

<b>Case Number:</b>	CM15-0192420		
<b>Date Assigned:</b>	10/06/2015	<b>Date of Injury:</b>	04/19/2006
<b>Decision Date:</b>	11/13/2015	<b>UR Denial Date:</b>	09/14/2015
<b>Priority:</b>	Standard	<b>Application Received:</b>	09/30/2015

### 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: Massachusetts

Certification(s)/Specialty: Physical Medicine & Rehabilitation, Pain Management

### 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 64-year-old male, who sustained an industrial injury on 4-19-2006. Medical records indicate the worker is undergoing treatment for status post right knee arthroscopy in 2012 and left knee pain with surgery in 2010. A progress noted from 5-22-2015 reported he had received repeat Synvisc injections and was doing well with it and taking less Tramadol. A recent progress report dated 8-28-2015, reported the injured worker complained of ongoing right knee pain and that he did well with Motrin and Tramadol, Alzheimer's disease is requesting to go back for further Synvisc injections. Physical examination revealed right knee tenderness and crepitus with range of motion. Treatment to date has included surgeries, Synvisc injection in the knee and medication management. The physician is requesting Repeat right knee Synvisc injection times 3. On 9-14-2015, the Utilization Review noncertified the request for Repeat right knee Synvisc injection times 3.

### IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

**Repeat right knee synvisc injection times 3: Upheld**

**Claims Administrator guideline:** The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines, Knee and leg chapter, Hyaluronic acid injections.

**MAXIMUS guideline:** The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Knee & Leg (Acute & Chronic): Hyaluronic acid injections.

**Decision rationale:** The claimant sustained a work injury in April 2006 and is being treated for bilateral knee pain. He has a history of bilateral arthroscopic knee surgeries with the last on the right in September 2012 and on the left in February 2013. In February 2015, prior Synvisc injection in August 2014 had provided 50% pain relief lasting for 4-5 months. A series of bilateral Synvisc injection was performed, starting on 03/13/15. When seen on 08/28/15 he felt his right knee pain was returning and was requesting repeat injections. He was continuing to do well with Motrin and tramadol. Omeprazole was also being prescribed. Physical examination findings included ongoing right knee tenderness and crepitus with range of motion. Authorization for a repeat series of Synvisc injection was requested. Hyaluronic acid injections are recommended as a possible option for severe osteoarthritis for patients who have not responded adequately to recommended conservative treatments to potentially delay total knee replacement. A repeat series of injections can be considered if there is a documented significant improvement in symptoms for 6 months or more and the symptoms recur. In this case, the claimant had only 4-5 months of improvement after the injections performed in August 2014 and this request is being submitted less than 6 months after the last series of injections in March 2015. He is reported to be continuing to do well with oral medications. A repeat series does not meet the applicable criteria and the request is not considered medically necessary.