

Case Number:	CM15-0102797		
Date Assigned:	06/05/2015	Date of Injury:	12/04/2014
Decision Date:	07/07/2015	UR Denial Date:	05/18/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/28/2015

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 53 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 12/04/2014. She reported an injury to her left knee after a fall at work and was diagnosed with left knee pain and contusion of left knee. The injured worker is currently working full duty. The injured worker is currently diagnosed as having left knee internal derangement. Treatment and diagnostics to date has included physical therapy, home exercise program, left knee MRI which showed articular surface pitting and irregularity, and medications. In a progress note dated 03/19/2015, the injured worker presented with complaints of anterior leg pain. According to the application, the treating physician reported requesting authorization for acupuncture and Synvisc injection to the left knee.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Acupuncture 1x6, left knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Acupuncture Treatment Guidelines.

Decision rationale: According to MTUS guidelines, "Acupuncture is used as an option when pain medication is reduced or not tolerated, it may be used as an adjunct to physical rehabilitation and/or surgical intervention to hasten functional recovery. It is the insertion and removal of filiform needles to stimulate acupoints (acupuncture points). Needles may be inserted, manipulated, and retained for a period of time. Acupuncture can be used to reduce pain, reduce inflammation, increase blood flow, increase range of motion, decrease the side effect of medication-induced nausea, promote relaxation in an anxious patient, and reduce muscle spasm." Furthermore and according to MTUS guidelines, "Acupuncture with electrical stimulation" is the use of electrical current (microamperage or milli-amperage) on the needles at the acupuncture site. It is used to increase effectiveness of the needles by continuous stimulation of the acupoint. Physiological effects (depending on location and settings) can include endorphin release for pain relief, reduction of inflammation, increased blood circulation, analgesia through interruption of pain stimulus, and muscle relaxation. It is indicated to treat chronic pain conditions, radiating pain along a nerve pathway, muscle spasm, inflammation, scar tissue pain, and pain located in multiple sites." In this case, there is no documentation that the patient's pain medications are used and/or not tolerated. Therefore, the request for Acupuncture Treatment; 12 Visits (2x6) is not medically necessary.

Synvisc 1 injection for left knee: 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), Hyaluronic Acid injection.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Hyaluronic acid injections, <http://www.worklossdatainstitute.verioiponly.com/odgtwc/knee.htm#Hyaluronicacidinjections>.

Decision rationale: According to ODG guidelines, Hyaluronic acid injections "Recommended as a possible option for severe osteoarthritis for patients who have not responded adequately to recommended conservative treatments (exercise, NSAIDs or acetaminophen), to potentially delay total knee replacement, but in recent quality studies the magnitude of improvement appears modest at best. See Recent research below. While osteoarthritis of the knee is a recommended indication, there is insufficient evidence for other conditions, including patellofemoral arthritis, chondromalacia patellae, osteochondritis dissecans, or patellofemoral syndrome (patellar knee pain). Hyaluronic acids are naturally occurring substances in the body's connective tissues that cushion and lubricate the joints. Intra-articular injection of hyaluronic acid can decrease symptoms of osteoarthritis of the knee; there are significant improvements in pain and functional outcomes with few adverse events. (Karlsson, 2002) (Leopold, 2003) (Day, 2004) (Wang, 2004) (Aggarwal, 2004) (Arrich, 2005) (Karatosun, 2005) (Blue Cross Blue Shield, 2005) (Petrella, 2005) Compared with lower-molecular-weight hyaluronic acid, this study concluded that the highest-molecular-weight hyaluronic acid may be more efficacious in treating knee OA. (Lo-JAMA, 2004) These more recent studies did not. (Reichenbach, 2007) (Jni, 2007) The response to hyaluronan/hylan products appears more durable than intra-articular corticosteroids in treatment of knee osteoarthritis. (Bellamy-Cochrane, 2005) Viscosupplementation is an effective

treatment for OA of the knee with beneficial effects: on pain, function and patient global assessment; and at different post injection periods but especially at the 5 to 13 week post injection period. Within the constraints of the trial designs employed no major safety issues were detected. (Bellamy-Cochrane², 2005) (Bellamy, 2006) Intra-articular viscosupplementation was moderately effective in relieving knee pain in patients with osteoarthritis at 5 to 7 and 8 to 10 weeks after the last injection but not at 15 to 22 weeks. (Modawal, 2005) This study assessing the efficacy of intra-articular injections of hyaluronic acid (HA) compared to placebo in patients with osteoarthritis of the knee found that results were similar and were not statistically significant between treatment groups, but HA was somewhat superior to placebo in improving knee pain and function, with no difference between 3 or 6 consecutive injections. (Petrella, 2006) The combined use of hyaluronate injections with a home exercise program should be considered for management of moderate-to-severe pain in patients with knee osteoarthritis. (Stitik, 2007) Patients with moderate to severe pain associated with knee OA that is not responding to oral therapy can be treated with intra-articular injections. Intra-articular injections of hyaluronate are associated with delayed onset of analgesia but a prolonged duration of action vs injections of corticosteroids. (Zhang, 2008) Treatment with hylan or hyaluronic acids is thought to restore synovial fluid viscoelasticity, which is depleted in patients with OA. Hyaluronic acids were modified to form high molecular weight hylans, to increase viscosity and decrease clearance from the joint. (Jni, 2007) Data of the literature demonstrate that hylan GF-20 is a safe and effective treatment for decreasing pain and improving function in patients suffering from knee osteoarthritis. (Conrozier, 2008) (Huskin, 2008) (Zietz, 2008) In one trial comparing the clinical effectiveness, functional outcome and patient satisfaction following intra articular injection with two viscosupplementation agents - Hylan G-F-20 and Sodium Hyaluronate in patients with osteoarthritis (OA) of the knee, both treatments offered significant pain reduction, but it was achieved earlier and sustained for a longer period with Hylan G-F 20. From this study, it appeared that the clinical effectiveness and general patient satisfaction are better amongst patients who received Hylan G-F 20, although the numbers of treatment related adverse events were higher (39 vs. 30) in the Hylan G-F 20 group. As with all injections, care must be given to watch for any possible adverse events, and particularly with the use of Hylan over Hyaluronic acid. (Raman, 2008) (Reichenbach, 2007) On 02/26/09 the FDA granted marketing approval for Synvisc-One (hylan G-F 20), a product intended for the relief of pain associated of the knee. Synvisc-One is the only single-injection viscosupplement approved for the treatment of OA knee pain in the [REDACTED], from [REDACTED] (FDA, 2009) A meta-analysis of clinical trials concluded that, from baseline to week 4, intra-articular corticosteroids appear to be relatively more effective for pain than intra-articular hyaluronic acid, but by week 4, the 2 approaches have equal efficacy, and beyond week 8, hyaluronic acid has greater efficacy. (Bannuru, 2009) In patients who are candidates for TKR, the need for TKR can be delayed with hyaluronic acid injections. (Waddell, 2007)" There is no documentation that the patient failed conservative therapies. There is no documentation that the patient is suffering from osteoarthritis or severe osteoarthritis that did not respond to conservative therapies. Therefore, the request for left knee Synvisc injection for the left knee is not a medical necessity.