

Case Number:	CM14-0020527		
Date Assigned:	04/25/2014	Date of Injury:	08/28/2003
Decision Date:	07/07/2014	UR Denial Date:	02/07/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	02/19/2014

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 Orthopedic Surgery 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:

The claimant is a 56-year-old gentleman who sustained an ankle fracture on August 28, 2003 and required open reduction internal fixation of the injury. The records provided for review include a December 20, 2013 progress report by [REDACTED], treating orthopedist, who documented subjective complaints of continued ankle pain following a recent ankle arthroscopy with no significant improvement. The claimant was currently being treated in immobilization. Physical exam showed diminished swelling, tenderness to palpation about the healed incisions with no motion deficit or evidence of instability. The claimant's working diagnoses was status post subtalar fusion on June 4, 2012 with recent ankle arthroscopy. [REDACTED] recommended a PRP injection of the ankle with the addition of a bone marrow aspirate from the calcaneus to be implanted at the site of the claimant's prior hardware. This was being recommended to "promote bone growth and healing". No reports of imaging studies were provided for review.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

RETRO BONE MARROW ASPIRATION DONE 01/27/14: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Treatment in

Worker's Comp, 18th Edition, 2013 Updates: Ankle Procedure: Stem Cell Autologous Transplantation.

Decision rationale: California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) Guidelines do not address this request. The Official Disability Guidelines state that autologous transplantation from adult cells including bone marrow, fat and peripheral blood remains under study for use in the ankle. There are currently no long term studies demonstrating efficacy or long term benefit. The specific request for the bone marrow procedure performed in this individual would not be supported as medically necessary.

RETRO PRP DONE 1/27/14 QTY:1.00: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Treatment in Worker's Comp, 18th Edition, 2013 Updates: ankle procedure: Platelet-rich plasma (PRP).

Decision rationale: When looking at Official Disability Guideline criteria as California Medical Treatment Utilization Schedule (MTUS) American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM) Guidelines do not address PRP injections, the PRP injection to the ankle also would not be support. The Official Disability Guidelines state that recent clinical literature in regards to PRP injections of the ankle indicates that it is no better than placebo in the long term treatment of chronic ankle complaints. The specific request for this injection at this chronic stage in the claimant's course of ankle care would thus not be supported as necessary.