

Case Number:	CM14-0105101		
Date Assigned:	09/16/2014	Date of Injury:	10/09/2009
Decision Date:	10/21/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/01/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/07/2014

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine and is licensed to practice in California. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/services. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

There were 90 pages provided for this review. The application for independent medical review was signed on July 3, 2014. It was for plasma rich protein to the right lateral epicondyles times three. The claimant is a 50-year-old female with right lateral epicondyles pain. The injury was October 9, 2009. The exam showed persistent pain over the conjoined tendon and lateral epicondyles. There was full motion of the elbow wrist and hand. The patient had undergone prior platelet rich plasma injection with reported significant improvement prior to the February 7, 2014 contusion. The claimant already had an injection. It is still considered investigational. He does not meet the criteria set forth for repeat injections. The Arthrotec double syringe was not approved because the primary procedure was not approved.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

PRP RT Lateral Epicondyle X3 Arthrex Double Syringe: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines Elbow Chapter

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Elbow section, PRP injection

Decision rationale: The ODG notes regarding Platelet-rich plasma (PRP): PRP looks promising, but it was not yet ready for prime time. PRP had become popular among professional athletes because it promises to enhance performance, but there was no science behind it yet. In a blinded, prospective, randomized trial of PRP vs. placebo in patients undergoing surgery to repair a torn rotator cuff, there was no difference in pain relief or in function. The only thing that was significantly different was the time it took to do the repair; it was longer if you put PRP in the joint. There were also no differences in residual defects on MRI. (AAOS, 2010). Based on the lack of full verification, this request is not medically necessary.