

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0036905		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	07/25/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	05/12/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/12/2014	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	02/26/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	03/26/2014

### 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:

The claimant is a 47-year-old gentleman injured in a work-related accident on May 12, 2011. Recent clinical records available for review include a January 14, 2014, progress report, which documents ongoing complaints of left knee pain. The claimant is noted to have undergone prior anterior cruciate ligament and posterior cruciate ligament reconstruction. Physical examination of the left knee showed 0 to 115 degrees range of motion and positive posterior cruciate ligament laxity. No other positive physical examination findings were noted. Reviewed at that time was a January 3, 2014, left knee MR arthrogram report showing prior anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction, calcification along the medial and lateral collateral ligaments with thickening, normal meniscus, and osteochondral lesion to the lateral femoral condyle. No findings of acute posterior cruciate ligament injury were documented. This request is for: a left knee arthroscopy with revision posterior cruciate ligament reconstruction utilizing Achilles' tendon allograft; an assistant surgeon; 18 sessions of postoperative physical therapy; and the postoperative use of a cold therapy unit, a total range of motion brace, crutches, a continuous passive motion device, and an electrical stimulation unit.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Left Knee arthroscopy with revision posterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with Achilles tendon allograft: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 343.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 343-4. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG); Treatment in Worker's Comp, 18th Edition, 2013 Updates: knee procedure Posterior cruciate ligament (PCL) repair Under study. Injuries of the posterior cruciate ligament (PCL) of the knee frequently occur in automobile accidents and sports injuries, although they are less frequent overall than injuries of the anterior cruciate ligament (ACL). Some patients show significant symptoms and subsequent articular deterioration, while others are essentially asymptomatic, maintaining habitual function. Management of PCL injuries remains controversial and prognosis can vary widely. Interventions extend from non-operative (conservative) procedures to reconstruction of the PCL, in the hope that the surgical procedure may have a positive effect in the reduction/prevention of future osteoarthritic changes in the knee. No randomized or quasi-randomized controlled studies were identified. (Peccin-Cochrane, 2005).

**Decision rationale:** California ACOEM Guidelines would not support a left knee arthroscopy and revision posterior cruciate ligament reconstruction with Achilles' tendon allograft. The reviewed records in this case do not document a posterior cruciate ligament lesion on MR arthrogram or other imaging that would support the need for surgical intervention. Additionally, Official Disability Guidelines would not recommend surgical intervention for the posterior cruciate ligament except in unusual circumstances where failed conservative care and significant instability persist. Because there are no imaging studies affirming PCL pathology in this case, and given the absence of significant instability, this request would not be established as medically necessary.

**Assistant Surgeon:** 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 -Other Medical Treatment Guideline or Medical Evidence: -Milliman Care Guidelines 18th edition: assistant surgeon Assistant Surgeon Guidelines (Codes 29240 to 29894) CPT® Y/N Description 29881 N Arthroscopy, knee, surgical; with meniscectomy (medial OR lateral, including any meniscal shaving) including debridement/shaving of articular cartilage (chondroplasty), same or separate compartment(s), when performed.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Pre-operative Medical Clearance:** 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 American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine (ACOEM), 2nd Edition, Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations, page 127.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Post operative physical therapy 18 sessions for the left knee:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Postsurgical Treatment Guidelines.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Purchase of cold therapy unit:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 337-339.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**total range of Motion brace:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 340.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**Crutches:** 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); Treatment in Worker's Comp , 18th Edition, 2013 Updates: knee procedure - Walking aids (canes, crutches, braces, orthoses, & walkers) 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. (Reeves, 2011).

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**rental of continuous passive motion device for 14 days:** 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); Treatment in Worker's Comp, 18th Edition, 2013 Updates: knee procedure -Continuous passive motion (CPM) Recommended as indicated below, for in-hospital use, or for home use in patients at risk

of a stiff knee, based on demonstrated compliance and measured improvements, but the beneficial effects over regular PT may be small. Routine home use of CPM has minimal benefit. Although research suggests that CPM should be implemented in the first rehabilitation phase after surgery, there is substantial debate about the duration of each session and the total period of CPM application. A Cochrane review on this topic concluded that short-term use of CPM leads to greater short-term range of motion. But in a recent RCT results indicated that routine use of prolonged CPM should be reconsidered, since neither long-term effects nor better functional performance was detected. The experimental group received CPM + PT in the home situation for 17 consecutive days after surgery, whereas the usual care group received the same treatment during the in-hospital phase (i.e. about four days), followed by PT alone (usual care) in the first two weeks after hospital discharge. (Lenssen, 2008) Continuous passive motion (CPM) combined with PT, may offer beneficial results compared to PT alone in the short-term rehabilitation following total knee arthroplasty. Results favoring CPM were found for the main comparison of CPM combined with physical therapy (PT) versus PT alone at end of treatment. For the primary outcomes of interest, CPM combined with PT was found to statistically significantly increase active knee flexion and decrease length of stay. CPM was also found to decrease the need for post-operative manipulation. CPM did not significantly improve passive knee flexion and passive or active knee extension. (Milne-Cochrane, 2003) (Kirschner, 2004) (Brosseau, 2004) (Bennett, 2005) (Lenssen, 2006) Continuous passive motion can stimulate chondrocyte production of proteoglycan 4 (PRG4), a molecule found in synovial fluid with putative lubricating and chondroprotective properties. (Nugent-Derfus, 2006) A recent Cochrane review concluded that there is high-quality evidence that continuous passive motion increases passive knee flexion range of motion (mean difference 2 degrees) and active knee flexion range of motion (mean difference 3 degrees), but that these effects are too small to be clinically worthwhile, and there is low-quality evidence that continuous passive motion has no effect on length of hospital stay but reduces the need for manipulation under anesthesia. (Harvey, 2010) The adjunctive home use of CPM may be an effective treatment option for patients at risk of knee flexion contractures, regardless of whether the patient is being treated as part of a worker's compensation claim or not. Recent literature suggests that routine home use of CPM has minimal benefit when combined with standard physical.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

**rental of electrical stimulation unit for 90 days:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines TENS unit Page(s): 116.

**Decision rationale:** Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.