

Case Number:	CM14-0198954		
Date Assigned:	12/09/2014	Date of Injury:	12/11/2013
Decision Date:	01/22/2015	UR Denial Date:	11/04/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	11/26/2014

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:

According to the records made available for review, this is a 24-year-old male with a 12/11/13 date of injury. At the time (10/23/14) of request for authorization for right knee MRI w/out contrast, there is documentation of subjective (right knee medial pain) and objective (tenderness over medial and lateral knee joint with minimal effusion) findings, current diagnoses (right knee internal derangement and status post right knee arthroscopy), and treatment to date (cortisone injections and medications). Medical reports identify a request for repeat MRI for mechanical symptoms on the medial side of the knee. There is no documentation of a diagnosis/condition (with supportive subjective/objective findings) for which a repeated study is indicated.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right knee MRI w/out contrast: 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): 344-347. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Minnesota Rules, 5221.6100 Parameters for Medical Imaging

Decision rationale: MTUS reference to ACOEM identifies documentation of an unstable knee with documented episodes of locking, popping, giving way, recurrent effusion, or clear signs of a bucket handle tear, as well as nondiagnostic radiographs, as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of MRI of the knee. ODG identifies documentation of a diagnosis/condition (with supportive subjective/objective findings) for which a repeat study is indicated (such as: To diagnose a suspected fracture or suspected dislocation, to monitor a therapy or treatment which is known to result in a change in imaging findings and imaging of these changes are necessary to determine the efficacy of the therapy or treatment (repeat imaging is not appropriate solely to determine the efficacy of physical therapy or chiropractic treatment), to follow up a surgical procedure, to diagnose a change in the patient's condition marked by new or altered physical findings) as criteria necessary to support the medical necessity of a repeat MRI. Within the medical information available for review, there is documentation of diagnoses of right knee internal derangement and status post right knee arthroscopy. However, despite documentation of a request for repeat MRI for mechanical symptoms on the medial side of the knee, there is no documentation of a diagnosis/condition (with supportive subjective/objective findings) for which a repeated study is indicated (to diagnose a suspected fracture or suspected dislocation, to monitor a therapy or treatment which is known to result in a change in imaging findings and imaging of these changes are necessary to determine the efficacy of the therapy or treatment (repeat imaging is not appropriate solely to determine the efficacy of physical therapy or chiropractic treatment), to follow up a surgical procedure, to diagnose a change in the patient's condition marked by new or altered physical findings). Therefore, based on guidelines and a review of the evidence, the request for right knee MRI w/out contrast is not medically necessary.