximum for continuous variables. We developed propensity score models and propensity scores for the purpose of creating comparability between those receiving BMAC/PRP versus surgical procedures. We developed two separate propensity models for the two treatment comparisons: PRP versus meniscectomy and BMAC (with or without PRP) versus TKA/pKA. All comparative analysis were conducted separately for the TKA/pKA and meniscectomy surgical cohorts.

To estimate the probability of receiving orthobiologic treatment, we fit a logistic regression model for all individuals in the comparison set. For each patient, the linear predictor ($X*\beta$) was estimated by applying the estimated coefficients from the propensity score model to their individual covariates. We conducted 1:10 greedy matching with respect to the linear predictor, beginning with each patient receiving orthobiologic treatment and seeking 10 matching surgical patients within a caliper of 0.20 times the standard deviation of $X*\beta$. Continuous covariates were assessed for non-linearity using restricted cubic splines if any imbalance suggested model mis-specification.

To evaluate the adequacy of the treatment selection model, baseline characteristics of each group were compared following matching. For each pre-specified confounder, absolute standardized mean differences (ASMDs) were calculated and visualized using standard ASMD plots. ASMDs below 0.10 indicate good balance and below 0.20 moderate balance.

At each timepoint we described HCRU outcomes between treatment comparator groups in the propensity matched population. P-values are included for the comparison of HCRU outcomes, but our purpose was primary descriptive and not hypothesis driven. Finally, we compared aggregate costs at the co-primary (12 and 24 months) and exploratory 36- and 48-months endpoints between treatment comparator groups in the propensity matched population. The distribution of cost across patients was reported by comparator group and the difference in mean costs computed along with a 95% confidence interval for the difference.

Due to requirements for privacy protection, cell counts less than 11 were suppressed and are reported as <11. To overcome the limitation of cell suppression, we removed the requirement for continuous coverage, at least one outpatient claim, and a relevant orthopedic diagnosis in the 12 months prior to the procedure. This doubled the sample size of Regenexx patients and allowed specific counts of some rare events to be unmasked. However, without detailed medical history it was not possible to establish comparability between these patients and a particular surgery. We therefore view this as exploratory.

RESULTS

After applying eligibility criteria and prior to matching, we identified 167 patients that received PRP and met criteria for comparability to meniscectomy, along with 116,473 patients that underwent meniscectomy, and 185 patients that received BMAC/PRP injection and met criteria for comparability to TKA/pKA, along with 97,327 patients that underwent TKA/pKA. (Table 1, Appendix H & I). After matching, the sample included 167 patients that received PRP injection matched to 1670 patients that underwent meniscectomy and 165 patients that received BMAC/PRP matched to 1650 patients that underwent TKA/pKA. All PRP patients were successfully matched with 10 meniscectomy patients, whereas 20 BMAC/PRP patients did not have comparable matches among TKA/pKA and were excluded by the matching process.

In both comparison cohorts, pre-specified confounders were well-balanced by matching (ASMDs <0.10; Table 2 and Table 3). The full set of measured variables are reported in Appendix D and were also moderately balanced (ASMDs<0.20), with the exception of variables that were expected to be bundled with surgery (required for pre-op or for reimbursement) and therefore not excluded from the set of confounders a-priori.

Health care use

BMAC with or without PRP versus TKA/pKA

After BMAC/PRP, the rates of post-procedure TKA/pKA were below the cell suppression limit of <11 events at 12 and 24 months among those continuously enrolled during those follow-up timeframes (Table 4 & 5). Rates of post-procedure BMAC/PRP or PRP re-injection, i.e., booster treatments on the same knee, were 8.5% at 12 months and 14.9% at 24 months. We observed lower rates (± SD) of outpatient visits (4.6 ± 5.0 vs 7.2 ± 7.5, p<0.001), physical therapy visits (10.1 ± 13.9 vs 15.9 ± 14.8, p<0.001), knee x-ray (15% vs 94%, p<0.001), and opioid use (35% vs 44%, p=0.02) among those receiving BMAC/PRP versus TKA/pKA, but a higher rate of MRI of the lower joints (13% vs 4.3%, p<0.001) at 12 months. Rates of outpatient visits (7.6 ± 6.8 vs 10.9 ± 10.6, p<0.001), physical therapy

visits (16.6 ± 23.4 vs 17.9 ± 17.9, p=0.003) and knee x-ray (28% vs 96%, p<0.001) were also lower among those receiving BMAC/PRP at 24 months, but use of MRI was lower (23% vs 7.7%, p<0.001) among those undergoing TKA/pKA. Rates of all other types of health care use were not different between groups.

PRP versus Meniscectomy

Rates of meniscectomy following PRP were below the cell suppression limit of <11 events at 12 and 24 months (Tables 6 & 7). Rates of post-procedure BMAC/PRP or PRP re-injection on the same knee, i.e., booster treatment, were 10% at 12 months and 12% at 24 months. Number of physical therapy visits was lower following PRP compared to meniscectomy (6.5 ± 14.4 vs 7.0 ± 10.4, p=0.003) at 12 months but not at 24 months. Opioid medication use was higher in those who received PRP compared to meniscectomy at 12 months (27% vs 13%) and 24 months (35% vs 20%). We observed no other significant differences in HCRU between the two treatments at 12 months and 24 months.

Costs

BMAC with or without PRP versus TKA/pKA

At 12 months, estimated mean difference (95% CI) between BMAC/PRP versus TKA/pKA ranged from (Q1,Q3) $13,556 (12,394, 14,718) using commercial payer costs, to $39,913 (37,900, 41,926) using external inflated costs (Table 8). Surgery was associated with higher costs using all costing estimates.

At 24 months, estimated mean difference for BMAC/PRP versus TKA/pKA range from $11,796 (9,510, 14,082) using commercial payer costs to $36,727 (32,964, 40,489) using external inflated costs (Table 8), with surgery associated with higher costs using all costing estimates.

PRP versus Meniscectomy

At 12 months, estimated mean difference for PRP versus meniscectomy using Medicare cost estimates was $4 (-672, 681; p=0.991). Meniscectomy was associated with higher costs at 12 months using all other costing estimates. (Table 9).

At 24 months, estimated mean difference for PRP versus meniscectomy using Medicare cost estimates was $484 (-482, 1449; p=0.326). Meniscectomy was associated with higher costs at 12 months using all other costing estimates (Table 9).

Exploratory analyses at 36 and 48 months

Rates of post-procedure TKA/pKA after BMAC/PRP were below the cell suppression limit of <11 events at 36 and 48 months among those continuously enrolled during those follow-up timeframes. Rates of knee x-ray continued to be higher among those undergoing TKA/pKA, while rates of MRI were higher in those receiving BMAC with or without PRP (Appendix J & K). At 36 months, rates of outpatient visits and physical therapy visits were higher in those undergoing meniscectomy, but these rates were not different between treatments at 48 months. At 36 and 48 months, costs were higher among those that underwent TKA/pKA compared to BMAC with or without PRP using all cost estimates (Appendix L).

Rates of post-procedure meniscectomy in the PRP sample were below the cell suppression limit of <11 events at 36 and 48 months among those continuously enrolled during those follow-up timeframes. Rates of all HCRU were similar across treatment groups at 36 and 48 months with the exception of opioid use, which was higher in those receiving PRP at 36 months (Appendix M & N). At 36 months, costs were higher in those receiving meniscectomy using all costing strategies except external (Medicare) costs, which showed no differences between treatments (Appendix O). At 48 months, those who received meniscectomy had higher costs using all costing estimates except the aggregate and truncated aggregate methods, which showed no difference between groups.

Sensitivity Analysis

The sensitivity analysis included n=763 undergoing orthobiologic treatment, n=130,466 undergoing TKA/pKA, and n=241,731 undergoing meniscectomy (Appendix P & Q). Among those who received orthobiologic treatment, rates of subsequent meniscectomy were 2.1% at 24 months and below the cell suppression limit of 11 at 12, 36 and 48 months (Appendix R through U). Among those who received orthobiologic treatment, rates of subsequent TKA/pKA were 1.8%, 4.5%, 6.7%, and 8.5% at 12, 24, 36 and 48 months.

DISCUSSION

This study addresses a clinically relevant question amid increasing interest in effective, less costly interventions for high-impact musculoskeletal conditions. Our findings suggest that BMAC and PRP treatments may represent a less expensive alternative to surgical options for certain patients with osteoarthritis and meniscal tears. Using multiple costing approaches designed to enhance generalizability and test the sensitivity of our findings, BMAC and PRP procedures and associated downstream HCRU were consistently less expensive or comparable to TKA/pKA and meniscectomy. These results challenge assumptions that surgery is inevitable following orthobiologic treatment, as progression to surgery in this cohort was rare across our co-primary endpoints at 12 and 24 months and remained low among those followed for 48 months.

We cannot directly measure cost-effectiveness due to the lack of quality measures. However, low downstream health care use in the BMAC and PRP cohorts likely reflect sustained symptom improvement, an assumption supported by prior clinical trials showing meaningful improvements in pain and function for similar populations.[10] Although we lacked patient-reported outcomes in this analysis, the relatively low rates of follow-up care in both groups may indicate satisfactory outcomes, consistent with evidence that patients often do not seek additional care when treatment is effective.[24,28]

Cost differences were most pronounced when comparing BMAC with or without PRP to arthroplasty, while PRP and meniscectomy showed smaller differences, largely attributable to the lower cost of

meniscectomy relative to TKA/pKA. Indirect costs such as missed work and travel expenses were not captured but cost differences would likely favor BMAC and PRP treatments given the longer recovery associated with surgery, especially TKA/pKA. Adverse events were difficult to quantify due to data suppression for low cell counts, but available data suggest events were low or absent in both groups. Generally, more invasive procedures are associated with higher risk of adverse events, which should also be considered when evaluating the risks and benefits of surgery versus orthobiologic use.

Of the limited prior studies that compare clinical outcomes among patients undergoing orthobiologic versus surgical treatment, very few compare downstream costs of care. This makes our study both unique and challenging to directly compare with other literature. A prior simulation study showed PRP alone was not cost-effective compared to TKA, but assumed all patients progressed to arthroplasty within one year.[33] That assumption is not supported by our data or other longitudinal studies. Pabinger et al.[31] assessed four-year outcomes in a small cohort (n=37) with moderate to severe knee osteoarthritis undergoing BMAC treatment and found sustained improvements in function over 4 years with no participants progressing to arthroplasty during follow-up. Our study helps address a critical gap in the literature by demonstrating that orthobiologic treatments can result in similar or lower downstream costs compared to common surgical alternatives for certain patients with osteoarthritis or meniscal tears.

Several factors should be considered when interpreting the generalizability of our findings. The propensity-matched cohorts were well-balanced across demographic and health-related variables, yet they represent a specific subset of patients, namely those eligible for surgery who elected orthobiologic treatment. Selection bias is possible, as individuals preferring BMAC or PRP treatment over surgery may differ in expectations or other unmeasured characteristics that might lead to better outcomes with orthobiologic treatment. Importantly, we should also note the mean age of patients with meniscal tears (approximately 51 years) and osteoarthritis (approximately 56 years). These sample characteristics suggest our findings apply primarily to management of degenerative meniscal tears rather than injury-related cases of meniscal tear that more commonly occur in younger adults.

Similarly, these findings are most relevant to the management of osteoarthritis in middle-aged adults, a group in which earlier stages of the disease are more common. Although we used proxy measures like intensity of health care use to approximate osteoarthritis severity, direct measures like Kellgren-Lawrence grade were unavailable, limiting our ability to assess applicability of these findings across the full spectrum of disease severity. Our matching process likely produced cohorts that were similar in severity, but we cannot report the exact distribution within each group. In summary, our analytic sample likely reflected populations for which the benefits of surgery are less certain, and this should be considered when determining how to apply these results to clinical practice.

A few other limitations are worth noting. Like all studies using claims data, we had to make assumptions about how documentation used for payment reflects clinical decision-making. Our analysis was further constrained because BMAC and PRP treatments were billed directly to Regenexx rather than through traditional commercial payer claims. Direct billing data included less detailed diagnostic information for each procedure. For this reason, complete diagnostic data associated with each BMAC and PRP treatment was not available. However, Regenexx employs a comprehensive utilization review process to ensure patients meet diagnostic criteria for orthopedic surgery, in this case TKA/pKA or meniscectomy. This provides reasonable assurance that comparison cohorts had similar diagnoses warranting treatment. A final limitation is the small sample available for comparisons beyond 24 months due to changes in health insurance coverage over time. Although trends in costs and health care use appeared consistent through 48 months, these findings should be interpreted cautiously given the limited long-term data.

Conclusion

Our results indicate that BMAC and PRP are associated with lower overall costs compared to TKA/pKA or meniscectomy, respectively, for some individuals whose age or health status makes the benefit of surgery uncertain. In this sample, patients who received BMAC and PRP rarely required subsequent surgery in the 1 to 2 years following orthobiologic treatment, and this rate remained low in

our sensitivity analysis. These insights should inform shared decision-making and payer strategies, especially given the substantial economic burden of musculoskeletal conditions. Further research that incorporates clinical outcomes and indirect costs is needed, but our results underscore the importance of offering orthobiologic treatment as an option in patient-centered care.

Acknowledgements

Funding: This study was sponsored by Regenexx. The sponsor had no role conduct of the analysis or interpretation of the data, manuscript preparation, or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Duke University investigators had full access to all study data and retained final responsibility for the content of the manuscript and the decision to submit for publication. We wish to acknowledge support from the Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Research Design (BERD) Methods Core funded through Grant Award Number UL1TR002553 from the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences (NCATS), a component of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.

References

1. Avila A, Vasavada K, Shankar DS, Petrera M, Jazrawi LM, Strauss EJ. Current Controversies in Arthroscopic Partial Meniscectomy. *Curr Rev Musculoskelet Med*. 2022;15(5):336-343. doi:10.1007/s12178-022-09770-7

2. Belk JW, Lim JJ, Keeter C, et al. Patients With Knee Osteoarthritis Who Receive Platelet-Rich Plasma or Bone Marrow Aspirate Concentrate Injections Have Better Outcomes Than Patients Who Receive Hyaluronic Acid: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Arthroscopy*. 2023;39(7):1714-1734. doi:10.1016/j.arthro.2023.03.001

3. Berg B, Roos EM, Englund M, et al. Arthroscopic partial meniscectomy versus exercise therapy for degenerative meniscal tears: 10-year follow-up of the OMEX randomised controlled trial. Published online January 1, 2025. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2024-108644

4. Bergstein VE, Ahiarakwe U, Haft M, Mikula JD, Best MJ. Decreasing Incidence of Partial Meniscectomy and Increasing Incidence of Meniscus Preservation Surgery From 2010 to 2020 in the United States. *Arthroscopy*. 2025;41(6):1919-1927.e1. doi:10.1016/j.arthro.2024.07.030

5. Carneiro D de C, Araújo LT de, Santos GC, et al. Clinical Trials with Mesenchymal Stem Cell Therapies for Osteoarthritis: Challenges in the Regeneration of Articular Cartilage. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*. 2023;24(12). doi:10.3390/ijms24129939

6. Centeno C, Lucas M, Stemper I, Dodson E. Image Guided Injection of Anterior Cruciate Ligament Tears with Autologous Bone Marrow Concentrate and Platelets: Midterm Analysis from A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Bio Orthop J*. 2021;3(SP2):e7-e20. doi:10.22374/boj.v3iSP2.24

7. Centeno C, Sheinkop M, Dodson E, et al. A specific protocol of autologous bone marrow concentrate and platelet products versus exercise therapy for symptomatic knee osteoarthritis: a randomized controlled trial with 2 year follow-up. *J Transl Med*. 2018;16:355. doi:10.1186/s12967-018-1736-8

8. Centeno CJ, Berger DR, Pitts J, et al. Non-surgical treatment of anterior cruciate ligament tears with percutaneous bone marrow concentrate and platelet products versus exercise therapy: a randomized-controlled, crossover trial with 2-year follow-up. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2025;26(1):882. doi:10.1186/s12891-025-09153-2

9. Dos Santos RG, Santos GS, Alkass N, et al. The regenerative mechanisms of platelet-rich plasma: A review. *Cytokine*. 2021;144:155560. doi:10.1016/j.cyto.2021.155560

10. Dubin J, Leucht P, Murray M, Pezold R, Contributors S of the AA of OS on B of the PRP (PRP) for KOTOW and. American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons Technology Overview Summary: Platelet-Rich Plasma (PRP) for Knee Osteoarthritis. *JAAOS - Journal of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons*. 2024;32(7):296. doi:10.5435/JAAOS-D-23-00957

11. El Zouhbi A, Yammine J, Hemdanieh M, Korbani ET, Nassereddine M. Utility of Platelet-Rich Plasma Therapy in the Management of Meniscus Injuries: A narrative review. *Orthop Rev (Pavia)*. 2024;16:94240. doi:10.52965/001c.94240

12. Elphingstone JW, Alston ET, Colorado BS. Platelet-rich plasma for nonoperative management of degenerative meniscal tears: A systematic review. *J Orthop*. 2024;54:67-75. doi:10.1016/j.jor.2024.03.009

13. Friedlis MF, Centeno CJ. Performing a Better Bone Marrow Aspiration. *Phys Med Rehabil Clin N Am*. 2016;27(4):919-939. doi:10.1016/j.pmr.2016.06.009

14. George SZ, Bolognesi MP, Bhavsar NA, Penrose CT, Horn ME. Chronic Pain Prevalence and Factors Associated With High Impact Chronic Pain following Total Joint Arthroplasty: An Observational Study. *J Pain*. 2022;23(3):3. doi:10.1016/j.jpain.2021.09.007

15. Ghorbani O, Mahdibarzi D, Yousefi-Tooddeshki P. Comparison of the short-term effect of intra-articular hyaluronic acid and platelet-rich plasma injections in knee osteoarthritis: a randomized clinical trial. *J Prev Med Hyg*. 2024;65(2):E214-E220. doi:10.15167/2421-4248/jpmh2024.65.2.3270

16. Hambright S, Koldewyn L, Donner C, Dregalla R, Herrera J, Donner J. Cellular And Acellular Characteristics Of Bone Marrow Aspirate Concentrate (Bmac) That Modulate Bone Marrow Derived Msc Health And Function. *Osteoarthritis and Cartilage*. 2023;31:S224-S225. doi:10.1016/j.joca.2023.01.211

17. Heo SM, Harris I, Naylor J, Lewin AM. Complications to 6 months following total hip or knee arthroplasty: observations from an Australian clinical outcomes registry. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2020;21:602. doi:10.1186/s12891-020-03612-8

18. Hernigou P, Bouthors C, Bastard C, Flouzat Lachaniette CH, Rouard H, Dubory A. Subchondral bone or intra-articular injection of bone marrow concentrate mesenchymal stem cells in bilateral knee osteoarthritis: what better postpone knee arthroplasty at fifteen years? A randomized study. *Int Orthop*. 2021;45(2):391-399. doi:10.1007/s00264-020-04687-7

19. Hernigou P, Delambre J, Quiennec S, Poignard A. Human bone marrow mesenchymal stem cell injection in subchondral lesions of knee osteoarthritis: a prospective randomized study versus contralateral arthroplasty at a mean fifteen year follow-up. *Int Orthop*. 2021;45(2):365-373. doi:10.1007/s00264-020-04571-4

20. Huang HY, Hsu CW, Lin GC, et al. Comparing efficacy of a single intraarticular injection of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) combined with different hyaluronans for knee osteoarthritis: a randomized-controlled clinical trial. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. 2022;23(1):954. doi:10.1186/s12891-022-05906-5

21. Jha V. Editorial Commentary: Rate of Meniscal Repair Versus Meniscectomy Has Improved and Should Continue to Improve. *Arthroscopy*. 2025;41(6):1928-1930. doi:10.1016/j.arthro.2024.10.006

22. Kangari P, Talaei-Khozani T, Razeghian-Jahromi I, Razmkhah M. Mesenchymal stem cells: amazing remedies for bone and cartilage defects. *Stem Cell Res Ther*. 2020;11(1):492. doi:10.1186/s13287-020-02001-1

23. Kim GB, Seo MS, Park WT, Lee GW. Bone Marrow Aspirate Concentrate: Its Uses in Osteoarthritis. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2020;21(9):3224. doi:10.3390/ijms21093224

24. Lentz TA, Beneciuk JM, George SZ. Prediction of healthcare utilization following an episode of physical therapy for musculoskeletal pain. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2018;18(1):1. doi:10.1186/s12913-018-3470-6

25. Lewis E, Merghani K, Robertson I, et al. The effectiveness of leucocyte-poor platelet-rich plasma injections on symptomatic early osteoarthritis of the knee: the PEAK randomized controlled trial. *Bone Joint J*. 2022;104-B(6):663-671. doi:10.1302/0301-620X.104B6.BJJ-2021-1109.R2

26. Lopez E, Neuman T, Jacobson G, Levitt L. *How Much More Than Medicare Do Private Insurers Pay? A Review of the Literature*. Kaiser Family Foundation; 2020. Accessed February 23, 2026. https://www.kff.org/medicare/how-much-more-than-medicare-do-private-insurers-pay-a-review-of-the-literature/

27. Molina CS, Thakore RV, Blumer A, Obremskey WT, Sethi MK. Use of the National Surgical Quality Improvement Program in orthopaedic surgery. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. 2015;473(5):1574-1581. doi:10.1007/s11999-014-3597-7

28. Mose S, Kent P, Smith A, Andersen JH, Christiansen DH. Trajectories of Musculoskeletal Healthcare Utilization of People with Chronic Musculoskeletal Pain – A Population-Based Cohort Study. *CLEP*. 2021;13:825-843. doi:10.2147/CLEP.S323903

29. Nawaz HMT, Jawwad MA, Khan MU, Qadir MJ, Farooq MO, Nawaz MH. Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma Injections in Knee Osteoarthritis: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Cureus*. 2025;17(10):e94288. doi:10.7759/cureus.94288

30. Noorduyn JCA, van de Graaf VA, Willigenburg NW, et al. Effect of Physical Therapy vs Arthroscopic Partial Meniscectomy in People With Degenerative Meniscal Tears. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(7):e2220394. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.20394

31. Pabinger C, Lothaller H, Kobinia GS. Intra-articular injection of bone marrow aspirate concentrate (mesenchymal stem cells) in KL grade III and IV knee osteoarthritis: 4 year results of 37 knees. *Sci Rep*. 2024;14(1):2665. doi:10.1038/s41598-024-51410-2

32. Park YB, Kim JH, Ha CW, Lee DH. Clinical Efficacy of Platelet-Rich Plasma Injection and Its Association With Growth Factors in the Treatment of Mild to Moderate Knee Osteoarthritis: A Randomized Double-Blind Controlled Clinical Trial As Compared With Hyaluronic Acid. *Am J Sports Med*. 2021;49(2):487-496. doi:10.1177/0363546520986867

33. Rajan PV, Ng MK, Klika A, et al. The Cost-Effectiveness of Platelet-Rich Plasma Injections for Knee Osteoarthritis: A Markov Decision Analysis. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2020;102(18):e104. doi:10.2106/JBJS.19.01446

34. Riddle DL, Jiranek WA, Hayes CW. Use of a validated algorithm to judge the appropriateness of total knee arthroplasty in the United States: a multicenter longitudinal cohort study. *Arthritis & Rheumatology (Hoboken, NJ)*. 2014;66(8):8. doi:10.1002/art.38685

35. Riddle DL, Perera RA, Jiranek WA, Dumenci L. Using Surgical Appropriateness Criteria to Examine Outcomes of Total Knee Arthroplasty in a United States Sample. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2015;67(3):3. doi:10.1002/acr.22428

36. Shichman I, Roof M, Askew N, et al. Projections and Epidemiology of Primary Hip and Knee Arthroplasty in Medicare Patients to 2040-2060. *JB JS Open Access*. 2023;8(1):e22.00112. doi:10.2106/JBJS.OA.22.00112

37. Sihvonen R, Paavola M, Malmivaara A, et al. Arthroscopic Partial Meniscectomy versus Sham Surgery for a Degenerative Meniscal Tear. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2013;369(26):2515-2524. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1305189

38. Singh JA, Yu S, Chen L, Cleveland JD. Rates of Total Joint Replacement in the United States: Future Projections to 2020–2040 Using the National Inpatient Sample. *The Journal of Rheumatology*. Published online April 15, 2019. doi:10.3899/jrheum.170990

39. Singh P, Marrache M, Kim AH, Williams S, Hegde V, Khanuja HS. Total Knee Arthroplasty Out-of-Pocket Costs on the Rise: A Nationwide Analysis of Financial Burden and Regional Disparities. *J Arthroplasty*. Published online October 9, 2025:S0883-5403(25)01260-4. doi:10.1016/j.arth.2025.10.005

40. Weinstein AM, Rome BN, Reichmann WM, et al. Estimating the Burden of Total Knee Replacement in the United States. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. 2013;95(5):385-392. doi:10.2106/JBJS.L.00206

41. Williams EE, Katz JN, Leifer VP, et al. Cost-Effectiveness of Arthroscopic Partial Meniscectomy and Physical Therapy for Degenerative Meniscal Tear. *ACR Open Rheumatol*. 2022;4(10):853-862. doi:10.1002/acr2.11480

42. Zhang JY, Fabricant PD, Ishmael CR, Wang JC, Petrigliano FA, Jones KJ. Utilization of Platelet-Rich Plasma for Musculoskeletal Injuries: An Analysis of Current Treatment Trends in the United States. *Orthop J Sports Med*. 2016;4(12):2325967116676241. doi:10.1177/2325967116676241

43. Zhu X, Chan YT, Yung PSH, Tuan RS, Jiang Y. Subchondral Bone Remodeling: A Therapeutic Target for Osteoarthritis. *Front Cell Dev Biol*. 2021;8. doi:10.3389/fcell.2020.607764

Table 1. Cohort flowchart

Inclusion/exclusion criteria	Orthobiologic Procedures	TKA/pKA Procedures	Meniscectomy Procedures
Starting population: Receiving eligible procedures	3833	340226	452957
Procedure occurred between 1/1/2016 and 12/31/2023	3553	323702	438312
Exclude patients who have multiple DOBs or sexes in commercial claims data	3553	323691	438301
Patients age 18 or older at the time of the procedure	3503	323649	425899
12 months of continuous enrollment with commercial insurer both before and after the procedure	905	173995	229540
At least one outpatient claim in the 12 months prior to the procedure	878	173989	229537
At least one outpatient claim in the 12 months after the procedure	863	173976	229537
Procedure is elective and preceded by a relevant clinical diagnosis			
At least one relevant diagnosis in an outpatient setting in the 12 months prior to the procedure	756	173936	229526
If ER care in the 3 months prior to the procedure, at least one relevant diagnosis in an outpatient setting after the ER care but before the procedure	748	171875	227736
If occurs in hospital, occurs on first day of service	748	169449	227687
Exclude patients with clinical contra-indications			
Patients with inflammatory syndrome diagnosis in the 12 months prior to the procedure	690	143851	205860
Ineligible connective tissue disorder diagnosis in the 12 months prior to the procedure	679	141451	202205
Ineligible joint disorder diagnosis in the 12 months prior to the procedure	679	141165	201806
Ineligible injuries in the 12 months prior to the procedure	675	140236	200822
Infectious arthropathies in the 12 months prior to the procedure	673	139806	200522
Bone cancer in the 12 months prior to the procedure	672	139745	200487
Exclude patients with prior treatment contra-indications			
Regenexx patients who had corticosteroids in the 2 months prior to the procedure	610	139745	200487
Previous knee surgery in the 12 months prior to the procedure	589	109600	183770
Mab medication in the 3 months prior to the procedure	583	108230	181865
Surgery patients who had Regenexx at any point	583	108158	181760
If a patient had multiple procedures, take the first one	509	98638	175487
Comparable patients based on surgery avoided criteria	352	97327	116473

Table 2. Post-matching demographic and clinical characteristics – BMAC with or without PRP versus TKA/pKA

Characteristic	BMAC ± PRP N = 165	TKA/pKA N = 1,650	Overall N = 1,815	SMD
Continuous commercial health plan enrollment after index procedure				
CE for 12 months	165 (100%)	1,650 (100%)	1,815 (100%)	0.000
CE for 24 months	114 (69%)	1,111 (67%)	1,225 (67%)	0.038
CE for 36 months	80 (48%)	734 (44%)	814 (45%)	0.080
CE for 48 months	59 (36%)	436 (26%)	495 (27%)	0.203
Location				1.03
Right	49 (30%)	851 (52%)	900 (50%)	
Left	59 (36%)	799 (48%)	858 (47%)	
Both	57 (35%)	--	57 (3.1%)	
Sex				0.130
Female	77 (47%)	877 (53%)	954 (53%)	
Male	88 (53%)	773 (47%)	861 (47%)	
Unknown	<11	<11	<11	
Age				0.016
Mean (SD)	56.9 (6.9)	56.8 (6.7)	56.8 (6.8)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	58.0 (53.0, 62.0)	58.0 (53.0, 62.0)	58.0 (53.0, 62.0)	
Min, Max	23.0, 68.0	19.0, 70.0	19.0, 70.0	
Geographic region				0.351
Northeast	31 (19%)	352 (21%)	383 (21%)	
Midwest	82 (50%)	766 (46%)	848 (47%)	
South	19 (12%)	399 (24%)	418 (23%)	
West	33 (20%)	132 (8.0%)	165 (9.1%)	
Other	<11	<11	<11	
Injury to the treated knee within 12 months prior to the procedure				
Meniscus tear	43 (26%)	494 (30%)	537 (30%)	0.086
Sprain of collateral ligament of knee	<11	50 (3.0%)	--	0.146
Sprain of cruciate ligament of knee	<11	66 (4.0%)	--	0.069
Other knee injuries (cartilage tear, subluxations/dislocations, sprains)	<11	42 (2.5%)	--	0.094
Orthopedic diagnoses on the treated knee within 12 months prior to the procedure				
Osteoarthritis	165 (100%)	1,650 (100%)	1,815 (100%)	0.000
Acquired deformity of the knee	<11	73 (4.4%)	--	0.074
Chondromalacia patellae	27 (16%)	180 (11%)	207 (11%)	0.159
Other disorders of patella	<11	<11	--	0.056
Derangement of meniscus	29 (18%)	334 (20%)	363 (20%)	0.068
Derangement, instability	17 (10%)	51 (3.1%)	68 (3.7%)	0.292
Spontaneous disruption of ligaments	<11	15 (0.9%)	--	0.153
Severe derangement	<11	26 (1.6%)	--	0.019
Derangement, unspecified	<11	53 (3.2%)	--	0.048
Musculoskeletal conditions (not exclusive to the treated knee) within 12 months prior to the procedure				
Knee effusion	55 (33%)	571 (35%)	626 (34%)	0.027
Number of knee effusions				0.100
Mean (SD)	0.6 (1.7)	0.6 (1.2)	0.6 (1.3)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 19.0	0.0, 20.0	0.0, 20.0	
Number of knee effusions among patients who had at least one				0.100
Mean (SD)	1.9 (2.6)	1.6 (1.5)	1.7 (1.7)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	1.0 (1.0, 2.0)	1.0 (1.0, 2.0)	1.0 (1.0, 2.0)	
Min, Max	1.0, 19.0	1.0, 20.0	1.0, 20.0	
Missing	110	1,079	1,189	
Enthesopathy of the lower limb, excluding foot	18 (11%)	65 (3.9%)	83 (4.6%)	0.268
Other knee joint disorders	122 (74%)	1,231 (75%)	1,353 (75%)	0.015
Disorders of synovium and tendon	<11	39 (2.4%)	--	0.134
Other soft tissue disorders	49 (30%)	493 (30%)	542 (30%)	0.004
Biomechanical lesions	<11	21 (1.3%)	--	0.121
Dorsopathy	64 (39%)	549 (33%)	613 (34%)	0.115

Characteristic	BMAC ± PRP N = 165	TKA/pKA N = 1,650	Overall N = 1,815	SMD
Osteoarthritis elsewhere (other than knees)	27 (16%)	317 (19%)	344 (19%)	0.075
Osteoarthritis elsewhere (including other knee)	109 (66.1%)	793 (48.1%)	902 (49.7%)	0.370
Injury to other parts of the body	32 (19%)	287 (17%)	319 (18%)	0.052
Injury to adjacent parts of the body	12 (7.3%)	105 (6.4%)	117 (6.4%)	0.036
ACL/MCL indication	20 (12%)	111 (6.7%)	131 (7.2%)	0.185
General comorbidities documented in the 12 months prior to the procedure				
Obesity	32 (19%)	312 (19%)	344 (19%)	0.012
Diabetes	<11	108 (6.5%)	--	0.020
Depression/Anxiety/Bipolar	27 (16%)	351 (21%)	378 (21%)	0.126
Medications within 12 months prior to the procedure				
Opioid medication	50 (30%)	387 (23%)	437 (24%)	0.155
NSAID medication	39 (24%)	434 (26%)	473 (26%)	0.062
Tramadol medication	<11	132 (8.0%)	--	0.129
Neuropathic pain medication	15 (9.1%)	141 (8.5%)	156 (8.6%)	0.019
Interventions in the 12 months prior to the procedure				
Oral corticosteroids	28 (17%)	270 (16%)	298 (16%)	0.016
Corticosteroid injection	65 (39%)	722 (44%)	787 (43%)	0.089
Number of corticosteroid injections				0.159
Mean (SD)	0.6 (1.0)	0.8 (1.2)	0.8 (1.2)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 8.0	0.0, 8.0	0.0, 8.0	
Hyaluronic acid injection	23 (14%)	176 (11%)	199 (11%)	0.100
Number of hyaluronic acid injections				0.063
Mean (SD)	0.3 (0.7)	0.2 (0.7)	0.2 (0.7)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 3.0	0.0, 6.0	0.0, 6.0	
Physical therapy	74 (45%)	636 (39%)	710 (39%)	0.128
Number of PT visits				0.268
Mean (SD)	5.1 (10.0)	2.7 (7.0)	3.0 (7.4)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 6.0)	0.0 (0.0, 2.0)	0.0 (0.0, 2.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 63.0	0.0, 142.0	0.0, 142.0	
Health seeking behavior in the 12 months prior to the procedure				
Outpatient visit	165 (100%)	1,650 (100%)	1,815 (100%)	0.000
Number of outpatient visits				0.134
Mean (SD)	20.9 (16.6)	18.8 (13.8)	19.0 (14.1)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	16.0 (9.0, 27.0)	15.0 (10.0, 23.0)	15.0 (10.0, 24.0)	
Min, Max	1.0, 90.0	1.0, 152.0	1.0, 152.0	
ER visit	21 (13%)	187 (11%)	208 (11%)	0.043
Number of ER visits				0.041
Mean (SD)	0.1 (0.4)	0.2 (0.5)	0.2 (0.5)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 2.0	0.0, 6.0	0.0, 6.0	
Chiropractic visit	35 (21%)	353 (21%)	388 (21%)	0.004
Number of chiropractic visits				0.067
Mean (SD)	2.2 (5.7)	1.8 (5.1)	1.9 (5.1)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 33.0	0.0, 57.0	0.0, 57.0	
Knee x-ray	116 (70%)	1,538 (93%)	1,654 (91%)	0.621
MRI of lower joint	98 (59%)	689 (42%)	787 (43%)	0.358
Knee x-ray or MRI of lower joint	145 (88%)	1,570 (95%)	1,715 (94%)	0.263
Other severity proxies in the 12 months prior to the procedure				
Osteoarthritis outpatient visit	165 (100%)	1,650 (100%)	1,815 (100%)	0.000
Number of osteoarthritis outpatient visits				0.089
Mean (SD)	4.1 (3.4)	4.3 (2.6)	4.3 (2.7)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	4.0 (3.0, 5.0)	4.0 (2.0, 5.0)	
Min, Max	1.0, 25.0	1.0, 20.0	1.0, 25.0	
Osteoarthritis outpatient visit for the treated knee	165 (100%)	1,650 (100%)	1,815 (100%)	0.000
≤ 1 OA outpatient visits for the treated knee	34 (21%)	157 (9.5%)	191 (11%)	0.314
Number of OA outpatient visits for the treated knee				0.146
Mean (SD)	3.6 (2.7)	4.0 (2.4)	4.0 (2.5)	

Characteristic	BMAC ± PRP N = 165	TKA/pKA N = 1,650	Overall N = 1,815	SMD
Median (Q1, Q3)	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	3.0 (2.0, 5.0)	
Min, Max	1.0, 14.0	1.0, 17.0	1.0, 17.0	
Outpatient visit with an 'M' dx code	165 (100%)	1,650 (100%)	1,815 (100%)	0.000
Number of outpatient visits with an 'M' dx code				0.154
Mean (SD)	11.4 (11.6)	9.8 (9.4)	10.0 (9.7)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	8.0 (4.0, 14.0)	7.0 (4.0, 12.0)	7.0 (4.0, 12.0)	
Min, Max	1.0, 68.0	1.0, 150.0	1.0, 150.0	

Table 3. Post-matching demographic and clinical characteristics – BMAC with or without PRP versus Meniscectomy

Characteristic	PRP N = 167	Meniscectomy N = 1,670	Overall N = 1,837	SMD
Continuous commercial health plan enrollment after index procedure				
CE for 12 months	167 (100%)	1,670 (100%)	1,837 (100%)	0.000
CE for 24 months	105 (63%)	1,224 (73%)	1,329 (72%)	0.225
CE for 36 months	63 (38%)	842 (50%)	905 (49%)	0.258
CE for 48 months	35 (21%)	550 (33%)	585 (32%)	0.272
Location				0.846
Right	60 (36%)	848 (51%)	908 (49%)	
Left	63 (38%)	822 (49%)	885 (48%)	
Both	44 (26%)	--	44 (2.4%)	
Sex				0.118
Female	80 (48%)	702 (42%)	782 (43%)	
Male	87 (52%)	968 (58%)	1,055 (57%)	
Unknown	<11	<11	<11	
Age				0.078
Mean (SD)	51.6 (11.0)	50.7 (11.3)	50.8 (11.3)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	54.0 (46.0, 59.0)	53.0 (46.0, 59.0)	53.0 (46.0, 59.0)	
Min, Max	18.0, 72.0	18.0, 77.0	18.0, 77.0	
Geographic region				0.093
Northeast	39 (23%)	445 (27%)	484 (26%)	
Midwest	69 (41%)	675 (40%)	744 (41%)	
South	37 (22%)	380 (23%)	417 (23%)	
West	22 (13%)	170 (10%)	192 (11%)	
Other	<11	<11	<11	
Injury to the treated knee within 12 months prior to the procedure				
Meniscus tear	23 (14%)	1,327 (79%)	1,350 (73%)	1.75
Sprain of collateral ligament of knee	<11	<11	--	0.000
Sprain of cruciate ligament of knee	<11	<11	--	0.000
Other knee injuries (cartilage tear, subluxations/dislocations, sprains)	<11	108 (6.5%)	--	0.236
Orthopedic diagnoses on the treated knee within 12 months prior to the procedure				
Osteoarthritis	48 (29%)	551 (33%)	599 (33%)	0.092
Acquired deformity of the knee	<11	<11	--	0.049
Chondromalacia patellae	30 (18%)	293 (18%)	323 (18%)	0.011
Other disorders of patella	<11	<11	--	0.071
Derangement of meniscus	14 (8.4%)	415 (25%)	429 (23%)	0.454
Derangement, instability	<11	58 (3.5%)	--	0.064
Spontaneous disruption of ligaments	<11	<11	--	0.000
Severe derangement	<11	61 (3.7%)	--	0.213
Derangement, unspecified	<11	144 (8.6%)	--	0.311
Musculoskeletal conditions (not exclusive to the treated knee) within 12 months prior to the procedure				
Knee effusion	23 (14%)	249 (15%)	272 (15%)	0.032
Number of knee effusions				0.104
Mean (SD)	0.2 (0.6)	0.2 (0.8)	0.2 (0.7)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 3.0	0.0, 23.0	0.0, 23.0	
Number of knee effusions among patients who had at least one				0.104
Mean (SD)	1.5 (0.6)	1.4 (1.5)	1.4 (1.5)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	1.0 (1.0, 2.0)	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)	1.0 (1.0, 1.0)	
Min, Max	1.0, 3.0	1.0, 23.0	1.0, 23.0	
Missing	144	1,421	1,565	
Enthesopathy of the lower limb, excluding foot	21 (13%)	115 (6.9%)	136 (7.4%)	0.193
Other knee joint disorders	103 (62%)	1,102 (66%)	1,205 (66%)	0.090
Disorders of synovium and tendon	<11	64 (3.8%)	--	0.123
Other soft tissue disorders	76 (46%)	803 (48%)	879 (48%)	0.052
Biomechanical lesions	<11	27 (1.6%)	--	0.092
Dorsopathy	76 (46%)	796 (48%)	872 (47%)	0.043

Characteristic	PRP N = 167	Meniscectomy N = 1,670	Overall N = 1,837	SMD
Osteoarthritis elsewhere (other than knees)	34 (20%)	265 (16%)	299 (16%)	0.117
Osteoarthritis elsewhere (including other knee)	50 (29.9%)	370 (22.2%)	420 (22.9%)	0.178
Injury to other parts of the body	46 (28%)	427 (26%)	473 (26%)	0.045
Injury to adjacent parts of the body	17 (10%)	192 (11%)	209 (11%)	0.042
ACL/MCL indication	<11	<11	--	0.000
General comorbidities documented in the 12 months prior to the procedure				
Obesity	22 (13%)	225 (13%)	247 (13%)	0.009
Diabetes	16 (9.6%)	162 (9.7%)	178 (9.7%)	0.004
Depression/Anxiety/Bipolar	26 (16%)	271 (16%)	297 (16%)	0.018
Medications within 12 months prior to the procedure				
Opioid medication	32 (19%)	290 (17%)	322 (18%)	0.047
NSAID medication	31 (19%)	258 (15%)	289 (16%)	0.083
Tramadol medication	<11	48 (2.9%)	--	0.100
Neuropathic pain medication	16 (9.6%)	106 (6.3%)	122 (6.6%)	0.120
Interventions in the 12 months prior to the procedure				
Oral corticosteroids	26 (16%)	257 (15%)	283 (15%)	0.005
Corticosteroid injection	41 (25%)	373 (22%)	414 (23%)	0.052
Number of corticosteroid injections				0.016
Mean (SD)	0.4 (0.8)	0.4 (0.9)	0.4 (0.9)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 4.0	0.0, 11.0	0.0, 11.0	
Hyaluronic acid injection	<11	<11	--	0.079
Number of hyaluronic acid injections				0.092
Mean (SD)	0.0 (0.2)	0.0 (0.1)	0.0 (0.1)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 3.0	0.0, 3.0	0.0, 3.0	
Physical therapy	70 (42%)	710 (43%)	780 (42%)	0.012
Number of PT visits				0.104
Mean (SD)	5.6 (14.3)	4.3 (9.1)	4.4 (9.6)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 6.0)	0.0 (0.0, 5.0)	0.0 (0.0, 5.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 153.0	0.0, 103.0	0.0, 153.0	
Health seeking behavior in the 12 months prior to the procedure				
Outpatient visit	166 (99%)	1,668 (100%)	1,834 (100%)	0.080
Number of outpatient visits				0.013
Mean (SD)	18.7 (17.3)	18.9 (15.8)	18.9 (16.0)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	14.0 (8.0, 24.0)	14.0 (8.0, 25.0)	14.0 (8.0, 25.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 162.0	0.0, 157.0	0.0, 162.0	
ER visit	18 (11%)	206 (12%)	224 (12%)	0.049
Number of ER visits				0.081
Mean (SD)	0.1 (0.4)	0.2 (0.6)	0.2 (0.6)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 2.0	0.0, 9.0	0.0, 9.0	
Chiropractic visit	37 (22%)	392 (23%)	429 (23%)	0.031
Number of chiropractic visits				0.046
Mean (SD)	3.1 (13.2)	2.6 (7.2)	2.6 (8.0)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	0.0 (0.0, 0.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 153.0	0.0, 84.0	0.0, 153.0	
Knee x-ray	59 (35%)	1,365 (82%)	1,424 (78%)	1.07
MRI of lower joint	54 (32%)	1,338 (80%)	1,392 (76%)	1.10
Knee x-ray or MRI of lower joint	79 (47%)	1,527 (91%)	1,606 (87%)	1.09
Other severity proxies in the 12 months prior to the procedure				
Osteoarthritis outpatient visit	73 (44%)	786 (47%)	859 (47%)	0.067
Number of osteoarthritis outpatient visits				0.069
Mean (SD)	0.8 (1.6)	0.7 (1.7)	0.7 (1.6)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	0.0 (0.0, 1.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 9.0	0.0, 44.0	0.0, 44.0	
Osteoarthritis outpatient visit for the treated knee	48 (29%)	551 (33%)	599 (33%)	0.092
≤ 1 OA outpatient visits for the treated knee	167 (100%)	1,670 (100%)	1,837 (100%)	0.000
Number of OA outpatient visits for the treated knee	48 (29%)	551 (33%)	599 (33%)	0.092
Outpatient visit with an 'M' dx code	160 (96%)	1,618 (97%)	1,778 (97%)	0.057

Characteristic	PRP N = 167	Meniscectomy N = 1,670	Overall N = 1,837	SMD
Number of outpatient visits with an 'M' dx code				0.003
Mean (SD)	9.4 (10.6)	9.4 (11.5)	9.4 (11.4)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	5.0 (2.0, 12.0)	5.0 (2.0, 12.0)	5.0 (2.0, 12.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 55.0	0.0, 109.0	0.0, 109.0	

Table 4. Healthcare Resource Utilization 12 months post procedure – BMAC with or without PRP versus TKA/pKA

Characteristic	BMAC ± PRP N = 165	TKA/PKA N = 1,650	Overall N = 1,815	p-value
Number of outpatient visits				< 0.001
Mean (SD)	4.6 (5.0)	7.2 (7.5)	7.0 (7.4)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	3.0 (1.0, 6.0)	5.0 (3.0, 9.0)	5.0 (3.0, 9.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 28.0	0.0, 159.0	0.0, 159.0	
Number of physical therapy visits				< 0.001
Mean (SD)	10.1 (13.9)	15.9 (14.8)	15.4 (14.8)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	5.0 (0.0, 14.0)	13.0 (4.0, 23.0)	12.0 (3.0, 23.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 79.0	0.0, 110.0	0.0, 110.0	
Knee x-ray	24 (14.5%)	1,559 (94.5%)	1,583 (87.2%)	< 0.001
MRI of lower joint	21 (12.7%)	71 (4.3%)	92 (5.1%)	< 0.001
CT of lower extremity	<11	65 (3.9%)	--	0.25
Subsequent same side TKA/PKA	<11	187 (11.3%)	--	0.007
Subsequent same side Meniscectomy	<11	<11	--	--
Subsequent same side ACL/MCL procedure	<11	<11	--	--
Subsequent orthobiologic procedure - any knee	22 (13.3%)	<11	--	--
Subsequent orthobiologic procedure – same knee	14 (8.5%)	<11	--	--
Deep vein thrombosis inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Hematoma inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Infection inpatient care	<11	14 (0.8%)	--	--
Pulmonary embolism inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Other post-surgical embolism inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
DVT, PE, or OE inpatient care	<11	12 (0.7%)	--	--
Opioid medication	57 (34.5%)	730 (44.2%)	787 (43.4%)	0.02

Table 5. Healthcare Resource Utilization 24 months post procedure – BMAC with or without PRP versus TKA/pKA

Characteristic	BMAC ± PRP N = 114	TKA/PKA N = 1,111	Overall N = 1,225	p-value
Number of outpatient visits				< 0.001
Mean (SD)	7.6 (6.8)	10.9 (10.6)	10.6 (10.3)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	5.0 (2.0, 11.0)	8.0 (4.0, 14.0)	8.0 (4.0, 14.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 27.0	0.0, 159.0	0.0, 159.0	
Number of physical therapy visits				0.003
Mean (SD)	16.6 (23.4)	17.9 (17.9)	17.8 (18.5)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	7.5 (0.0, 25.0)	14.0 (4.0, 26.0)	14.0 (4.0, 25.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 144.0	0.0, 154.0	0.0, 154.0	
Knee x-ray	32 (28.1%)	1,063 (95.7%)	1,095 (89.4%)	< 0.001
MRI of lower joint	26 (22.8%)	86 (7.7%)	112 (9.1%)	< 0.001
CT of lower extremity	<11	70 (6.3%)	--	0.82
Subsequent same side TKA/PKA	<11	136 (12.2%)	--	0.22
Subsequent same side Meniscectomy	<11	<11	--	--
Subsequent same side ACL/MCL procedure	<11	<11	--	--
Subsequent orthobiologic procedure - any knee	20 (17.5%)	<11	--	--
Subsequent orthobiologic procedure – same knee	17 (14.9%)	<11	--	--
Deep vein thrombosis inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Hematoma inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Infection inpatient care	<11	18 (1.6%)	--	--
Pulmonary embolism inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Other post-surgical embolism inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
DVT, PE, or OE inpatient care	<11	16 (1.4%)	--	--
Opioid medication	48 (42.1%)	516 (46.4%)	564 (46.0%)	0.43

Table 6: Healthcare Resource Utilization 12 months post procedure – PRP versus Meniscectomy

Characteristic	PRP N = 167	Meniscectomy N = 1,670	Overall N = 1,837	p-value
Number of outpatient visits				0.15
Mean (SD)	4.2 (5.5)	3.8 (5.5)	3.9 (5.5)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	2.0 (1.0, 5.0)	2.0 (0.0, 5.0)	2.0 (0.0, 5.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 29.0	0.0, 53.0	0.0, 53.0	
Number of physical therapy visits				0.003
Mean (SD)	6.5 (14.4)	7.0 (10.4)	6.9 (10.8)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	0.0 (0.0, 9.0)	2.0 (0.0, 10.0)	2.0 (0.0, 10.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 132.0	0.0, 81.0	0.0, 132.0	
Knee x-ray	23 (13.8%)	298 (17.8%)	321 (17.5%)	0.22
MRI of lower joint	14 (8.4%)	175 (10.5%)	189 (10.3%)	0.47
CT of lower extremity	<11	14 (0.8%)	--	--
Subsequent same side TKA/PKA	<11	32 (1.9%)	--	--
Subsequent same side Meniscectomy	<11	85 (5.1%)	--	0.09
Subsequent same side ACL/MCL procedure	<11	<11	--	--
Subsequent orthobiologic procedure - any knee	20 (12.0%)	<11	--	--
Subsequent orthobiologic procedure – same knee	17 (10.2%)	<11	--	--
Deep vein thrombosis inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Hematoma inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Infection inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Pulmonary embolism inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Other post-surgical embolism inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
DVT, PE, or OE inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Opioid medication	45 (26.9%)	218 (13.1%)	263 (14.3%)	< 0.001

Table 7. Healthcare Resource Utilization 24 months post procedure – PRP versus Meniscectomy

Characteristic	PRP N = 105	Meniscectomy N = 1,224	Overall N = 1,329	p-value
Number of outpatient visits				0.82
Mean (SD)	6.6 (8.4)	7.1 (10.2)	7.1 (10.1)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	4.0 (1.0, 8.0)	4.0 (1.0, 9.0)	4.0 (1.0, 9.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 46.0	0.0, 100.0	0.0, 100.0	
Number of physical therapy visits				0.52
Mean (SD)	12.2 (33.1)	9.4 (14.5)	9.7 (16.7)	
Median (Q1, Q3)	3.0 (0.0, 13.0)	3.5 (0.0, 13.0)	3.0 (0.0, 13.0)	
Min, Max	0.0, 315.0	0.0, 144.0	0.0, 315.0	
Knee x-ray	24 (22.9%)	366 (29.9%)	390 (29.3%)	0.16
MRI of lower joint	17 (16.2%)	207 (16.9%)	224 (16.9%)	0.96
CT of lower extremity	<11	17 (1.4%)	--	--
Subsequent same side TKA/PKA	<11	43 (3.5%)	--	--
Subsequent same side Meniscectomy	<11	73 (6.0%)	--	0.49
Subsequent same side ACL/MCL procedure	<11	<11	--	--
Subsequent orthobiologic procedure - any knee	15 (14.3%)	<11	--	--
Subsequent orthobiologic procedure – same knee	13 (12.4%)	<11	--	--
Deep vein thrombosis inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Hematoma inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Infection inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Pulmonary embolism inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Other post-surgical embolism inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
DVT, PE, or OE inpatient care	<11	<11	--	--
Opioid medication	37 (35.2%)	250 (20.4%)	287 (21.6%)	< 0.001

Table 8. Costs – BMAC ± PRP versus TKA/PKA at 12- and 24-months post procedure

Characteristic	BMAC ± PRP N = 165	TKA/PKA N = 1,650	Estimated mean difference (95% CI)	p-value
12 months post-procedure				
External costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	15,195.2 (6,138.2)	28,947.7 (8,825.2)	13,753 (12,720, 14,785)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	13,134.6 (12,284.6, 14,784.6)	25,550.0 (25,150.0, 26,750.0)		
External inflated costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	17,982.1 (11,907.0)	57,895.5 (17,650.3)	39,913 (37,900, 41,926)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	14,284.6 (12,584.6, 16,984.6)	51,100.0 (50,300.0, 53,500.0)		
Commercial payer costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	16,699.3 (6,888.6)	30,255.3 (10,068.8)	13,556 (12,394, 14,718)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	14,432.6 (13,012.6, 16,667.6)	26,694.0 (24,956.0, 29,961.0)		
Aggregate costing method ($)				
Mean (SD)	18,759.3 (11,328.7)	37,497.4 (23,590.9)	18,738 (16,662, 20,814)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	13,980.4 (12,856.7, 18,086.4)	32,703.1 (24,729.3, 44,701.3)		
Aggregate costing method – truncated ($)				
Mean (SD)	18,692.0 (10,757.7)	36,094.4 (16,199.7)	17,402 (15,579, 19,226)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	13,980.4 (12,856.7, 18,086.4)	32,703.1 (24,729.3, 44,701.3)		
24 months post-procedure				
	BMAC ± PRP N = 114	**TKA/PKA** N = 1,111	**Estimated mean difference (95% CI)**	**p-value**
External costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	18,286.3 (9,924.1)	30,177.9 (10,347.6)	11,892 (9,961, 13,822)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	14,384.6 (12,634.6, 17,920.1)	26,200.0 (25,350.0, 27,950.0)		
External inflated costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	23,629.3 (19,286.6)	60,355.9 (20,695.3)	36,727 (32,964, 40,489)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	16,477.3 (13,284.6, 22,384.6)	52,400.0 (50,700.0, 55,900.0)		
Commercial payer costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	20,968.2 (11,706.2)	32,764.1 (12,701.3)	11,796 (9,510, 14,082)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	16,653.3 (13,552.6, 23,143.1)	28,176.0 (25,855.0, 33,178.0)		
Aggregate costing method ($)				
Mean (SD)	27,414.7 (42,436.5)	41,295.4 (26,695.6)	13,881 (5,892, 21,869)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	16,170.5 (13,085.9, 28,973.5)	35,255.9 (26,377.9, 48,838.0)		
Aggregate costing method – truncated ($)				
Mean (SD)	23,608.6 (16,486.3)	39,682.7 (18,657.8)	16,074 (12,839, 19,309)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	16,170.5 (13,085.9, 28,973.5)	35,255.9 (26,377.9, 48,838.0)		

Table 9. Costs – PRP versus meniscectomy at 12- and 24-months post procedure

Characteristic	PRP N = 167	Meniscectomy N = 1,670	Estimated mean difference (95% CI)	p-value
12 months post-procedure				
External costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	5,256.0 (4,195.1)	5,260.1 (4,652.3)	4.0 (-672, 681)	0.991
Median (Q1, Q3)	3,785.5 (3,285.5, 5,585.5)	4,023.0 (3,523.0, 5,223.0)		
External inflated costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	6,628.6 (6,583.6)	10,520.1 (9,304.7)	3,892 (2,794, 4,989)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	4,485.5 (3,485.5, 6,985.5)	8,046.0 (7,046.0, 10,446.0)		
Commercial payer costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	6,701.2 (5,558.8)	9,279.0 (5,724.8)	2,578 (1,688, 3,468)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	4,749.5 (3,477.5, 7,092.5)	7,523.0 (6,379.0, 9,527.0)		
Aggregate costing method ($)				
Mean (SD)	7,579.7 (8,485.6)	9,510.8 (12,929.2)	1,931 (498, 3,364)	0.008
Median (Q1, Q3)	4,422.6 (3,295.4, 7,019.7)	6,564.9 (4,504.3, 10,228.7)		
Aggregate costing method – truncated ($)				
Mean (SD)	6,891.6 (5,864.6)	8,427.8 (5,631.6)	1,536 (603, 2,469)	0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	4,422.6 (3,295.4, 7,019.7)	6,564.9 (4,504.3, 10,228.7)		
24 months post-procedure				
	PRP N = 105	**Meniscectomy** N = 1,224	**Estimated mean difference (95% CI)**	**p-value**
External costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	5,989.7 (4,598.4)	6,473.2 (6,900.1)	484 (-482, 1,449)	0.326
Median (Q1, Q3)	4,485.5 (3,385.5, 6,620.9)	4,523.0 (3,723.0, 6,223.0)		
External inflated costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	8,055.3 (7,946.2)	12,946.4 (13,800.2)	4891 (3,178, 6,605)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	5,885.5 (3,685.5, 9,685.5)	9,046.0 (7,446.0, 12,446.0)		
Commercial payer costs ($)				
Mean (SD)	8,176.9 (6,457.0)	11,533.5 (8,709.5)	3,357 (2,022, 4,691)	<0.001
Median (Q1, Q3)	5,818.5 (3,869.5, 9,632.5)	8,739.0 (6,951.0, 12,044.5)		
Aggregate costing method ($)				
Mean (SD)	9,414.0 (9,484.1)	12,012.9 (13,855.4)	2,599 (616, 4,582)	0.01
Median (Q1, Q3)	6,170.9 (3,659.2, 9,407.0)	7,581.3 (4,967.1, 12,449.8)		
Aggregate costing method – truncated ($)				
Mean (SD)	9,160.9 (8,565.3)	10,882.0 (8,821.1)	1,721 (1, 3,442)	0.05
Median (Q1, Q3)	6,170.9 (3,659.2, 9,407.0)	7,581.3 (4,967.1, 12,449.8)		