MAXIMUS Federal Services

Case Number:	CM13-0037695		
Date Assigned:	12/18/2013	Date of Injury:	08/24/2004
Decision Date:	02/05/2014	UR Denial Date:	09/06/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	09/24/2013

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 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. 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:

53 year old male with left knee pain. Industrial injury 8/24/04. Status post left knee arthroscopy on 12/14/12. Exam note from 8/21/13 demonstrates antalgic gait. Trace effusion noted with medial joint line tenderness. Diagnosis of left knee osteoarthritis with plan for total knee arthroplasty. Total joint arthroplasty not authorized per review of records.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Crutches: 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, Walking aids

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee, walking aids.

Decision rationale: "Recommended, as indicated below. Almost half of patients with knee pain possess a walking aid. Disability, pain, and age-related impairments seem to determine the need for a walking aid. Nonuse is associated with less need, negative outcome, and negative evaluation of the walking aid. (Van der Esch, 2003) There is evidence that a brace has additional

beneficial effect for knee osteoarthritis compared with medical treatment alone, a laterally wedged insole (orthosis) decreases NSAID intake compared with a neutral insole, patient compliance is better in the laterally wedged insole compared with a neutral insole, and a strapped insole has more adverse effects than a lateral wedge insole. (Brouwer-Cochrane, 2005) Contralateral cane placement is the most efficacious for persons with knee osteoarthritis. In fact, no cane use may be preferable to ipsilateral cane usage as the latter resulted in the highest knee moments of force, a situation which may exacerbate pain and deformity. (Chan, 2005) While recommended for therapeutic use, braces are not necessarily recommended for prevention of injury. (Yang, 2005) Bracing after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction is expensive and is not proven to prevent injuries or influence outcomes. (McDevitt, 2004) Recommended, as indicated below. Assistive devices for ambulation can reduce pain associated with OA. Frames or wheeled walkers are preferable for patients with bilateral disease. (Zhang, 2008) While foot orthoses are superior to flat inserts for patellofemoral pain, they are similar to physical therapy and do not improve outcomes when added to physical therapy in the short-term management of patellofemoral pain. (Collins, 2008) In patients with OA, the use of a cane or walking stick in the hand contralateral to the symptomatic knee reduces the peak knee adduction moment by 10%. Patients must be careful not to use their cane in the hand on the same side as the symptomatic leg, as this technique can actually increase the knee adduction moment. Using a cane in the hand contralateral to the symptomatic knee might shift the body's center of mass towards the affected limb, thereby reducing the medially directed ground reaction force, in a similar way as that achieved with the lateral trunk lean strategy described above. Cane use, in conjunction with a slow walking speed, lowers the ground reaction force, and decreases the biomechanical load experienced by the lower limb. The use of a cane and walking slowly could be simple and effective intervention strategies for patients with OA. In a similar manner to which cane use unloads the limb, weight loss also decreases load in the limb to a certain extent and should be considered as a long-term strategy, especially for overweight individuals." There is insufficient evidence in the medical records to support medical necessity for crutches therefore the determination is non-certification.

single point cane: 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, Walking aids

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee, walking aids.

Decision rationale: The CA MTUS/ACOEM guidelines are silent regarding single point cane. According to the ODG knee chapter, walking aids, "Recommended, as indicated below. Almost half of patients with knee pain possess a walking aid. Disability, pain, and age-related impairments seem to determine the need for a walking aid. Nonuse is associated with less need, negative outcome, and negative evaluation of the walking aid. (Van der Esch, 2003) There is evidence that a brace has additional beneficial effect for knee osteoarthritis compared with medical treatment alone, a laterally wedged insole (orthosis) decreases NSAID intake compared

with a neutral insole, patient compliance is better in the laterally wedged insole compared with a neutral insole, and a strapped insole has more adverse effects than a lateral wedge insole. (Brouwer-Cochrane, 2005) Contralateral cane placement is the most efficacious for persons with knee osteoarthritis. In fact, no cane use may be preferable to ipsilateral cane usage as the latter resulted in the highest knee moments of force, a situation which may exacerbate pain and deformity. (Chan, 2005) While recommended for therapeutic use, braces are not necessarily recommended for prevention of injury. (Yang, 2005) Bracing after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction is expensive and is not proven to prevent injuries or influence outcomes. (McDevitt, 2004) Recommended, as indicated below. Assistive devices for ambulation can reduce pain associated with OA. Frames or wheeled walkers are preferable for patients with bilateral disease. (Zhang, 2008) While foot orthoses are superior to flat inserts for patellofemoral pain, they are similar to physical therapy and do not improve outcomes when added to physical therapy in the short-term management of patellofemoral pain. (Collins, 2008) In patients with OA, the use of a cane or walking stick in the hand contralateral to the symptomatic knee reduces the peak knee adduction moment by 10%. Patients must be careful not to use their cane in the hand on the same side as the symptomatic leg, as this technique can actually increase the knee adduction moment. Using a cane in the hand contralateral to the symptomatic knee might shift the body's center of mass towards the affected limb, thereby reducing the medially directed ground reaction force, in a similar way as that achieved with the lateral trunk lean strategy described above. Cane use, in conjunction with a slow walking speed, lowers the ground reaction force, and decreases the biomechanical load experienced by the lower limb. The use of a cane and walking slowly could be simple and effective intervention strategies for patients with OA. In a similar manner to which cane use unloads the limb, weight loss also decreases load in the limb to a certain extent and should be considered as a long-term strategy, especially for overweight individuals." There is insufficient evidence in the medical records to support medical necessity for single point ca

3-1 commode: 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 (ODG).

Decision rationale: Per the ODG, Recommended generally if there is a medical need and if the device or system meets Medicare's definition of durable medical equipment (DME) below. Most bathroom and toilet supplies do not customarily serve a medical purpose and are primarily used for convenience in the home. Medical conditions that result in physical limitations for patients may require patient education and modifications to the home environment for prevention of injury, but environmental modifications are considered not primarily medical in nature. Certain DME toilet items (commodes, bed pans, etc.) are medically necessary if the patient is bed- or room-confined, and devices such as raised toilet seats, commode chairs, sitz baths and portable whirlpools may be medically necessary when prescribed as part of a medical treatment plan for injury, infection, or conditions that result in physical limitations. Many assistive devices, such as

electric garage door openers, microwave ovens, and golf carts, were designed for the fully mobile, independent adult, and Medicare does not cover most of these items.. In this case there is insufficient evidence to support a 3-1 commode therefore the determination is non-certification..

joint kit (reacher, sock aide, long-handled shoe horn, bath sponge): 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 Durable medical equipment (DME).

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

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of a joint kit. Per the ODG, Recommended generally if there is a medical need and if the device or system meets Medicare's definition of durable medical equipment (DME) below. Most bathroom and toilet supplies do not customarily serve a medical purpose and are primarily used for convenience in the home. Medical conditions that result in physical limitations for patients may require patient education and modifications to the home environment for prevention of injury, but environmental modifications are considered not primarily medical in nature. Certain DME toilet items (commodes, bed pans, etc.) are medically necessary if the patient is bed- or room-confined, and devices such as raised toilet seats, commode chairs, sitz baths and portable whirlpools may be medically necessary when prescribed as part of a medical treatment plan for injury, infection, or conditions that result in physical limitations. Many assistive devices, such as electric garage door openers, microwave ovens, and golf carts, were designed for the fully mobile, independent adult, and Medicare does not cover most of these items. In this case there is insufficient evidence to support a joint kit and therefore the determination is non-certification.

ice machine: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 1015-1017.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Cold Therapy.

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%." In this case there is insufficient evidence to support continuous cold cryotherapy and therefore the determination is non-certification.

wedge cushion: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 1009.

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

Decision rationale: Per the ODG, Recommended generally if there is a medical need and if the device or system meets Medicare's definition of durable medical equipment (DME) below. Most bathroom and toilet supplies do not customarily serve a medical purpose and are primarily used for convenience in the home. Medical conditions that result in physical limitations for patients may require patient education and modifications to the home environment for prevention of injury, but environmental modifications are considered not primarily medical in nature. Certain DME toilet items (commodes, bed pans, etc.) are medically necessary if the patient is bed- or room-confined, and devices such as raised toilet seats, commode chairs, sitz baths and portable whirlpools may be medically necessary when prescribed as part of a medical treatment plan for injury, infection, or conditions that result in physical limitations. Many assistive devices, such as electric garage door openers, microwave ovens, and golf carts, were designed for the fully mobile, independent adult, and Medicare does not cover most of these items.. In this case there is insufficient evidence to support a wedge cushion for elevation therefore the determination is non-certification..

front wheel walker: 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, Walking aids

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee Chapter, Walking Aids.

Decision rationale: "Recommended, as indicated below. Almost half of patients with knee pain possess a walking aid. Disability, pain, and age-related impairments seem to determine the need for a walking aid. Nonuse is associated with less need, negative outcome, and negative evaluation of the walking aid. (Van der Esch, 2003) There is evidence that a brace has additional beneficial effect for knee osteoarthritis compared with medical treatment alone, a laterally wedged insole (orthosis) decreases NSAID intake compared with a neutral insole, patient compliance is better in the laterally wedged insole compared with a neutral insole, and a strapped insole has more adverse effects than a lateral wedge insole. (Brouwer-Cochrane, 2005) Contralateral cane placement is the most efficacious for persons with knee osteoarthritis. In fact, no cane use may be preferable to ipsilateral cane usage as the latter resulted in the highest knee moments of force, a situation which may exacerbate pain and deformity. (Chan, 2005) While recommended for therapeutic use, braces are not necessarily recommended for prevention of injury. (Yang, 2005) Bracing after anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction is expensive and is not proven to prevent injuries or influence outcomes. (McDevitt, 2004) Recommended, as indicated below. Assistive devices for ambulation can reduce pain associated with OA. Frames or wheeled walkers are preferable for patients with bilateral disease. (Zhang, 2008) While foot orthoses are superior to flat inserts for patellofemoral pain, they are similar to physical therapy and do not improve outcomes when added to physical therapy in the short-term management of patellofemoral pain. (Collins, 2008) In patients with OA, the use of a cane or walking stick in the hand contralateral to the symptomatic knee reduces the peak knee adduction moment by 10%. Patients must be careful not to use their cane in the hand on the same side as the symptomatic leg, as this technique can actually increase the knee adduction moment. Using a cane in the hand contralateral to the symptomatic knee might shift the body's center of mass towards the affected limb, thereby reducing the medially directed ground reaction force, in a similar way as that achieved with the lateral trunk lean strategy described above. Cane use, in conjunction with a slow walking speed, lowers the ground reaction force, and decreases the biomechanical load experienced by the lower limb. The use of a cane and walking slowly could be simple and effective intervention strategies for patients with OA. In a similar manner to which cane use unloads the limb, weight loss also decreases load in the limb to a certain extent and should be considered as a long-term strategy, especially for overweight individuals." There is insufficient evidence in the medical records to support medical necessity for front wheel walker and therefore the determination is non-certification..