

Case Number:	CM15-0102165		
Date Assigned:	06/04/2015	Date of Injury:	09/09/2013
Decision Date:	08/28/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/21/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/27/2015

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: 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 injured worker is a 64 year old male with an industrial injury dated 12/16/2000. The mechanism of injury is documented as a fall landing on a concrete floor striking his head, shoulder and lower back. His diagnoses included post laminectomy syndrome, lumbar; cervicgia, and lumbago. Prior treatment included medications and diagnostics. He presents on 03/20/2015 with complaints of lower back sore in the morning before he took his pain medication. His medications were Norco, Lidoderm patch, Norflex and Ultram. The progress note dated 03/20/2015 documents bulging disk cervical 3, 4, and 5 and bulging disk lumbar 5 and 6. There was tenderness at lumbar 4-5 with no palpable paraspinal muscle spasm. The injured worker walked with a slow guarded gait. Bilateral toe walk was demonstrated but he was unable to heel walk on left side due to heel pain. MRI of lumbar spine had been requested. There were no reports of MRI in the submitted records. The request is for urine analysis, lumbar epidural steroid facet injection lumbar 4-sacral 1 times 2 and post-op physical therapy three times four.

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 and Leg Chapter.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation (ODG), Knee arthroplasty.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of total knee replacement. According to the Official Disability Guidelines regarding Knee arthroplasty the criteria for knee joint replacement includes conservative care with subjective findings including 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 3/20/15 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. There is no formal weight bearing radiographic report of degree of osteoarthritis. Therefore the guideline criteria have not been met and the determination is the request is not medically.

Associated Surgical Service: 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 Service: 2-3 day hospital stay: 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 Service: CPM Unit Rental for 21 days: 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 Service: Ice Machine Rental for 7 days: 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.

Post-op Physical therapy 3x4 for the right knee: 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.