

Case Number:	CM13-0048605		
Date Assigned:	12/27/2013	Date of Injury:	05/05/2009
Decision Date:	12/18/2014	UR Denial Date:	10/17/2013
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/06/2013

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 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 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:

This is a 54 year old female with a 5/5/09 injury date. In a 10/10/13 note, the patient complained of left knee pain. Objective findings included full left knee range of motion, 1 to 2+ retropatellar pain with resisted extension, and no atrophy. In a 1/22/14 note, there was medial and patellofemoral tenderness. Diagnostic impression: left knee arthritis, left foot pain. Treatment to date: physical therapy, left knee chondroplasty, medications, cortisone injection. A UR decision on 10/17/13 denied the requests for foot orthotics and Euflexxa injections with ultrasound guidance. However, the rationale for the decision was not included in the documentation.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

1 Foot Orthotics: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 370.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 14 Ankle and Foot Complaints Page(s): 371.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS states that rigid orthotics may reduce pain experienced during walking and may reduce more global measures of pain and disability for patients with plantar fasciitis and metatarsalgia. However, there is no rationale for custom orthotics. It is unclear

whether a trial of pre-fabricated orthotics has failed or why pre-fabricated orthotics would be insufficient. In addition, there were no clinical notes provided that were relevant to the patient's left foot symptoms. No left foot diagnosis could be established on the basis of the provided documentation. Therefore, the request for 1 Foot Orthotics is not medically necessary.

1 Euflexxa Series of 3 injections with Ultrasound Guidance: 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 Chapter (Acute and Chronic).

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

Decision rationale: CA MTUS does not address this issue. ODG recommends viscosupplementation injections in patients with significantly symptomatic osteoarthritis that has not responded adequately to standard nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic treatments or is intolerant of these therapies; OR is not a candidate for total knee replacement or has failed previous knee surgery for arthritis; OR a younger patient wanting to delay total knee replacement; AND failure of conservative treatment; AND plain x-ray or arthroscopy findings diagnostic of osteoarthritis. ODG states that knee injections should not generally require ultrasound guidance. However, there is a lack of relevant clinical information in the provided documentation. There are no imaging findings or operative arthroscopy reports that would confirm the diagnosis of arthritis. The recorded objective findings are quite brief and limited. There was no discussion of exceptional factors that would necessitate the use of ultrasound guidance during knee injection. Therefore, the request for 1 Euflexxa series of 3 injections with Ultrasound Guidance is not medically necessary.