

| | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------------|------------|
| Case Number: | CM15-0187440 | | |
| Date Assigned: | 10/06/2015 | Date of Injury: | 11/10/2011 |
| Decision Date: | 12/16/2015 | UR Denial Date: | 09/11/2015 |
| Priority: | Standard | Application Received: | 09/23/2015 |

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:

This is a 71 year old female who sustained a work-related injury on 11-10-11. Medical record documentation on 8-10-15 (8 on 7-5-15) revealed the injured worker was being treated for left knee moderate to severe osteoarthopathy and medial meniscus tear. She rated her pain an 8 on a 10-point scale. Her refractory treatment included viscosupplementation, physical therapy, home exercise program, and activity modification. Medications facilitate her activities of daily living to include light household duties, shopping, grooming and cooking. Objective findings included tenderness of the left knee. Her left knee range of motion was 0-80 degrees with pain. She had crepitation with range of motion and tenderness to palpation at the medial joint line and the lateral joint line. She had difficulty rising from a seated position. She had atrophy of the left lower extremity. A request for left total knee arthroplasty and associated services was received on 9-3-15. On 9-11-15 the Utilization Review physician determined left total knee arthroplasty and associated services were not medically necessary.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

Left total knee arthroplasty: Upheld

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

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: CA MTUS/ACOEM is silent on the issue of total knee replacement. According to the Official Disability Guidelines regarding Knee arthroplasty: Criteria for knee joint replacement which 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. In this case, there is no clear radiographic evidence of significant chondral clear space loss in 2 of 3 compartments on standing radiographs. The request is not medically necessary.

Associated service: assistant: Upheld

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

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated service: Pre-op history and physical: Upheld

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

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated service: Pre-op CBC with diff: Upheld

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

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated service: Pre-op UA: Upheld

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

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated service: Pre-op Chem panel: Upheld

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

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated service: Pre-op PT and PTT: Upheld

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

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated service: Post-op home physical therapy 3x2 weeks: Upheld

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

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.

Associated service: Post-op outside physical therapy 3x6: Upheld

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

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: As the requested surgical procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary and appropriate.