

Case Number:	CM15-0148863		
Date Assigned:	08/12/2015	Date of Injury:	02/19/2014
Decision Date:	09/14/2015	UR Denial Date:	07/06/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	07/31/2015

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, North Carolina
Certification(s)/Specialty: Family Practice

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 60 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on 2-19-2014. The mechanism of injury is unknown. The injured worker was diagnosed as having bilateral knee osteoarthritis. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included therapy and medication management. In a progress note dated 7-2-2015, the injured worker complains of bilateral knee osteoarthritis. Physical examination showed bilateral knee tenderness. The treating physician is requesting Viscosupplementation bilateral knees x 4.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Viscosupplementation bilateral knees x 4: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons (AAOS) Guidelines: Treatment of Osteoarthritis of the knee, 2nd edition 2013.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons, Treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee, 2nd Edition, 2013.

Decision rationale: CA MTUS/ACOEM does not address viscosupplementation of the knee. ODG previously recommended viscosupplementation. The American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons in 2013 issued a strong recommendation against the use of viscosupplementation in the treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee. In this case, the claimant has bilateral osteoarthritis of the knees and is s/p meniscectomy of the left knee. Recent guidelines suggest that the evidence for viscosupplementation is inconsistent and clinical improvement is small and not clinically meaningful. Therefore this request is deemed not medically necessary or appropriate.