

**MAXIMUS FEDERAL SERVICES, INC.**

Independent Medical Review

P.O. Box 138009

Sacramento, CA 95813-8009

(855) 865-8873 Fax: (916) 605-4270



---

**Independent Medical Review Final Determination Letter**

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Dated: 12/26/2013

Employee: [REDACTED]  
Claim Number: [REDACTED]  
Date of UR Decision: 7/16/2013  
Date of Injury: 10/31/2007  
IMR Application Received: 8/8/2013  
MAXIMUS Case Number: CM13-0008935

DEAR [REDACTED]

MAXIMUS Federal Services has completed the Independent Medical Review (“IMR”) of the above workers’ compensation case. This letter provides you with the IMR Final Determination and explains how the determination was made.

Final Determination: PARTIAL OVERTURN. This means we decided that some (but not all) of the disputed items/services are medically necessary and appropriate. A detailed explanation of the decision for each of the disputed items/services is provided later in this letter.

The determination of MAXIMUS Federal Services and its physician reviewer is deemed to be the Final Determination of the Administrative Director of the Division of Workers’ Compensation. This determination is binding on all parties.

In certain limited circumstances, you can appeal the Final Determination. Appeals must be filed with the Workers’ Compensation Appeals Board within 30 days from the date of this letter. For more information on appealing the final determination, please see California Labor Code Section 4610.6(h).

Sincerely,

Paul Manchester, MD, MPH  
Medical Director

cc: Department of Industrial Relations, [REDACTED]

## HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to a physician reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. The physician 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 physician 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.

### DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The following relevant documents received from the interested parties and the documents provided with the application were reviewed and considered. These documents included:

- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

### CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

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

This is a 43 year old female with left knee pain, swelling and popping. Genu valgus alignment. Impression of aseptic loosening of prior unicompartmental knee replacement.

### IMR DECISION(S) AND RATIONALE(S)

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

**1. Intermittent limb compression cold therapy device times 21 day rental is not medically necessary and appropriate.**

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the Official Disability Guidelines, Continuous flow cryotherapy, which is not part of MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer found that no section of the MTUS was applicable. Per the Strength of Evidence hierarchy established by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Workers' Compensation, the Physician Reviewer based his/her decision on the Official Disability Guidelines, Continuous flow cryotherapy.

The Physician Reviewer's decision rationale:

According to the Official Disability Guidelines regarding cold therapy, "Continuous-flow cryotherapy: Recommended as an option after surgery, but not for nonsurgical treatment. Postoperative use generally may be up to 7 days, including home use. In the postoperative setting, continuous-flow cryotherapy units have been proven to decrease pain, inflammation, swelling, and narcotic usage; however, the effect on more frequently treated acute injuries (eg, muscle strains and contusions) has not been fully evaluated. Continuous-flow cryotherapy units provide regulated temperatures through use of power to circulate ice water in the cooling packs.

The available scientific literature is insufficient to document that the use of continuous-flow cooling systems (versus ice packs) is associated with a benefit beyond convenience and patient compliance (but these may be worthwhile benefits) in the outpatient setting. his meta-analysis showed that cryotherapy has a statistically significant benefit in postoperative pain control, while no improvement in postoperative range of motion or drainage was found. As the cryotherapy apparatus is fairly inexpensive, easy to use, has a high level of patient satisfaction, and is rarely associated with adverse events, we believe that cryotherapy is justified in the postoperative management of knee surgery. There is limited information to support active vs passive cryo units. Aetna considers passive hot and cold therapy medically necessary. Mechanical circulating units with pumps have not been proven to be more effective than passive hot and cold therapy. This study concluded that continuous cold therapy devices, compared to simple icing, resulted in much better nighttime pain control and improved quality of life in the early period following routine knee arthroscopy. Two additional RCTs provide support for use after total knee arthroplasty (TKA). Cold compression reduced blood loss by 32% and pain medication intake by 24%. It improved ROM and reduced hospital stay by 21%.” Based upon the guidelines the use of continuous-flow cryotherapy request for 21 day rental is not certified.

**2. Knee CPM Machine, 21 day rental for the left knee is medically necessary and appropriate.**

The Claims Administrator based its decision on the Official Disability Guidelines, Criteria for the use of continuous passive motion devices, which is not part of MTUS.

The Physician Reviewer found that no section of the MTUS was applicable. Per the Strength of Evidence hierarchy established by the California Department of Industrial Relations, Division of Workers' Compensation, the Physician Reviewer based his/her decision on the Official Disability Guidelines, Knee Chapter, continuous passive motion devices.

The Physician Reviewer's decision rationale:

Per ODG Guidelines, “Criteria for the use of continuous passive motion devices: In the acute hospital setting, postoperative use may be considered medically necessary, for 4-10 consecutive days (no more than 21), for the following surgical procedures: 1.) Total knee arthroplasty (revision and primary). The need for postoperative CPM use for this patient meets medical necessity.

Disclaimer: MAXIMUS is providing an independent review service under contract with the California Department of Industrial Relations. MAXIMUS is not engaged in the practice of law or medicine. Decisions about the use or nonuse of health care services and treatments are the sole responsibility of the patient and the patient's physician. MAXIMUS is not liable for any consequences arising from these decisions.

[REDACTED]

CM13-0008935