

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0161643		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	08/28/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	08/22/2014
<b>Decision Date:</b>	09/30/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	08/11/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	08/18/2015

### 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: 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 55 year old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 8-22-2014. The mechanism of injury is unknown. The injured worker was diagnosed as having left ankle fracture, lumbar disc displacement, left hip sprain-strain, left knee medial meniscus tear, left cruciate ligament sprain and left ankle sprain-strain. There is no record of a recent diagnostic study. Treatment to date has included acupuncture, physical therapy and medication management. In a progress note dated 7-13-2015, the injured worker complains of low back pain and left hip, leg and knee pain. Physical examination showed bilateral lumbar spasm and tenderness, spasm and tenderness to the left gluteus medius, spasm and tenderness in the left knee and in the left ankle. The treating physician is requesting 3D magnetic resonance imaging of the left knee.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**3D MRI of the left knee:** Upheld

**Claims Administrator guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints Page(s): 341-343.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 13 Knee Complaints  
Page(s): 343-347.

**Decision rationale:** The ACOEM chapter on knee complaints, states that MRI is indicated to determine the extent of ACL tears preoperatively. Reliance only on imaging studies to evaluate the source of knee symptoms may carry a significant risk of diagnostic confusion (false-positive test results) because of the possibility of identifying a problem that was present before symptoms began, and therefore has no temporal association with the current symptoms. Even so, remember that while experienced examiners usually can diagnose an ACL tear in the non-acute stage based on history and physical examination, these injuries are commonly missed or over diagnosed by inexperienced examiners, making MRIs valuable in such cases. Criteria per the ACOEM for ordering an MRI of the knee in the provided documentation for review have not been met. Therefore the request is not certified.