

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM14-0201044		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	12/11/2014	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/17/2013
<b>Decision Date:</b>	05/01/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	11/17/2014
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	12/01/2014

### 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. 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/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: California

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

### 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 a 48 year old male, who sustained a work/ industrial injury on 6/17/13. He has reported initial symptoms of left knee and ankle pain. The injured worker was diagnosed as having lateral collateral ligament laxity, and tibial plateau fracture. Treatments to date included medication and surgery (hardware removal of left knee 5/12/14, left total knee replacement on 7/16/14; along with Methicillin-Resistant Staphylococcus Aureus (MRSA) wound infection 7/8/14. Currently, the injured worker complains of left knee pain. The treating orthopedic examination from 11/14/14 indicated left knee was tender to palpation medially and laterally, no effusion, no significant erythema, range of motion 0-120 degrees, and lateral collateral ligament laxity present. Plan was to work on gait stability, strengthening, and ankle rehab. Treatment plan included physical therapy for the left knee.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Physical therapy 2 x week for 4 weeks for the left knee:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 337-338, 339.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines 8 C.C.R. 9792.20 - 9792.26 MTUS (Effective July 18, 2009) Page(s): 98-99 of 127. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ODG, Knee Chapter, Physical Medicine.

**Decision rationale:** Regarding the request for physical therapy, Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines recommend a short course (10 sessions) of active therapy with continuation of active therapies at home as an extension of the treatment process in order to maintain improvement levels. ODG has more specific criteria for the ongoing use of physical therapy. ODG recommends a trial of physical therapy. If the trial of physical therapy results in objective functional improvement, as well as ongoing objective treatment goals, then additional therapy may be considered. Within the documentation available for review, there is no documentation of specific objective functional improvement with the recent PT sessions and remaining deficits that cannot be addressed within the context of an independent home exercise program yet are expected to improve with formal supervised therapy. Furthermore, the request would exceed the amount of PT recommended by the CA MTUS and, unfortunately, there is no provision for modification of the current request. In light of the above issues, the currently requested physical therapy is not medically necessary.