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Design: systematic review of randomized clinical trials

Purpose of study: to review the literature on the efficacy of PRP injections for chronic lateral epicondylar tendinopathy

Reasons not to cite as evidence:

* The definition of “strong evidence” is met by generally consistent findings in two or more high quality studies, where at least 75% of studies reported consistent findings
* Three studies were found to be high quality and were cited in support of the conclusion that there was strong evidence against PRP injections for tennis elbow
* Two of these studies randomized patients to PRP injection or to whole blood injection, while the third study randomized patients to PRP or saline injections
* Two of the studies reported PRP resulting in better functional scores at 3 months than the control injection, but the 95% confidence intervals for the injection included the null value and the results were not statistically significant in favor of PRP; the third study showed a small advantage of whole blood over PRP but again the statistical significance of the results was lacking
* Thus, it appears that the authors interpreted results from three inconclusive studies as if each one demonstrated the lack of effectiveness of PRP
	+ This is an error in interpretation; part of the reason for the development of meta-analysis such as is done by the Cochrane collaboration was that individual studies could be underpowered to detect therapeutic effects of interventions, but pooling the results from several studies could show a treatment effect due to the added power from larger numbers of observations
* The conclusion of strong evidence against PRP thus cannot be considered to have been supported by the evidence cited in the review of clinical trials