

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0142726		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/03/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	09/22/2011
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/03/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	07/09/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	07/23/2015

### 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, Indiana, Oregon  
 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 50 year old male who sustained a work related injury September 22, 2011. Past history included right knee surgery August, 2012 and left knee December, 2011. An MRI of the right knee, dated March 2, 2015 (report present in the medical record) revealed suspicion for a slightly complex horizontal tear in the posterior horn of the medial meniscus, the lateral meniscus is intact; small joint effusion. An orthopedic consultation performed June 24, 2015, noted approximately two months prior, the injured worker was getting up from a squatting position and felt a tearing sensation on the medial knee with increased symptoms. Physical examination of the right knee revealed range of motion 0-130 degrees with no patella instability or apprehension. There is moderate patellofemoral crepitation and medial joint line tenderness. McMurray's is positive with varus stress. There is no lateral joint line tenderness; the knee is stable to anterior, posterior, medial, and lateral stress. Assessment is documented as right knee arthritis; internal derangement; medial meniscal tear. Treatment plan included a discussion regarding alternative treatments and at issue, a request for authorization for a right knee arthroscopy with meniscectomy and debridement, Norco, Colace, ibuprofen, Zofran, Keflex, and post-surgical physical therapy.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Right knee arthroscopy with meniscectomy and debridement:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints. 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 Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) knee.

**Decision rationale:** CAMTUS/ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints, pages 344-345, states regarding meniscus tears, Arthroscopic partial meniscectomy usually has a high success rate for cases in which there is clear evidence of a meniscus tear symptoms other than simply pain (locking, popping, giving way, recurrent effusion). According to ODG Knee and Leg section, Meniscectomy section, states indications for arthroscopy and meniscectomy include attempt at physical therapy and subjective clinical findings, which correlate with objective examination and MRI. In this case the exam notes from 6/24/15 do not demonstrate evidence of adequate recent course of physical therapy or other conservative measures. The MRI findings are equivocal given the prior surgeries. The request is not medically necessary.

**Norco 7.5/325mg #50mg:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines opioids Page(s): 80.

**Decision rationale:** According to the CA MTUS/Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 80, opioids should be continued if the patient has returned to work and the patient has improved functioning and pain. Based upon the records reviewed there is insufficient evidence to support chronic use of narcotics. There is lack of demonstrated functional improvement, percentage of relief, demonstration of urine toxicology compliance or increase in activity from the exam note of 6/24/15. Therefore the request is not medically necessary.

**Colace 100mg #10:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. 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 Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain.

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of stool softeners. According to the ODG Pain section, opioid induced constipation treatment, if prescribing opioids has been determined to be appropriate, then ODG recommends, under Initiating Therapy, that Prophylactic treatment of constipation should be initiated. In this case the constipating medications are not medically necessary, so the stool softener is not medically necessary.

**Ibuprofen 600mg #90:** Upheld

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

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines NSAIDS Page(s): 67.

**Decision rationale:** According to the CA/MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment Guidelines, page 67, NSAIDs, specific recommendations are for Osteoarthritis (including knee and hip): Recommended at the lowest dose for the shortest period in patients with moderate to severe pain. Acetaminophen may be considered for initial therapy for patients with mild to moderate pain, and in particular, for those with gastrointestinal, cardiovascular or renovascular risk factors. NSAIDs appear to be superior to acetaminophen, particularly for patients with moderate to severe pain. There is no evidence to recommend one drug in this class over another based on efficacy. In particular, there appears to be no difference between traditional NSAIDs and COX-2 NSAIDs in terms of pain relief. The main concern of selection is based on adverse effects. COX-2 NSAIDs have fewer GI side effects at the risk of increased cardiovascular side effects, although the FDA has concluded that long-term clinical trials are best interpreted to suggest that cardiovascular risk occurs with all NSAIDs and is a class effect (with naproxyn being the safest drug). There is no evidence of long-term effectiveness for pain or function. (Chen, 2008) (Laine, 2008) In this case, there is insufficient evidence to support functional improvement on Ibuprofen or osteoarthritis to warrant usage. The request is not medically necessary.

**Zofran 4mg #10:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. 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 Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) pain.

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of Zofran for postoperative use. According to the ODG, Pain Chapter, Ondansetron (Zofran) is not recommended for nausea and vomiting secondary to chronic opioid use. In this case the submitted records demonstrate no evidence of nausea and vomiting or increased risk for postoperative issues. Therefore determination is not medically necessary.

**Keflex 500mg #4:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM. 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 Stulberg DL, Penrod MA, Blatny RA. Common bacterial skin infections. Am Fam Physician. 2002 Jul 1; 66(1):119-24.

**Decision rationale:** CA MTUS/ACOEM and ODG are silent on the issue of Keflex. An alternative guideline was utilized. According to the American Family Physician Journal, 2002 July 1; 66 (1): 119 - 125, titled "Common Bacterial Skin Infections", Keflex is often the drug of choice for skin wounds and skin infections. It was found from a review of the medical record submitted of no evidence of a wound infection to warrant antibiotic prophylaxis. The request for Keflex is therefore not medically necessary and appropriate.

**Sixteen post-surgical physical therapy visits over eight weeks 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.