

Case Number:	CM15-0194602		
Date Assigned:	10/08/2015	Date of Injury:	12/01/2014
Decision Date:	12/10/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/09/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/05/2015

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

Certification(s)/Specialty: Emergency Medicine

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 35 year old female, who sustained an industrial injury on December 1, 2014. The initial symptoms reported by the injured worker are unknown. The injured worker was currently diagnosed as having right knee complex medial meniscus tear, left knee cleavage tears medial meniscus and bilateral plantar fasciitis. Treatment to date has included diagnostic studies, medications and acupuncture. On August 13, 2015, the injured worker complained of left knee pain rated a 7 on a 1-10 pain scale, right knee pain rated a 5 on the pain scale, left ankle pain rated a 7 on the pain scale and right ankle pain rated an 8 on the pain scale. Physical examination revealed tenderness to bilateral knee joint line and tenderness to bilateral ankles and feet. The treatment plan included x-rays of bilateral knees and bilateral ankles, MRI of bilateral knees and bilateral ankles, medication, chiropractic treatment three times four, urinalysis test for toxicology, shockwave therapy to bilateral feet and a follow-up visit. On September 9, 2015, utilization review denied a request for MRI of left knee, ortho shockwave one times six to bilateral foot, follow up visit with neurology times one in four weeks, chiropractic treatment three time four to bilateral knee and retrospective urine toxicology screen (date of service 08-13-2015).

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

MRI Left Knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Knee Complaints 2004, Section(s): Follow-up Visits. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG); Knee Chapter (Online Version).

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)/MRI's (magnetic resonance imaging).

Decision rationale: The request is for an MRI of the knee. The Official Disability Guidelines state the following regarding this topic: Indications for imaging MRI (magnetic resonance imaging): Acute trauma to the knee, including significant trauma (e.g, motor vehicle accident), or if suspect posterior knee dislocation or ligament or cartilage disruption. Non-traumatic knee pain, child or adolescent: non-patellofemoral symptoms. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs non-diagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion) next study if clinically indicated. If additional study is needed. Non-traumatic knee pain, child or adult. Patellofemoral (anterior) symptoms. Initial anteroposterior, lateral, and axial radiographs nondiagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional imaging is necessary, and if internal derangement is suspected. Non-traumatic knee pain, adult. Non-trauma, non-tumor, non-localized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs nondiagnostic (demonstrate normal findings or a joint effusion). If additional studies are indicated, and if internal derangement is suspected. Non-traumatic knee pain, adult - non-trauma, non-tumor, non-localized pain. Initial anteroposterior and lateral radiographs demonstrate evidence of internal derangement (e.g.). Peligrini Stieda disease, joint compartment widening). Repeat MRIs: Post-surgical if need to assess knee cartilage repair tissue. Routine use of MRI for follow-up of asymptomatic patients following knee arthroplasty is not recommended. In this case, the study is not indicated. This is secondary to poor documentation of qualifying factors as listed above. The patient has previously had an MRI and the reasoning for a repeat study is no clear. Also, the change in management depending on the result is not found in the documentation. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Retro Urine Toxicology Screen (DOS: 8/13/15): Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Opioids, pain treatment agreement.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (Chronic)/Urine drug testing (UDT).

Decision rationale: The request is for a urine drug screen. The ODG states the following regarding this topic: Recommended as a tool to monitor compliance with prescribed substances, identify use of undisclosed substances, and uncover diversion of prescribed substances. The test should be used in conjunction with other clinical information when decisions are to be made to continue, adjust or discontinue treatment. This information includes clinical observation, results of addiction screening, pill counts, and prescription drug monitoring reports. The prescribing clinician should also pay close attention to information provided by family members, other providers and pharmacy personnel. The frequency of urine drug testing may be dictated by state and local laws. Indications for UDT: At the onset of treatment: (1) UDT is recommended at the onset of treatment of a new patient who is already

receiving a controlled substance or when chronic opioid management is considered. Urine drug testing is not generally recommended in acute treatment settings (i.e. when opioids are required for nociceptive pain). (2) In cases in which the patient asks for a specific drug. This is particularly the case if this drug has high abuse potential, the patient refuses other drug treatment and/or changes in scheduled drugs, or refuses generic drug substitution. (3) If the patient has a positive or at risk addiction screen on evaluation. This may also include evidence of a history of comorbid psychiatric disorder such as depression, anxiety, bipolar disorder, and/or personality disorder. See Opioids, screening tests for risk of addiction & misuse. (4) If aberrant behavior or misuse is suspected and/or detected. See Opioids, indicators for addiction & misuse. Ongoing monitoring: (1) If a patient has evidence of a high risk of addiction including evidence of a comorbid psychiatric disorder (such as depression, anxiety, attention-deficit disorder, obsessive-compulsive disorder, bipolar disorder, and/or schizophrenia), has a history of aberrant behavior, personal or family history of substance dependence (addiction), or a personal history of sexual or physical trauma, ongoing urine drug testing is indicated as an adjunct to monitoring along with clinical exams and pill counts. See Opioids, tools for risk stratification & monitoring. (2) If dose increases are not decreasing pain and increasing function, consideration of UDT should be made to aid in evaluating medication compliance and adherence. The frequency of drug testing is indicated below: Patients at low risk of addiction/aberrant behavior should be tested within six months of initiation of therapy and on a yearly basis thereafter. There is no reason to perform confirmatory testing unless the test is inappropriate or there are unexpected results. If required, confirmatory testing should be for the questioned drugs only. Patients at moderate risk for addiction/aberrant behavior are recommended for point-of-contact screening 2 to 3 times a year with confirmatory testing for inappropriate or unexplained results. This includes patients undergoing prescribed opioid changes without success, patients with a stable addiction disorder, those patients in unstable and/or dysfunction social situations, and for those patients with comorbid psychiatric pathology. Patients at high risk of adverse outcomes may require testing as often as once per month. This category generally includes individuals with active substance abuse disorders. In this case, a urine drug screen is not supported by the guidelines. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of risk level commensurate to the frequency of evaluation requested. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Ortho Shockwave 1x6 Bilateral Foot: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG); Ankle & Foot Chapter (Online version); extracorporeal shock wave therapy (ESWT).

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Ankle & Foot (Acute & Chronic), extracorporeal shock wave therapy.

Decision rationale: The request is for extracorporeal shock wave therapy. The official disability guidelines state the following regarding this topic: Criteria for the use of Extracorporeal Shock Wave Therapy (ESWT): (1) Patients whose heel pain from plantar fasciitis has remained despite six months of standard treatment. (2) At least three conservative treatments have been performed prior to use of ESWT. These would include: (a) Rest; (b) Ice; (c) NSAIDs; (d) Orthotics; (e) Physical Therapy; (e) Injections (Cortisone). (3) Contraindicated in: Pregnant women; Patients younger than 18 years of age; Patients with blood clotting diseases, infections, tumors, cervical compression, arthritis of the spine or arm, or nerve damage; Patients with cardiac pacemakers; Patients who had physical or occupational therapy within the past 4 weeks; Patients who received a local steroid injection within the past 6 weeks; Patients with bilateral pain; Patients who had previous surgery for the condition. (4) Maximum of 3 therapy sessions over 3 weeks. Low energy ESWT without local anesthesia recommended. In this case, this treatment is not guideline-supported. This is secondary to inadequate documentation of at least three conservative treatments performed as listed above including cortisone injections. As such, the request is not medically necessary.

Follow Up Visit with Neurology x1 in 4 weeks: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation ACOEM Occupational Medicine Practice Guidelines, Chapter 7 Independent Medical Examinations and Consultations.

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not base their decision on the MTUS. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain (chronic)/Office visits.

Decision rationale: The request is for a specialty consultation with a neurologist. The MTUS guidelines are silent regarding this issue. The ODG state the following: Recommended as determined to be medically necessary. Evaluation and management (E&M) outpatient visits to the offices of medical doctor(s) play a critical role in the proper diagnosis and return to function of an injured worker, and they should be encouraged. The need for a clinical office visit with a health care provider is individualized based upon a review of the patient concerns, signs and symptoms, clinical stability, and reasonable physician judgment. The determination is also based on what medications the patient is taking, since some medicines such as opiates, or medicines such as certain antibiotics, require close monitoring. As patient conditions are extremely varied, a set number of office visits per condition cannot be reasonably established. The determination of necessity for an office visit requires individualized case review and assessment, being ever mindful that the best patient outcomes are achieved with eventual patient independence from the health care system through self-care as soon as clinically feasible. The ODG Codes for Automated Approval (CAA), designed to automate claims management decision-making, indicates the number of E&M office visits reflecting the typical number of E&M encounters for a diagnosis, but this is not intended to limit or cap the number of E&M encounters that are medically necessary for a particular patient. Office visits that exceed the number of office visits listed in the CAA may serve as a flag to payors for possible evaluation, however, payors should not automatically deny payment for these if preauthorization has not been obtained. Note: The high quality medical studies required for treatment guidelines such as ODG provides guidance about specific treatments and diagnostic procedures, but not about the recommended number of E&M office visits. Studies have and are being conducted as to the value of virtual visits compared with inpatient visits, however the value of patient/doctor interventions has not been questioned. Further, ODG does provide guidance for therapeutic office visits not included among the E&M codes, for example Chiropractic manipulation and Physical/Occupational

therapy. See also Telehealth. In this case, the request is not medically necessary. This is secondary to poor documentation as to the reasoning for the visit and consultation with a neurologist. There is inadequate discussion of the specific issue requiring further evaluation and assessment.

Chiro 3x4 Bilateral Knee: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Manual therapy & manipulation.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Medical Treatment 2009, Section(s): Manual therapy & manipulation.

Decision rationale: The request is for physical therapy to aid in pain relief. The MTUS guidelines states that manipulation is recommended for chronic pain if caused by musculoskeletal conditions. Manual Therapy is widely used in the treatment of musculoskeletal pain. The intended goal or effect of Manual Medicine is the achievement of positive symptomatic or objective measurable gains in functional improvement that facilitate progression in the patient's therapeutic exercise program and return to productive activities. Manipulation is manual therapy that moves a joint beyond the physiologic range-of-motion but not beyond the anatomic range-of-motion. It is indicated for low back pain but not ankle and foot conditions, carpal tunnel syndrome, forearm/wrist/hand pain, or knee pain. The use of active treatment modalities instead of passive treatments is associated with substantially better clinical outcomes. Active treatments also allow for fading of treatment frequency along with active self-directed home PT, so that less visits would be required in uncomplicated cases. The guidelines state the following: Low back: Recommended as an option. Therapeutic care trial of 6 visits over weeks, with evidence of objective functional improvement, total of up to 18 visits over 6-8 weeks. Elective/maintenance care not medically necessary. Recurrences/flare-ups need to reevaluate treatment success, if RTW achieved then 1-2 visits every 4-6 months. Ankle & Foot: Not recommended. Carpal tunnel syndrome: Not recommended. Forearm, Wrist, & Hand: Not recommended. Knee: Not recommended. In this case, the patient does not qualify for physical therapy as indicated above and would benefit most from at home active therapy. Manipulation for knee pathology is not guideline-supported. As such, the request is not medically necessary.