

Case Number:	CM13-0006524		
Date Assigned:	03/07/2014	Date of Injury:	01/16/2002
Decision Date:	05/12/2014	UR Denial Date:	07/17/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	08/05/2013

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. The expert reviewer is Board Certified in Occupational Medicine 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 applicant is a represented [REDACTED] employee who has filed a claim for chronic knee pain reportedly associated with an industrial injury of January 16, 2002. Thus far, the applicant has been treated with the following: Analgesic medications; attorney representation; MRI imaging of the knee of March 22, 2013, notable for evidence of an earlier medial meniscectomy and knee arthritis; earlier knee arthroscopy; unspecified amounts of physical therapy over the life of the claim; a knee brace; and Synvisc injection. In a Utilization Review Report of July 17, 2013, the claims administrator denied a request for mechanical prophylaxis calf wraps. The applicant's attorney subsequently appealed. The wraps were apparently provided on one date alone, June 7, 2013. Also reviewed is a handwritten note of June 7, 2013, in which the applicant apparently underwent a right knee arthroscopy and meniscectomy surgery to ameliorate a preoperative diagnosis of knee internal derangement.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MECHANICAL PROPHYLAXIS (PIC) BILATERAL CALF WRAPS (DOS : 06/07/13):
Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf. 2011.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine, Prevention of Venous Thromboembolism after surgery.

Decision rationale: The Expert Reviewer's decision rationale: The MTUS does not address the topic. As noted by the Cleveland Clinic Journal of Medicine, individuals who undergo lower risk procedures such as knee arthroscopy need mechanical prophylaxis only if there is evidence of individual risk factors such as morbid obesity, limited mobility after surgery, a history of prior deep venous thrombosis or malignancy. In this case, however, there was no clearly voiced history of earlier DVT, obesity, issues with mobility, etc, which might have made a case for mechanical prophylaxis following knee arthroscopy. No narrative commentary was attached to the request for authorization or to the application for Independent Medical Review. Therefore, the request is not certified.