

Case Number:	CM14-0207074		
Date Assigned:	12/19/2014	Date of Injury:	06/28/2006
Decision Date:	03/06/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/08/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/10/2014

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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:
State(s) of Licensure: Maryland, District of Columbia
Certification(s)/Specialty: Internal Medicine

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 employee was a 66 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 06/28/06. The request was for right knee platelet rich plasma injection and intra-articular platelet rich plasma preparation. The note from 11/25/14 was reviewed. He had right knee pain. He also had complaints relating to his neck, low back and both shoulders. During his last evaluation on 05/01/14 he reported good, but not lasting relief from the PRP injection performed in mid March 2014. His repeat injection was authorized, but preparation was not. Objective findings included medial joint tenderness, satisfactory range of motion and increased pain with McMurray. His prior treatments have included multiple viscosupplementation according to the note from 05/01/14.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right knee platelet-rich plasma injection, QTY: 1: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee, Platelet rich Plasma injections.

Decision rationale: The employee was a 66 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 06/28/06. The request was for right knee platelet rich plasma injection and intra-articular platelet rich plasma preparation. The note from 11/25/14 was reviewed. He had right knee pain. He also had complaints relating to his neck, low back and both shoulders. During his last evaluation on 05/01/14 he reported good, but not lasting relief from the PRP injection performed in mid March 2014. His repeat injection was authorized, but preparation was not. Objective findings included medial joint tenderness, satisfactory range of motion and increased pain with McMurray. His prior treatments have included multiple viscosupplementation according to the note from 05/01/14. According to Official Disability Guidelines, Platelet rich Plasma injections look promising, but it is not ready for prime time yet. It is promising in early studies for early arthritis in younger people under 50 years of age, but is not promising for severe osteoarthritis in older patients. Hence the PRP injection and its preparation are not medically necessary or appropriate.

Intra-articular platelet-rich plasma preparation, QTY: 1: Upheld

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

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

Decision rationale: The employee was a 66 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 06/28/06. The request was for right knee platelet rich plasma injection and intra-articular platelet rich plasma preparation. The note from 11/25/14 was reviewed. He had right knee pain. He also had complaints relating to his neck, low back and both shoulders. During his last evaluation on 05/01/14 he reported good, but not lasting relief from the PRP injection performed in mid March 2014. His repeat injection was authorized, but preparation was not. Objective findings included medial joint tenderness, satisfactory range of motion and increased pain with McMurray. His prior treatments have included multiple viscosupplementation according to the note from 05/01/14. According to Official Disability Guidelines, Platelet rich Plasma injections look promising, but it is not ready for prime time yet. It is promising in early studies for early arthritis in younger people under 50 years of age, but is not promising for severe osteoarthritis in older patients. Hence the PRP injection and its preparation are not medically necessary or appropriate.