

Case Number:	CM14-0209842		
Date Assigned:	12/22/2014	Date of Injury:	09/09/2009
Decision Date:	03/03/2015	UR Denial Date:	12/05/2014
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	12/15/2014

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: Orthopedic Surgery

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 64-year-old male with a date of injury of 9/9/2009. Claimant is being treated for multiple chronic musculoskeletal complaints. The patient has been diagnosed with right knee tricompartmental arthritis, lumbar spine sprain, status post fusion with residuals, and right hip pain. The patient currently presented with lumbar spine, right knee, and bilateral hip pain. The patient has a prior history of right knee pain, soreness and swelling at night. Exam from 11/25/14 demonstrates findings including a body mass index of 33.2, ambulation without difficulty, right knee tenderness medially with crepitus, and right knee range of motion from 0 to 100 degrees. Prior imaging studies indicated tricompartmental right knee osteoarthritis with complete loss of the medial joint space. The provider stated that the patient has failed Supartz injections, medication management and physical therapy.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Right total knee arthroplasty: 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 & Leg (Acute & Chronic) Indications for Surgery - Knee Arthroplasty

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, Arthroplasty.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of total knee replacement. According to the Official Disability Guidelines regarding knee arthroplasty: criteria for knee joint replacement which includes conservative care with subjective findings includes limited range of motion less than 90 degrees. In addition the patient should have a BMI of less than 35 and be older than 50 years of age. There must also be findings on standing radiographs of significant loss of chondral clear space. The clinical information submitted demonstrates insufficient evidence to support a knee arthroplasty in this patient. There is no documentation from the exam notes from 11/25/14 of increased pain with initiation of activity or weight bearing. There are no records in the chart documenting when physical therapy began or how many visits were attempted. There is no evidence in the cited examination notes of limited range of motion less than 90 degrees. Therefore the guideline criteria have not been met and the determination is for non-certification.

Associated surgical services: Pre-op 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 cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Associated surgical services: 12 post-op physical therapy sessions: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Associated surgical services: 1 walker: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Associated surgical services: 1 polar care unit: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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

Associated surgical services: 1 CPM machine: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

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