

Case Number:	CM13-0025645		
Date Assigned:	11/20/2013	Date of Injury:	11/01/2009
Decision Date:	01/29/2014	UR Denial Date:	08/23/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/17/2013

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 Connecticut, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania. 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. 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 injured worker sustained injuries to their bilateral knees on November 21, 2009. The patient has had two right knee arthroscopies and a Synvisc injection to the knees that was initiated on April 22, 2013. Reportedly on the November 16, 2012, intraoperative findings documented grade 2 chondrosis of the patella in the medial femoral condyle did not have high grade chondromalacia changes noted. In a record of August of 2013, Synvisc injections to the bilateral knees were requested and this request would represent repeat injections.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Synvisc one injection 6ml (48mg) in the bilateral knees: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG), Criteria for Hyaluronic acid injections

Decision rationale: The California MTUS does not address this request. The Official Disability Guidelines, state, it is appropriate to repeat hyaluronic acid injections (Synvisc) in a clinical setting in which there is documentation of six months' duration of symptomatic relief with

recurrent symptoms. In this case, the prior Synvisc One injections had been administered in April and the request for repeat injections was submitted just four months after that. As guidelines require documented relief over a six month period of time, this was not presented in this case. The request for repeat Synvisc One injections, 6ml (48mg) in the bilateral knees is not medically necessary and appropriate.