Introduction

Approximately 10% of couples following in vitro fertilization (IVF) treatment experience repeated implantation failure (RIF) causing a deep impact on the quality of life and a heavy financial burden. Despite the lack of uniform definition, RIF is generally defined as the failure to achieve a clinical pregnancy after three or more transfers of at least four or more high-quality embryos in a woman below 40 years old (1,2).

To date, many treatment modalities have been utilized to improve the pregnancy outcomes of the couple with RIF, including blastocyst transfer, preimplantation genetic screening, assisted hatching, salpingectomy for tubal disease, hysteroscopy, and endometrial scratching. However, these approaches have not gained widespread acceptance, and their effects on pregnancy rates are unsatisfactory. Thus, there is a need for alternative treatments for patients with repeated IVF failure (3-8).

It seems that two-thirds of implantation failures can be explained by the lack of adequate uterine receptivity. The imbalance between pro- and anti-inflammatory cytokines and several molecules was probably associated with RIF (11-14).

Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) is prepared from fresh whole blood that has a platelet count 4-5 times higher than the baseline concentration. After the activation of the platelet in PRP, platelets release many cytokines, growth factors, and other molecules that stimulate cell proliferation, differentiation, angiogenesis, and tissue regeneration. Hence, it may help modulate endometrial cell migration, attachment, and neoangiogenesis, potentially resulting in beneficial effects on endometrial receptivity (15,16).

Recently, the use of autologous PRP has gained great attention in human-assisted reproductive medicine and the gynecology field. Some studies showed that the intrauterine infusion of autologous PRP is effective in improving endometrial growth and implantation rate in women with the cancellation history of a previous embryo transfer (ET) cycle due to thin endometrium after infertility treatment (17-23).

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first clinical trial study that evaluated the efficacy of the intra-uterine infusion of autologous PRP on pregnancy outcomes in patients with repeated implantation failure (RIF).
administration of autologous PRP on implantation and clinical pregnancy rate and live birth before frozen-thawed embryo transfer (FET) in women with normal endometrial growth who failed to conceive after three or more ET in the ART cycle.

**Materials and Methods**

This randomized controlled trial was performed at the Infertility Department of Shariati Hospital and Omid Fertility Center, Tehran, Iran from October 2017 to April 2020.

A total of 120 infertile women within the age range of 20-40 years old were enrolled in this study. These women had failed to conceive after three or more ET with high-quality embryos and had at least one frozen good-quality blastocyst-stage embryo, and were candidates for FET.

On the other hand, participants with chromosomal and genetic disorders, hematological and immunological disorders, hormonal disorders, uterine abnormality (congenital or acquired), body mass index above 30 kg/m², severe endometriosis, and patients with cancellation history of the previous ET due to a thin endometrium (≤7 mm) in hormone replacement therapy cycles were excluded from the study.

The patients were randomized into two equal groups through balanced block randomization, including PRP (intervention) and control groups.

In both groups, endometrial preparation was initiated with 4-6 mg daily oral estradiol valerate (Aburaihan, Iran) on day 2 of the patient's menstrual cycle after performing a transvaginal ultrasound.

The dose of estradiol was increased according to the endometrial response up to a maximal dose of 12 mg per day after observing a triple line endometrial pattern and approximately thickness of 8 mm on ultrasound. Afterward, 100 mg endometrin vaginal suppositories (Ferring, Switzerland) twice a day plus a daily intramuscular injection of 50 mg progesterone (Aburaihan, Iran) was administrated for 5 complete days before ET and continued until 12 weeks in the case of pregnancy occurrence.

In the PRP group, 48 hours before ET, 8.5 mL of peripheral venous blood (cubital vein) was drawn from the 10 mL syringe pre-filled with 1.5 mL of acid citrate as an anticoagulant solution (Rooyagen, Iran) based on the manufacturer's instruction and immediately centrifuged at 1600 rpm for 10 minutes to separate red blood cells. Then, plasma was re-centrifuged at 3500 rpm for 6 minutes at room temperature (18°C) to obtain 1.5 mL lympho PRP with a platelet concentration of 4-5 times higher than the basal blood sample and 2000 lymphocyte/µL.

Next, 0.5 mL of PRP was gently infused into the uterine cavity with an intrauterine insemination (IUI) catheter under ultrasound guidance in sterile conditions, and a control group undergoing ET without the intrauterine infusion of PRP.

For all participants, based on each patient's profile, one to three good-quality blastocyst(s) (Grade A or B) were transferred by two physicians having an infertility fellowship under abdominal ultrasound guidance. Embryo quality was evaluated by an expert embryologist using an inverted microscope. Chemical pregnancy was defined as a positive beta human chorionic gonadotropin (β-hCG) 14 days after the ET, and clinical pregnancy was defined as the presence of a gestational sac with fetal heart pulsation on transvaginal ultrasound 4 weeks following the ET. The implantation rate was defined as the number of gestational sac on transvaginal ultrasound by the number of the transferred embryos.

Ongoing pregnancy is defined as a pregnancy beyond 12 weeks of gestation. Live birth was defined as the delivery of one or more living infant(s), and the miscarriage rate (MR) (per clinical pregnancy) is defined as a fetal loss before 20 weeks of gestation. Multiple pregnancy rate per cycle is defined as the presence of more than one gestational sac on transvaginal ultrasound. Preterm delivery was considered as the birth between 23–36+6 weeks of gestation.

**Statistical Analysis**

Qualitative and quantitative data were presented as the frequency and percentage, as well as mean and standard deviation. The normality of data was assessed with the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Continuous variables between the two groups were compared using an independent t test. On the other hand, categorical variables were compared using the chi-square test or Fisher's exact test when more than 20% of cells with expected counts of less than 5 were observable. All analyses were done using SPSS (version 23, SPSS Inc., Illinois, USA), and a P value less than 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

**Results**

Totally, 120 patients with RIF history (60 patients in the PRP group and 60 patients in the control group) were included in this study (Figure 1).

The baseline and clinical characteristics of participants are shown in Table 1. Based on the results, there were no significant differences in terms of age, body mass index (BMI), anti-Müllerian hormone (AMH), number of embryos, and the duration and etiology of infertility between the groups (P > 0.05). In addition, there was no significant difference between the two groups with regard to gravidity, parity, abortion, and ectopic pregnancy.
The etiology of infertility between intervention and control groups is compared in Table 2. In both groups, the main etiology of infertility was mixed and belonged to both genders (55% in the intervention group and 56.77% in the control group).

Table 3 provides the clinical outcomes of patients in the intervention and control groups. There was a significant difference between the two groups in relation to β-hCG, clinical pregnancy rate (CPR), ongoing pregnancy rate (OPR), and live birth rate (LBR). In other words, 51.67%, 51.67%, 48.33%, and 58.33% of cases in the intervention group were β-hCG, CPR, OPR, and LBR positive compared to 30%, 26.67%, 25%, and 28.33% of them in the control group respectively (P<0.05). The implantation rate was significantly higher in the intervention group (28% vs. 11.9%, P<0.001). There was no significant difference regarding the multiple pregnancy rate (0.133% vs. 0.05%, P=0.11). Further, no significant difference was found in terms of chemical pregnancy, delivery type, grade of the embryo, and MR per clinical pregnancy between the two investigated groups (P>0.05) although preterm delivery was significantly higher in the PRP group (P<0.001).

The etiology of cesarean section in PRP and control groups is shown in Figure 2. Elective choosing cesarean and twin pregnancy were two common causes of caesarian in both groups.

Discussion
Successful implantation requires a good quality embryo and a receptive endometrium. The window of implantation is a restricted time during the mid-secretory phase when the endometrium is receptive to blastocyst under the control of estrogen and progesterone and is characterized by the up-regulation of several cytokines, growth factors, and adhesion molecules, and other proteins (1).

Table 2. The Etiology of Infertility in Both Intervention and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male Only</th>
<th>Female Only</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRP group</td>
<td>9 (15)</td>
<td>18 (30)</td>
<td>33 (55)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td>9 (15)</td>
<td>17 (28.33)</td>
<td>34 (56.67)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 (15)</td>
<td>35 (29.17)</td>
<td>67 (55.83)</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: PRP: Platelet-rich plasma.
PRP is prepared from the patient’s own fresh whole blood and contains a multitude of growth factors, cytokines, proteins, and antimicrobial properties such as the vascular endothelial growth factor, platelet-derived growth factor, hepatocyte growth factor, and interleukin 8 that release from their cytoplasm and conduct cell proliferation, differentiation, and tissue regeneration necessary for embryo implantation (15,16).

Considering that the first study of the application of autologous PRP therapy in reproductive medicine was carried out by Chang et al, numerous studies (17-24) indicated that the intrauterine infusion of PRR is a new treatment in the improvement of endometrial growth and the outcome of pregnancy in patients undergoing infertility treatment with a thin endometrium (endometrial thickness <7 mm).

Kim et al in a pilot study revealed that after the intrauterine administration of PRP in twenty women with a history of the cancellation of the previous ET cycle due to poor endometrial growth, the pregnancy outcome significantly improved even though the average of increment in endometrial thickness was not significant (20). Likewise, Tandulwadkar et al showed that after the use of the IUI of PRP, endometrial vascularity and pregnancy rate increased in patients with a history of repeated ET cancellation cycle due to suboptimal endometrial thickness and vascularity (23).

A recent in vitro study by Aghajanova et al demonstrated that PRP stimulates the cell process involved in endometrial regeneration and neoangiogenesis. Then, they also identified that PRP is effective in the treatment of Asherman’s syndrome. In another study, Zhang et al found that PRP could regulate endometrial receptivity by promoting mesenchymal stem cell proliferation (25-27).

Consistent with our finding, Nazari et al investigated the effectiveness of PRP in enhancing the pregnancy rate in RIF20 women with a history of RIF and reported that 18 of 20 participants became pregnant and 16 clinical pregnancies were recorded accordingly. They further showed that the intrauterine administration of PRP was effective in improving the pregnancy rate in RIF patients (21).

To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first clinical trial that evaluated the effectiveness of PRP on
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Table 3. Clinical Outcomes of Patients in the Intervention and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>PRP Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>P Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>β-HCG</td>
<td>31/51.67</td>
<td>18/30.00</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>29/48.33</td>
<td>42/70.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>31/51.67</td>
<td>16/26.67</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>29/48.33</td>
<td>44/73.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPR</td>
<td>31/51.67</td>
<td>15/25.00</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>29/48.33</td>
<td>45/75.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LBR</td>
<td>35/58.33</td>
<td>17/28.33</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>31/51.67</td>
<td>43/71.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>25/41.67</td>
<td>41/71.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery type</td>
<td>Cesarean</td>
<td>NVD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>18/36.92</td>
<td>8/61.54</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0/26.44</td>
<td>1/61.54</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>10/20.30</td>
<td>13/21.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>8/13.56</td>
<td>4/6.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-term rate</td>
<td>2/3.39</td>
<td>1/1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of embryo transfer</td>
<td>3/5.08</td>
<td>5/8.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical pregnancy</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0/2.33</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>60/100.00</td>
<td>58/96.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade of embryo</td>
<td>Grade A</td>
<td>109/78.42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>113/71.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade B</td>
<td>30/21.58</td>
<td>46/28.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-term rate</td>
<td>13/25.00</td>
<td>2/3.33</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of embryo transfer</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implantation rate</td>
<td>39/139=0.28</td>
<td>19/159=0.12</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR per clinical pregnancy</td>
<td>4/31=0.129</td>
<td>2/16=0.125</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPR</td>
<td>8/60=0.133</td>
<td>3/60=0.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. PRP: Platelet-rich plasma; β-HCG: beta human chorionic gonadotropin; CPR: Clinical pregnancy rate; OPR: Ongoing pregnancy rate; LBR: Live birth rate; IR: Implantation rate; MR: Miscarriage rate; MPR: Multiple pregnancy rate.
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Figure 2. The Etiology of Cesarean Section in PRP and Control Groups. Note. PRP: Platelet-rich plasma.
pregnancy outcomes in RIF patients with normal growth endometrium. This study included 120 RIF patients who had experienced implantation failure after three or more ETs. The results of the present study indicated that the intrauterine infusion of PRP before ET can significantly improve the clinical pregnancy and live birth in RIF women, which is independent of the woman's age, the AMH level, endometrial thickness, and the number of good-quality transferred embryos.

The incidence of preterm delivery was higher in the PRP group compared to the control group independent of the cause of infertility and maternal age.

The positive effect of using PRP on implantation may be partly related to the mechanical stimulation of the endometrium induced by the insertion of the catheter into the uterine cavity although this is only a possibility and no definitive conclusion can be drawn in this regard.

Chronic endometritis is a persistent inflammation of the uterine gland and endometrial stroma and is usually asymptomatic. Various studies have recently reported that the prevalence of subclinical chronic endometritis is high in RIF patients. Chronic endometritis could have a deleterious effect on receptivity via altering the expression of some genes that encode cytokines and chemokines involved in the implantation process. The results of some animal studies showed that the intrauterine administration of autologous PRP is effective in the treatment of endometritis and can improve implantation via activating peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) and modulating the excessive uterine inflammatory response (28-31).

A recent study indicated that dialogue between the platelet and PBMC can induce the activation of PBMC and the release of several cytokines and growth factors (32). The findings of another similar study showed that the intrauterine infusion of cultured PBMC before ET is effective in the improvement of pregnancy outcomes in RIF patients (33).

In addition to hemostasis, platelet release mediators induce human extravillous trophoblast migration and differentiation to modulate spiral artery in uterine and its consequence is regulation of the placentation process (34).

The balance between pro-inflammatory and anti-inflammatory cytokine response is essential for embryo implantation, and disturbance in each of these expressions could result in RIF (13,14).

Lédée et al demonstrated that 56.6% of RIF patients have up-regulated endometrial immune profile in comparison with fertile women, hence, PRP insemination may worsen this condition. Therefore, endometrial immune profiling and personalized treatment approaches are recommended in RIF patients (35). In addition, it is suggested that further studies compare PRP and endometrial scratching in a control group to obtain more accurate results.

According to some human studies, PRR can improve endometrial growth and uterine receptivity by its angiogenic factor or antimicrobial and anti-inflammatory properties (15,16).

According to the above-mentioned discussion, it seems that the intrauterine administration of PRP modulates the microenvironment of the uterus and improves endometrial growth and uterine receptivity by its angiogenic factor or antimicrobial and anti-inflammatory properties (36, 37).

Limitations of the Study
However, our study had some limitations. Due to the nature of this study, it was un-blinded and no placebo was used in the control group for ethical reasons. Considering that the clinical pregnancy rate is an objective outcome, these factors are unlikely to create any bias. Further, a large sample size is needed to have better comparison outcomes between the two groups.

Conclusions
PRP is effective in improving pregnancy outcomes in RIF patients and is prepared from the autologous blood sample, easily available inexpensive treatment without the risk of transmission of infection and immunological reaction. The exact mechanism of PRP in this field and which group of patients are most likely to benefit from this intervention should be clarified as well. It seemed that PRP can be used as a new promising method for the treatment of RIF patients.
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