

Case Number:	CM15-0199029		
Date Assigned:	10/14/2015	Date of Injury:	01/06/2006
Decision Date:	12/31/2015	UR Denial Date:	09/28/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	10/09/2015

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 56 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 1-6-2006. A review of the medical records indicates that the injured worker is undergoing treatment for chronic pain syndrome, osteoarthritis of bilateral knees and degenerative joint disease. According to the progress report dated 7-2-2015, the injured worker complained of bilateral knee pain, greater on the right. The physical exam (7-2-2015) revealed an antalgic gait. There was tenderness to palpation over the right knee. Treatment has included knee arthroscopy, cortisone injections, Synvisc injections, physical therapy and medications (Tramadol). Knee x-rays from 9-17-2015 showed moderate to severe degenerative changes of the knee, greatest in the medial compartments and minimal left joint effusion. The physician letter dated 9-17-2015 documents progressive pain in both knees, but the right knee in particular. The physician noted that magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) suggested significant, severe arthritis, tricompartmental in nature involving the right knee. The recommendation was for right total knee replacement. The request for authorization was dated 9-21-2015. The original Utilization Review (UR) (9-28-2015) denied a request for a right total knee replacement and associated services.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

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

One right total knee replacement: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: Decision based on MTUS Knee Complaints 2004. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG).

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, the BMI is 40.2. The request is not medically necessary.

Pre op labs: CBC: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre op labs: Renal function panel: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre op labs PT/PTT: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre op clearance: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Three day inpatient stay: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Eight home health nurse visits: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Eight physical therapy visits: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

Pre op electrocardiogram: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

One shower chair: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

One walker: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.

One assistant surgeon: Upheld

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

MAXIMUS guideline: The Expert Reviewer did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

Decision rationale: Since the primary procedure is not medically necessary, none of the associated services are medically necessary.