

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM13-0045925		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	02/26/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/10/2012
<b>Decision Date:</b>	04/16/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/18/2013
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/12/2013

### 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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Orthopedic Surgery

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

This 42-year-old male reported a work-related injury on 05/10/2012. According to the progress report dated 10/1/13, the injured worker (IW) reports left knee pain. The IW was diagnosed with chondromalacia patella, patellofemoral syndrome and status post partial medial and lateral meniscectomy. Previous treatments include medications, ice/heat, physical therapy and Synvisc-One injection. The treating provider requests injection: PRP injection left knee. The Utilization Review on 10/18/2013 non-certified the request for injection: PRP injection left knee, citing Official Disability Guidelines Treatment for Worker's Compensation (ODG-TWC): Knee and Leg Procedure Summary.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Platelet-rich plasma (PRP) Injection left knee: 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), Knee and Leg.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Knee and Leg, PRP.

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) for the knee. According to the ODG, Knee and Leg, PRP, "Under study. PRP looks promising, but it is not yet ready for prime time. PRP has become popular among professional athletes because it promises to enhance performance, but there is no science behind it yet. A study of PRP injections in patients with early arthritis compared the effectiveness of PRP with that of low-molecular-weight hyaluronic acid and high-molecular-weight hyaluronic acid injections, and concluded that PRP is promising for less severe, very early arthritis, in younger people under 50 years of age, but it is not promising for very severe osteoarthritis in older patients". As the guidelines do not support PRP for the knee, the determination is for non-certification.