

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0100572		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	06/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	06/07/2007
<b>Decision Date:</b>	07/09/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	05/04/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	05/26/2015

### 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: New Jersey, Alabama, California  
 Certification(s)/Specialty: Neurology, Neuromuscular Medicine

### 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 61 year old male with an industrial injury dated 05/12/2006; 07/26/2006; cumulative trauma 05/03/1978 to 06/07/2007. Prior treatment included medications, diagnostics, physical therapy, acupuncture and shock wave treatments. Parts of the progress record dated 04/14/2015 are difficult to decipher including the diagnoses. He presents on 04/14/2015 with complaints of low back pain "essentially without changes". Documentation states the injured worker presents to recheck and obtain wrist and knee brace. "Old ones worn out." Objective findings include decreased range of motion and increased low back pain with straight leg raising. The request is for bilateral knee brace and left wrist replacement brace.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Left Wrist Replacement Brace: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 265.

**Decision rationale:** According to MTUS and ODG guidelines, splinting Recommend splinting of wrist in neutral position at night & day prn, as an option in conservative treatment. Use of daytime wrist splints has positive, but limited evidence. Splinting after surgery has negative evidence. When treating with a splint, there is scientific evidence to support the efficacy of neutral wrist splints in CTS, and it may include full-time splint wear instructions as needed, versus night-only. Carpal tunnel syndrome may be treated initially with a splint and medications before injection is considered, except in the case of severe CTS (thenar muscle atrophy and constant paresthesias in the median innervated digits). Outcomes from carpal tunnel surgery justify prompt referral for surgery in moderate to severe cases. Nevertheless, surgery should not be performed until the diagnosis of CTS is made by history, physical examination and possible electro diagnostic studies. Symptomatic relief from a cortisone/anesthetic injection will facilitate the diagnosis; however the benefit from these injections although good is short-lived. Two prospective randomized studies show that there is no beneficial effect from postoperative splinting after carpal tunnel release when compared to a bulky dressing alone. In fact, splinting the wrist beyond 48 hours following CTS release may be largely detrimental, especially compared to a home physical therapy program. (Banta, 1994) (Bury, 1995) (Courts, 1995) (Finsen, 1999) (Walker, 2000) (Gerritsen-JAMA, 2002) (Goodyear-Smith, 2004) (Muller, 2004) (Sevim, 2004) (Werner, 2005) (Premoselli, 2006) (Ucan, 2006) A hand brace significantly improves symptoms after four weeks. There is limited evidence that a nocturnal hand brace improves symptoms, hand function and overall patient-reported change in the short-term (up to four weeks of use). There is limited evidence that night-only wrist splint use is equally effective as full-time wrist splint use in improving short-term symptoms and hand function. There is limited evidence that neutral wrist splinting results in superior short-term overall and nocturnal symptom relief (at two weeks) when compared with wrist splinting in extension. Furthermore, limited evidence suggests that short-term daytime symptom relief is similar for both splint groups. (O'Conner-Cochrane, 2003) It is concluded that steroid injections and wrist splinting may be effective for relief of CTS symptoms but have a long-term effect in only 10 percent of patients. Symptom duration of less than 3 months and absence of sensory impairment at presentation are predictive of a lasting response to conservative treatment. Selected patients (i.e., with no thenar wasting or obvious underlying cause) presenting with mild to moderate carpal tunnel syndrome may receive either a single steroid injection or wear a wrist splint for 3 weeks. This will allow identification of the 10 percent of patients who respond well to conservative therapy and do not need surgery. (Graham, 2004) Statistical evaluation identified five factors which were important in predicting lack of response to wrist splints: (1) age over 50 years, (2) duration over ten months, (3) constant paraesthesiae, (4) stenosing flexor tenosynovitis, and (5) a Phalen's test positive in less than 30 seconds. When none of these factors was present, 66% of patients were cured by medical therapy, 40% of patients with one factor, 17% with two factors, and 7% with three factors, and no patient with four or five factors present was cured by medical management. (Kaplan, 1990) Data suggest that splinting is most effective if applied within three months of symptom onset. (Kruger, 1991) This systematic review found that the usefulness of splinting as initial treatment for improving CTS symptoms is still supported by recent literature, but these effects are temporary. (Bernardino, 2011). Therefore, wrist splinting is not

recommended for chronic wrist pain or remotely after carpal tunnel release. Therefore, the request for Left Wrist Replacement Brace is not medically necessary.

**Bilateral Knee Brace:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Page(s): 340. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Knee brace. <http://www.odg-twc.com/index.html>.

**Decision rationale:** According to ODG guidelines, Knee brace is Recommended as indicated below. Recommend valgus knee braces for knee OA. Knee braces that produce a valgus moment about the knee markedly reduce the net knee adduction moment and unload the medial compartment of the knee, but could be impractical for many patients. There are no high quality studies that support or refute the benefits of knee braces for patellar instability, ACL tear, or MCL instability, but in some patients a knee brace can increase confidence, which may indirectly help with the healing process. Criteria for the use of knee braces: Prefabricated knee braces may be appropriate in patients with one of the following conditions: 1. Knee instability 2. Ligament insufficiency/deficiency 3. Reconstructed ligament 4. Articular defect repair 5. Avascular necrosis 6. Meniscal cartilage repair 7. Painful failed total knee arthroplasty 8. Painful high tibial osteotomy 9. Painful unicompartmental osteoarthritis 10. Tibial plateau fracture Custom fabricated knee braces may be appropriate for patients with the following conditions which may preclude the use of a prefabricated model: 1. Abnormal limb contour, such as: a. Valgus [knock-kneed] limb; b. Varus [bow-legged] limb; c. Tibial varum; d. Disproportionate thigh and calf (e.g., large thigh and small calf); e. Minimal muscle mass on which to suspend a brace; 2. Skin changes, such as: a. Excessive redundant soft skin; b. Thin skin with risk of breakdown (e.g., chronic steroid use); 3. Severe osteoarthritis (grade III or IV); 4. Maximal off-loading of painful or repaired knee compartment (example: heavy patient; significant pain); 5. Severe instability as noted on physical examination of knee; There is no clear and recent documentation of knee instability or ligament damage a vascular necrosis or any other indication for knee brace. Therefore, the request for Bilateral Knee Brace is not medically necessary.