

Case Number:	CM13-0026032		
Date Assigned:	11/22/2013	Date of Injury:	01/26/2013
Decision Date:	04/17/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/10/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/19/2013

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 Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation 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 patient is a 46-year-old male who reported an injury on 01/26/2013. The mechanism of injury was a motor vehicle accident. The patient had an x-ray of the left knee that was within normal limits on 01/30/2013. The patient's diagnoses were noted to include left knee strain with patellofemoral subluxation. The request as submitted was for a repeat x-ray.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 X-RAY OF THE LEFT KNEE: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 1021-1022.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 341-343.

Decision rationale: ACOEM Guidelines indicate that special studies are not needed to evaluate most knee complaints until after a period of conservative care and observation. The patient was noted to have a prior x-ray of the knee, which revealed a normal study. There was no physical examination or DWC form RFA submitted with a request of an X-ray for the left knee. Given the above, the request for 1 x-ray of the left knee is not medically necessary.