

Case Number:	CM15-0084636		
Date Assigned:	05/06/2015	Date of Injury:	03/21/2014
Decision Date:	06/11/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/02/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/04/2015

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: California, Texas, Florida

Certification(s)/Specialty: Anesthesiology, Pain Management, Hospice & Palliative 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 injured worker is a 42 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on August 21, 2014. The injured worker was diagnosed as having elbow pain, epicondylitis and elbow stiffness. Treatment and diagnostic studies to date have included Platelet Rich Plasma (PRP), cortisone injection, elbow strap, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), medication and stretching. A progress note dated March 23, 2015 provides the injured worker complains of right elbow pain. He reports Platelet Rich Plasma (PRP) injection helped. He is working light duty. Physical exam notes right elbow tenderness with decreased range of motion (ROM). The plan is for further Platelet Rich Plasma (PRP) injections, forearm strap and stretching.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Two additional platelet rich plasma injections, right elbow Qty 2: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Platelet-rich plasma.

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

Decision rationale: Regarding the request for two additional platelet rich plasma (PRP) injections, California MTUS does not address the issue. ODG cites that PRP is recommended for the elbow only as a second-line therapy after failure of first-line therapy and PRP should be reserved for the most severe cases since 80% of tennis elbows will be cured spontaneously without doing anything within a year. Also it is only recommended as a single injection. Within the documentation available for review, there is no clear rationale for a repeat injection. There is no indication of pain relief with associated reduction of medication use as well as functional improvement from previous PRP injections. In light of the above issues, the currently requested two additional platelet rich plasma (PRP) injections is not medically necessary.