

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0188211		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	11/18/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	02/06/1993
<b>Decision Date:</b>	01/07/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	10/31/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	11/12/2014

### 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 Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation and is licensed to practice in New York. 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 injured worker is an 88-year-old female who reported an injury on 02/06/1993 due to an unknown mechanism. Past treatments revealed 2 left knee injections. The most recent 1 was reported to have been given to the right knee 1 month ago with a reported 50% improvement from the injection. Medication reported was Norco. Physical examination on 10/15/2014 revealed tenderness over the medial joint of the right and left knee. +1 crepitus was noted in the right knee and +2 in the left knee. There was decrease in range of motion bilateral knees. It was also noted that the injured worker ambulated with a walker. Treatment plan was to continue Norco as needed for flare ups and continue home exercise program as tolerated. Also, a request for hyaluronic acid injection series, Euflexxa/Synvisc for the left knee. It was reported that the injured worker was bone on bone on her last standing x-ray and had a successful series done 12/20/2013. The rationale and Request for Authorization were not submitted.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**3 Euffexxa Injections (Hyaluronic Acid Injections series) for the left knee: 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), Treatment Index, 11th Edition(web) 2013, Treatment In Workers Compensation, Knee

**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, Hyaluronic Acid Injections

**Decision rationale:** The decision for 3 Euffexxa Injections (Hyaluronic Acid Injections series) for the left knee is not medically necessary. Criteria for hyaluronic acid injections are patients that experience significantly symptomatic osteoarthritis, but have not responded adequately to recommended conservative nonpharmacologic and pharmacologic treatments. Documented symptomatic severe osteoarthritis of the knee, which may include the following: bony enlargement, bony tenderness, crepitus on active motion, less than 30 minutes of morning stiffness, and no palpable warmth of synovium, and over 50 years of age. Pain interferes with functional activities and not attributed to other forms of joint disease. Failure to adequately respond to aspiration and injection of intra-articular steroids, and generally performed without fluoroscopic or ultrasound guidance. The patient should also not be a candidate for total knee replacement. The clinical documentation submitted for review did not indicate failure to adequately respond to aspiration and injection of intra-articular steroids. The guidelines also state there should be documented symptomatic severe osteoarthritis of the knee. The clinical documentation did not indicate that the injured worker had severe osteoarthritis of the knee. Furthermore, it was not reported that the injured worker had injection of intra-articular steroids. The clinical documentation submitted for review does not provide evidence to support the decision for 3 Euflexxa injections for the left knee. Therefore, this request is not medically necessary.